



UNIVERSITY  
of HAWAII  
MĀNOA

University Libraries

To: Mānoa Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
Via: Robert Cooney, Chair

From: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa Library Faculty Senate  
Via: Gwen Sinclair, Chair

Re: Reorganization Proposal for Library Services

Date: September 15, 2011

The UHM Library administration is proposing a reorganization of the Library. The Manoa Faculty Senate Executive Committee should receive it for review sometime in September. SEC should also receive copies of comments from Library faculty and staff submitted during review periods following issuance of Library administration's original draft of April 5, 2011 and revision of August 5, 2011.

Because the one week review period for the August 5, 2011 revision did not allow sufficient time for the Library Senate to meet or formulate a response, at its August 16, 2011 meeting, the Senate approved the following motion: *That the Library Senate Executive Board communicate the Library Senate's collective responses to Library Administration's proposed reorganization.*

The Library Senate Executive Board devised a five-question survey to elicit comments from members of the Library Senate to be forwarded to the Mānoa Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The survey was distributed to 50 voting members of the Library Senate on August 25, 2011. The survey closed on September 9, 2011. 26 senators responded to the survey, a response rate of 52 percent.

The survey questions and responses are appended for your information. In addition, one comment was received outside of the survey structure, and it is also appended. To improve readability, clarifications in square brackets ([ ]) have been inserted into some comments.

Please feel free to contact us via Gwen Sinclair ([g Sinclair@hawaii.edu](mailto:g Sinclair@hawaii.edu)). Library Services' representatives to the MFS this year are Jim Cartwright ([jimc@hawaii.edu](mailto:jimc@hawaii.edu)) and Dore Minatodani ([dorem@hawaii.edu](mailto:dorem@hawaii.edu)).

c: Paula Mochida, Interim University Librarian

Attachments:

Results of UHM Library Senate Survey on Reorganization Proposal of August 5, 2011  
Independent comment

2550 McCarthy Mall  
Honolulu, HI 96822  
Telephone: (808) 956-xxxx  
Fax: (808) 956-5968

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution

**Results of UHM Library Senate Survey on  
Reorganization Proposal of August 5, 2011**

<b>Question 1</b>		
<b>Please indicate your level of agreement with this statement: I support the proposed reorganization of the library.</b>		
Option	Number of Responses	Percent
Strongly disagree	10	38.46%
Disagree	5	19.23%
Undecided	5	19.23%
Agree	4	15.38%
Strongly agree	2	7.69%
Total	26	100.00%

<b>Question 2</b>	
<b>In the comments submitted to Library Administration on the reorg proposal, some people supported parts of the proposal and opposed other parts of the proposal. If you partially support or oppose parts of the proposal, which aspects of the proposal do you support? Why?</b>	
Response 1	I would prefer to see fewer Department Heads but I understand this is the best the Library could work out the people we have to work with.
Response 2	Merging collection services. It may be easier to coordinate their workflow and utilize personnel.
Response 3	The idea of designating librarians to work solely on collection development or instruction is worth consideration. With attrition, librarians have been stretched thin and need to be able to focus on particular areas. The idea of focusing on scholarly communication is also good. This is an area that the library is uniquely positioned to lead in.
Response 4	I am concerned that outreach will be compromised, particularly in areas that require subject familiarity (let alone expertise). I would also like the reorganization to make the parts of the library more porous but I fear that we are just building bigger and stronger silos.
Response 5	I oppose merging Systems and DNS [Desktop Network Services]
Response 6	Relabelling of UL and AUL to Dean and Assoc Dean seem like harmless, if not absolutely essential changes. I support the overall concept of combining some separate public service and technical service units but not any of the ways specifically proposed.
Response 7	I don't support any part of the proposed reorganization.

