

Minutes
Joint Administration and Library Faculty Assembly
Committee on University Library Reorganization
Third Meeting, Monday, February 25, 2008, 9:30 -11:00 a.m., Room 1A

Roll of Members (Present):

Stephanie Haas, Support Services, co-chair
James Cusick, Collections, co-chair
Carl Van Ness, Collections
Jana Ronan, Public Services
Patrick Reakes, Public Services
Jimmie Lundgren, Technical Services
Priscilla Williams, Technical Services
Adrian Zeck, Collections
Jim Stevens, Public Services
Amy Polk, Support Services
Raimonda Margjoni, Technical Services

Brian Keith, ex officio

Absent: Blake Landor

Observers: Matthew Loving, Joe Aufmuth, Vernon Kisling

Meeting commenced 9:35 A.M.

Minutes were approved as amended with a correction from Jimmie Lundgren: that committee members decided on Friday there should be a strong rationale give for any recommendations they may regarding reorganizing the structure of the library.

Following approval of the minutes a request was made for additional agenda items. The agenda was accepted as presented.

The first item on the agenda was to review and discuss information Dean Judith Russell sent by email to the committee in response to their questions about (1) her sense of the percentage of time she would need to commit to library development; (2) her description of the duties of the Senior Associate Dean; and (3) the place of Access Services in the organization chart proposed and released for discussion on February 1, 2008.

There was no discussion of (1) and (2) above although the committee will probably review this information with the dean at the Wednesday meeting. There was extensive discussion about Access Services. There is no provision for an access services unit or department in the proposed reorganization. Committee members expressed concern about how some basic functions of access services would be coordinated in the absence of this unit. To address this, two committee members—Jana Ronan and Jim Stevens—and one attending librarian—Matthew Loving—will compile a list of basic services provided by Access Services and highlight any that seem to be left unaccounted for in the proposed reorganization. This is part of the committee's consideration of how to coordinate functions across libraries and branches if current library structure is changed.

As part of this discussion, committee members briefly discussed how other libraries, such as Ohio State and University of Maryland, use team or cooperative groups to bring together librarians and staffs to oversee various library functions. This discussion will continue.

Certain requirements of any reorganization emerged from the discussion pertaining to access services. In general, committee members agreed:

- That a changed library structure still needs to coordinate basic services; concerns expressed by current employees about the future nature of access services and collection management illustrate that this issue needs more explicit consideration in any plan for change
- That the past legacy of the library has been one of too much micromanagement from the top and not enough delegation to employees in charge of day-to-day operations
- That a permanent employee “buy in” for changes means employees should be more directly involved in operations and decision-making
- That—apart from a reporting structure—changes need to include the creation and ongoing use of coordinating or participatory bodies composed from different levels of library employees
- That the library needs to create permanent mechanisms for input and also for accountability that have been largely lacking in the past
- And finally, related to a need for accountability, there also needs to be mechanisms for timely decision-making

Committee members feel that many library employees want to know more about how basic decisions and functions will be coordinated—something not explicitly depicted on an organizational chart

In reviewing discussion from Friday’s meeting, members remained in broad agreement over the reporting structure for the SUS shared facility and for the Associate Dean of Development. There is still debate about whether or not Support Services and IT should be combined into a single division. The committee is seeking additional input from people who would be in that division. The committee has also not reached a consensus on the best divisional structure for the branches and collections.

The committee will be talking with Dean Russell at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 AM

The next meeting will be held, Wednesday, February 27 from 9:30 to 11:00 in Room 1A Library East.