

## **Library Council Retreat, June 22, 2009**

Attendees: Jennifer Banks, Rebecca Bisbee, Nina Davis-Millis, Tracy Gabridge, Millicent Gaskell, Steven Gass, Diane Geraci, Keith Glavash, Marilyn McSweeney, Tom Rosko, Howard Silver, MacKenzie Smith, Theresa Tobin, Ann Wolpert, Ann Whiteside, Brian McDonald, Larry Gallagher and Elaine Mello.

### **I. Opening comments: objectives for this meeting, review of agenda**

- To consider an organizational framework for the MIT Libraries that will enable the Libraries to move toward the desired future state.
- To identify issues or potential refinements to the organizational framework. To outline what would be needed to move from the current state to the desired future state given the proposed organizational framework.
- To develop a communications plan for sharing this with various stakeholders.

### **II. Review List of What the Libraries Should Invest In and Do “Less of”**

LC divided into 3 groups to develop priorities for investment and de-investment from the list that was compiled as a result of the previous LC meeting.

#### **Group A**

Less of:

- Reduce effort...as appropriate for selecting/acquiring/checking/cataloguing
- Service points
- Consolidate similar positions

More of:

- MIT provided content.
- IT Infrastructure
- Marketing/Communication.

#### **Group B**

Less of:

- Print related work: less buying, less cataloging, less processing.
- Fewer service points, fewer places, consolidation, fewer hours.
- Calibrate service standards

More of:

- Online discovery environment
- Marketing and Communicating (outreach/awareness)
- Assessment
- Enterprise systems maintenance and development.

#### **Group C:**

Less of:

- Fewer points of service for collection, consolidation.
- Less print purchasing

More of:

- IT Infrastructure

- Better infrastructure
- Curation of MIT Content
- Selective collaboration w/ internal and external.

### **III. Provide an Overview on the Proposed Organizational Framework**

The draft service framework was presented and LC, in small groups, was asked to consider some key questions in the context of this proposed framework.

- How would we recognize and measure success and improvement?
- How would this simplify innovation?
- How does this design respond to changes we foresee in our desired future state?
- What will motivate our talented and entrepreneurial staff?

Each group then reported out its responses and questions.

#### **Group X**

How does this design respond to changes we foresee in our desired future state? Questions and comments were offered:

- How are support staff involved in and “supportive” of the left side of the framework?
- Framework depth appears inconsistent: right side of chart is finer grained than left.
- Are we removing policy development from the left side?
- This framework actually strengthens the links between outward facing and back room operations.
- Central measurement/assessment will serve us well.
- Unclear how this will address the design priorities of fostering innovation.
- Potential support for the three I’s (interdisciplinary, international, inter-institutional)
- How to retain relationships with and influence by specific schools (Deans and Assoc Deans)

How are staff motivated?

- Sense of accomplishing something useful.
- Some measure of autonomy.
- Sense of where each of us fits in the big picture.
- Engagement with user community
- Motivated by having growth opportunities.
- Commitment to contributing to education and research.
- Understanding where we are going as an organization.

#### **Group Y**

How does this design respond to changes we foresee in our desired future state?

- Framework can move us toward DFS though depends on implementation.
  - Moves us forward:
    - Seamless discovery
    - Provide expert support
    - Create high-quality spaces
    - Build and strengthen relationships
    - Advocacy of info policy

- Improve infrastructure
- Jury still out on how the framework improves:
  - Managing knowledge – MIT content
  - Leading initiatives to inform and shape.
  - Staff capabilities.
  - Collaboration.

## **Group Z**

How to measure success?

- Use realistic aggressive timeline.
- Achieve high user satisfaction, attract high-quality staff.
- Need to combine data and subject expertise.

Does this simplify innovation?

- Alignments allow for more system-level thinking
- AMPS integration does.
- specialized content expertise and online user interface – good synergy

Issues:

- We need a more holistic view, unified Marketing & Communication
  - Unclear about decision making process
  - Separation of software product development and production systems – alignment needed?
  - We need clear authority and accountability.
- 

As a group LC was asked to consider these additional questions:

- Looking at the next level of design considerations, what are some important facets of the framework that need to be developed?
- What's missing from the framework?
- What are some concurrent changes that may be part of the transition from the current state to the desired future state?
- What are the high-level cross-unit collaborations that may be required?

Responses:

- Implementation is very important.
- We want the organizational design to foster innovation/sustainable implementable invention/innovation
- We want the organization to enable people to make decisions
- Communication/priorities
- Need an org chart
- Roles Designed/populated
- Linkages key

## **IV. Input on the Next Level of Work on the Organizational Framework**

### **Group 1**

What are some concurrent changes that could be part of the transition to the desired future state?

Would we want to consolidate collections? Move more print offsite?

- Look at patterns by discipline.
- Look at R2 report.