Response 8	The technical services areas are just not given the attention a mid-size research library deserves. How many ARL libraries have no head of acquisitions, for example? I suppose some of the public service area combinations are okay....but, it remains to be seen how it will work. Admin at least changed its mind on the Asia and Hawn/Pac [Hawaiian & Pacific] areas.
Response 9	[SKIPPED]
Response 10	I do not feel strongly that any part of the proposal influences my answer to the previous question. I am ok with it.
Response 11	[SKIPPED]
Response 12	I support creation of Special Research Collections to give these resources more prominence within the library and better identify them for the public.
Response 13	The parts that I do not support have to do with the civil service and leadership structure being proposed for civil service rich departments, such as for Access Services and what used to be Technical Services. It puts too great a burden on the civil service staff, who will be expected to act as unit heads (almost in the capacity as the previous department heads) and eliminates the librarians' ability to lead and direct staff members, except in a consulting capacity. In addition, some members of the library will be experience little or no change in order to obtain their buy in, whereas other who sections of the library will be undergoing significant changes.
Response 14	Support looking at reorganizing some of the departments where efficiencies might be gained (e.g., technology/computing), collection development focus, technical services, instructional services through coordinating overlapping efforts and planning projects from all aspects. Do agree that it would be better to try to sit down and figure out our vision and goals (specifics) in addition to, or as a way to organize the efforts (see Hwn/Pac submitted comments). I'm a believer in form follows function, thus discussing function/aims is an important first step. I think that bringing together like functions like special collections (preservation, archives, etc.) makes sense, but again, it would be helpful to outline the goals behind the reorg. Also, I support the idea that the "reference" units work more closely with the Access Services units so that perhaps service points can be combined and strengthened. Whether this needs to be done with a combined department, or whether a "charge" from Admin is adequate, I'm not sure.

Response 15	I support renaming the University Librarian as Dean and the Associate University Librarians as Associate Deans. I feel that the new names will align the positions more closely with similarly named positions on the campus.
Response 16	The entire proposal would need revising. Start from the beginning: What are we trying to accomplish with the reorganization proposal? Does this proposal appear to accomplish the goal(s)? Are there other ways to accomplish the same goal(s) without a large reorganization?
Response 17	The consolidation of departments that perform similar activities (Government Documents, BHSD, and Science & Technology).
Response 18	[SKIPPED]
Response 19	[SKIPPED]
Response 20	[SKIPPED]
Response 21	do not support.
Response 22	[SKIPPED]
Response 23	Making the library more efficient, lessening duplication of work, and so it functions almost seamlessly.
Response 24	I oppose the entire proposed reorganization because it has been constructed using faulty reasoning. Over the years that I have worked at the UHM Library, it has become evident that the organizational structure of Library Services has been based on personalities, not on a logical arrangement built around functions or activities. The current reorganization proposal perpetuates this practice. The reorganization claims to combine similar functions in order to streamline work. In fact, departments whose functions are very different have been grouped together, while departments with similar functions are kept separate. For example, Hamilton Academic Services and Sinclair Academic Services both handle reference, circulation, and instruction functions. In early versions of the reorganization plan, these two departments were slated to be combined. However, in the current proposal, they are separate departments. In fact, Sinclair Library's functions and internal organization will scarcely change. On the other hand, the Special Research Collections department is composed of several disparate collections that provide no opportunities for the cross-training benefits touted in the reorganization.

Response 25	Consolidating technical services would help for better communication and work flow. The same principle could be applied to the IT [Information Technology] area, DNS [Desktop Network Services] and Systems. They may work together in a more efficient manner. Shrinking the number of depts from 14 to 7 would not be bad.
Response 26	I support departments reporting to AULs [Associate University Librarians], rather than faculty division heads, because the AULs will presumably have the authority necessary to directly act on requests, etc.

<p><b>Question 3</b>  <b>In the Library Senate's April 2011 survey on the reorganization proposal, 80% responded "Yes" to the question, "Do you feel that some change (whether it be reprioritization within the current library structure, a partial or a full reorganization) is necessary?" What kind of organizational change, if any, do you feel would best enable the Library to direct its resources to strategic priorities?</b></p>	
Response 1	Streamlining operations, reducing bureaucracy, building teams that stimulate innovation and outstanding services. I think the current reorganization has tried to do this as much as possible.
Response 2	Reorganization based on workflow not based on personnel conflicts and personal preferences. Smaller and more flexible units, which can be formed based on projects and workflow.
Response 3	The library should explicitly cut some of its programs. The reorganization proposal adds services without cutting anything that would offset the increased costs associated with the new services and programs.
Response 4	I would really like to see more librarians share the public service face of the library, e.g. staffing the reference desks. There is no reason anyone should be behind the scenes all of the time.
Response 5	Clearer decision-making processes that enable setting library priorities with which units and individuals could align themselves.

Response 6	See previous answer. Many of the workflow streamlining recommendations of R2 consulting [The R2 consulting firm was hired to provide recommendations for streamlining technical services workflows in 2009] have not been explored and smaller scale merging of units (e.g. BHSD [Business, Humanities, and Social Sciences] with Sci/tech [Science and Technology] and Serials/Acq [Serials/Acquisitions]) would be less disruptive and disturbing to the overall organization. Serious consideration of potential positive aspects of no longer being a full government repository would be a reprioritization that could free up staff, space and resources to focus on other services.
Response 7	I believe that what the library needs most is new leadership. An incompetent administration is what is preventing the library from realizing its potential.
Response 8	A review of work being done by who and which people / depts. might be helpful. A prime example of a good work flow review was the R2 group's report....but, WHAT has been implemented of that??
Response 9	[SKIPPED]
Response 10	Some of the organizational change has been already begun with hiring of new/more staff. We cannot do everything as is, so if we can eliminate some duplication of efforts, or work together to save time, facilitating that change toward more communication and collaboration among departments is good. We have a communication problem that seems to never get solved, is that because of the personalities of the staff or because of organization?
Response 11	I would like to see the Library incorporate suggestions made by R2 related to Collection Services. I support the desire of Library Administration to reorganize the 3 top admin positions, but I disagree with how departments have been parceled out between the 2 associate deans to create a balance in terms of numbers of staff they will supervise. The combinations are not logical.
Response 12	[SKIPPED]
Response 13	I do not believe we have significant redundancy to eliminate in the library. But I can see some consolidations of services points and units. The area I'm in will consolidate with other departments. But I also see more potential consolidation that is untapped for a variety of reasons.

Response 14	We need to discuss and decide upon what our goals are, where our services should head, and thus what format our staffing should take. (form follows function). This would include the very difficult choices as to what to do and what to give up. This is even more important with the decline of budgets due to the economic conditions. For example, we might change to more of a patron-driven acquisition [PDA] model for some collections that many other universities are exploring. A PDA focus would mean a radical change in acquisitions processes on both the technical services (acquisitions, cataloging) side and public services side. I guess my general focus would be upon the decision-making model (who and how things are decided?), and the ways to get the decisions enacted (specific coordinators, teams, cross departmental committees?). To me, this is as an important an issue as the actual organizational structure of who sits where next to whom and reports to whom.
Response 15	Fewer public services positions and more technical services positions.
Response 16	I don't know that a large structural change to the organization is required (or is the best solution) to make better progress toward our strategic priorities.
Response 17	The consolidation of departments that perform similar tasks (e.g., BHSD, Sciece & Technology, and Government Documents) (Sinclair Circulation and Hamilton Circulation) and (Acquisitions and Serials) for example.
Response 18	[SKIPPED]
Response 19	While I am unsure that the current proposal will result in major improvements, I do not have any better suggestions - wish I did!