- Create a compelling vision for space utilization/collaborative space.
- Transition to e-theses.
- Hosting facilities for self-service media production.
- Centralized collection services could be located elsewhere.
- Review cost-recovery funding models.
- Next level wins re: print workflow analysis.
- Align resource development with desired future state.
- Engage broader segment of leadership.
- External (non-MIT) partnerships
- Use a project to test new organization, eg MIT 150<sup>th</sup>.

## **Group 2**

Propose a process, criteria and timeline for transitioning to a staffing plan for the organization taking shape.

- First need to articulate top levels of positions.
- Inventory staff for interests and aptitudes.
- Assoc. Dir. partners w/ a Dept. Head for a different directorate to propose AD's top layer of managers.
- Identify unique character culture/temperament of each physical location.
- Rationalize our use of space in terms of programs and services.

## **Group 3**

Identify high-level cross-unit collaborations that will be important in the emerging design.

- Assume iterative process.
- Eliminate standing committees; Replace w/ these task forces:
- Communication. (internal/external)
- Content/Collections.
- Assessment.
- IT/Software development.
- User experience.
- Populated w/ staff from different areas.

## **Group 4**

Develop an aggressive timeline for a transition w/ proposed milestones for an organizational chart, roles/positions populated, staff alignment, and financial structure

- By Sept., 2009, develop org chart with key roles.
- By Dec., 2009, identify transition team and budget submission.
- By March, 2010, define roles and positions, map staff to new roles.
  - Deliverables: job descriptions and proposal for where people will go.
- By June, 2010, transition plan ready.
- By Sept, 2010, phase one of Transition plan complete.
- By Dec, 2010, plan completed.

---

As a group LC was asked to consider these additional questions:

Where could we get resources to implement concurrent changes?

- It's time to reprioritize.
- Staging needs to be tightly synchronized.
- Restructure collections development
  - Budget
  - Selector relationships

What have we forgotten? What other concerns do you have?

- How will selection be framed?
- Relationships and decision making.
- Where will we find the resources in time of constraint?
- How does Archives fit in?
- What about transition costs?
- Collaboration within MIT.
- What might MIT require of us?
- We can make anything work if we try.
- Having AD partner with Dept. Head from other directorate (as proposed above) raises concerns.
- Divisional libraries are mapped to schools currently.

## **V. Working on Communicating the Framework and Planning the Transition**

Key communication issues are:

- Sketching out the high level reasons for this approach.
- How to best present the framework to the staff?
- How will we present the framework to other stakeholders?
- Identify what work groups might be engaged.
- Identify elements of a transition plan.

Feedback on proposed timeline:

- Process should go faster.
- Have org chart ready by July 31, 2009.
- Timeline seems suitable and realistic.
- Great schedule. Roles and positions must include new capabilities needed as well as the possibility of staff reductions.
- Looks good: aggressive but still reasonable.
- Can implementation happen that fast? (ie June – Dec transition) Is this achievable?
- Writing 200 position descriptions in 4 months seems too short.
- Plan won't be complete by Dec 2010, will be continuing. Does "Plan completed" allow for more continual change?
- Add additional milestone --- to take stock 6 months after Dec 2010.

Personnel issues:

- How do we identify positions that don't currently exist?
- The role of staff member's self-assessment of his/her aptitudes and suitability for a place in the new framework.
- Need to provide staff with support for change process and communicate as openly as possible.
- Don't necessarily have to preserve culture of location. People will be moving around and

creating a new culture.

- Make sure we emphasize true user need vs. what we hold dear. Also make sure it's a user need for more than a tiny minority of the community.
- Broaden the scope of key decision makers.

State the high level reasons for this approach:

- Move from predominantly print to electronic content.
- Easier to assign all resources to changing needs as they evolve.
- Operational efficiency and staffing flexibility
- Digital
- Flexible
- Evolving

Create an outline for presentation to staff with Bullet points we can use within MIT and beyond:

- Awareness raising of library usage via survey.
- Create better access and delivery infrastructure.
- Realignment of library resources to digital environment.

Feedback on the proposed framework – a sentiment check; LC members were asked to rate the framework on a 1-10 scale (1 lowest, 10 highest with number of votes in parentheses) and provide a comment:

5 (2) has potential, how will org chart unfold  
devil is in details

6 (1) Eager to ID leadership roles

6.5 (1) Key is in implementation

7 (3) Large pieces are there, details will make or break, tight timeline given all our other work.  
Framework falls a little short, how will this day influence the direction  
Generally good, the how matters

7.5 (1) Fairly positive, lot of unknowns

8 (4) Like strategy and system approach  
Goldilocks – just about right, can we stay focused.  
Like the framework, need more on how to get there.  
Framework good, need more clarity

9 (3) Headed in the right direction, need change agents to step up.  
Progress, moving in the right direction  
Like the process to move faster

Next steps:

- STC will review discussion at STC mtg 6/23 and set out transition timeline.
- Process for staffing plan
- Process for getting to Org chart
- Communication plan