Response 20	I originally agreed with the 80%, but after further consideration and deliberation with other library staff and faculty, I have come to appreciate the way things are currently set up. All of this talk for a savings that will possibly net of a little over \$20,000 in savings. Further confusing is the amount of new staff that have been brought on board since the reorganization talks started, as if the reorganization proposal is a done deal, when the proposal has yet to be vented or approved. I would venture to say the library has approved and hired over 1/2 million dollars or more in new staff positions. Much more staff and faculty are confused and view the proposal as a disservice to the university faculty and students. I further believe we need to get a permanent UL and give them the opportunity to put forth a proposal, not interim UL. We need a UL who has experience in human resources, work flow management, fund raising, and budgeting. A permanent UL will actually be the one who will be living with any decisions that are made, not outgoing management who will most likely retire after this process is complete, or attempt to apply. The other disservice is the putting of people into these interim management positions who do not meet the DQs much less the MQs for the positions they are in and now are spearheading this reorganization effort. The university brought in and paid for R2 Consulting services, which management has used as a reason for why we need a reorganization. But, if you look at actually what is being proposed it is missing the mark on the R2 recommendations.
Response 21	It has not been made clear how this re-org will enable to library to direct its resources to strategic priorities. I believe this is a re-org for the sake of re-org.
Response 22	[SKIPPED]
Response 23	Lessen paperwork; improved workflow Use technology at hand to help make process, procedures work smoothly Utilize the current system to be more efficient rather than continuing to do things the old fashioned, arduous, and archaic methods.
Response 24	Reprioritization is needed before any thought of reorganization should occur.
Response 25	[SKIPPED]

Response 26	<p>I think given the acute shortage of librarians in BHSD (largely perpetrated by arbitrary and unsupportable decisions by the UL) and to a lesser extent in SciTech, perhaps some sort of organizational tinkering might be in order to relieve those people of the impossibly heavy instructional, reference, and collection development workload they now are required to handle. However, no wholesale reorganization is needed. Gov Docs and Maps should remain a separate department. Putting Access Services with these reference and instruction units is nuts. It makes no organizational sense. I do not see the purpose of combining Collection Services units. This was not suggested by R2, the consulting firm which advised the library on changes it might implement to better improve services. I think, in general, given the unstable external information environment which we must contend with, small targeted changes (with ample supporting evidence to justify them) are far more preferable than large systemic changes which may become dysfunctional in a relatively short period and will lock us in to a possibly unsuitable organizational structure.</p>
-------------	--

<p><b>Question 4</b>  <b>In the Library Senate's April 2011 survey on the reorganization proposal, 75% responded "No" to the question, "Does the reorganization address the fundamental issue of lack of resources within the Library to carry out its mission?" Do you think that the reorganization addresses the fundamental issue of lack of resources within the Library to carry out its mission? Why or why not?</b></p>	
Response 1	<p>Yes, but reducing the the number of department heads by half creates a cost savings. No reorganization is going to magically produce large increased funding. Moving the staff around will not reduce the salary costs or operational cost to any great extent. If this were the private sector, where a reorganization would result in the loss of jobs, then we would really see cost savings and economies that would move funds to more mission critical operations. But the Library Senate and Union would never allow this to happen. With the way UH and the State currently operate, the question itself is almost ridiculous. It assumes an unrealistic expectation from a reorganization.</p>
Response 2	<p>No. No workflow and workloads analysis had been done in the Public Services. Why does the Preservation Dept, which is expected to work for a library-wide preservation management, have to be merged with other one-person "special" collections?</p>
Response 3	<p>No it does not. The reorganization proposal adds services without cutting anything that would offset the increased costs associated with the new services and programs.</p>

Response 4	The reorganization is not being done to create money streams--our resource problem is complex and really requires cash to ease the situation
Response 5	No, the reorganization will not enable the library to use resources more efficiently
Response 6	No. It does not save any significant money and does not spell out how the new services will be adequately funded while all other services apparently will be left in place. E.g. allocation of many librarians and staff to "special research collections" leaving preservation unit with about two staff to perform all unit functions.
Response 7	No, the proposal does not address resources at all except to indicate that some \$24,000 will be saved by eliminating up to half of the department heads.
Response 8	NO.....in the end it all comes down to money.....which we don't have. Pouring almost the entire budget into electronic resources does NOT help many of our patrons...especially upper level undergrads, grads, and faculty. I believe the library has lost it's former supporters on campus due to this fact. The library admin has not worked to convince UH admin that we are a key component to campus learning.
Response 9	[SKIPPED]
Response 10	No, the reorganization proposal itself only states that we will save \$20,000 or some small amount. No projection is made about what other time or money will be saved by specifically reorganizing in the way proposed. No mention is made about how the reorg will help library administration will do their job of better positioning the library as more important among the other groups on campus. I think they could have stated this easily if they wanted to. It cannot just be a change to help daily operations, so for this reason and more their argument is not very convincing.
Response 11	I find the lack of a clear statement of what programs will be eliminated to be disingenuous. It is even more disturbing if there is no plan to refocus our efforts and eliminate certain services and/or programs in view of decreasing resources.
Response 12	Never going to happen--as far as I can remember, there has never been adequate funding (or staffing) for this library. Who gets more of the pie varies with the latest new and usually necessary in-thing. Evaluation of the effects of chronic shortfall on the rest of operations--quality of collections and services--is not done. For example, there has been no assessment of the effects of the chronic lack of bodies in Cataloging or the effects of burn out on people who have been doing more with less every year. Many of us recognize we could accomplish a lot more with support.

Response 13	No. I see that some of the levels--in particular the civil service staff and the new department heads--will be particularly busy and overburdened, while a significant amount of the library faculty will not be able to participate in leadership opportunities.
Response 14	Although probably not possible at this point in time, I would love to start the discussion all over again. Granted, it would need to be Admin who makes the final call as to organization, goals, missions, etc., but I think we still need to sit down as an organization and hash out what we will choose to focus upon. This of course means cutting out or dropping some things that we might have done in the past. If we can come together to discuss, that would be the first step. Whereas consensus is nice to have, I believe that the necessity of change does not always allow the luxury of getting everyone's agreement. However, making the case and argument for the plan with the reasoning(s) behind the choices and telling everyone what is the plan IS a necessity for change within an academic environment. Form follows function mantra again...
Response 15	No. The proposal does not align the human resources with the mission.
Response 16	Of course not.
Response 17	No. Although the proposed reorganization saves a modest amount of money by eliminating several department chairs, it does not address a lack of resources in any substantive way. The question of 'why or why not' is best answered by Library Administration. However, this has never, in my view, been clearly (or persuasively) explained by Library Administration (thus 75% of our colleagues responded "No" to this question).
Response 18	[SKIPPED]
Response 19	I think it attempts to assign more of our limited resources to the area that the campus has indicated is its priority - undergraduate education. I do not believe that it addresses the library's significant need for additional resources.
Response 20	No, the reorganization does not address the fundamental issue of lack of resources within the library. This reorganization proposal actually makes it worse.
Response 21	No. The salary savings (from fewer department chairs) expected from the proposed reorg is small -- this will not result in more resources. The library will continue to face the fundamental issue of lack of resources.
Response 22	[SKIPPED]

Response 23	We should be fully utilizing the resources that we do have. But what is inefficient is the workflow; trying to fit the new mold into the old formats.
Response 24	The reorganization does not establish a structure that will free up resources. On the contrary, by turning some departments into super-departments, resources will actually be taken away from some activities and redirected to administrative tasks. For example, the person who is head of the Hamilton Academic Services department will have no time to make his or her subject expertise available to users, because all of this department head's time will be taken up with administrative tasks. If department head appointments were rotated on a one- or two-year schedule, this would not be such a great concern. However, the University Librarian intends to appoint department heads for three years with the possibility of renewal, effectively taking department heads out of their subject areas and turning them into de facto "division heads," the elimination of which was supposedly one of the problems this reorganization was designed to solve. For the most part, the needs of users -- the Library's raison d'être -- are missing in the proposal. The Library Administration needs to approach the organization of the Library from the standpoint of determining which services are needed by faculty, students, and staff, and which organizational structure best supports the provision of those services. For example, the video librarian retired in 2010, and her position has not been replaced. How was it determined that we no longer needed this position?
Response 25	[SKIPPED]
Response 26	No, it doesn't. The workload remains the same, especially in the BHSD/SciTech depts. where the reorganization's impact will be the greatest. There has been no attempt to determine what must be done, what is desirable but not necessary, and what can be let go. In the unstable information and financial environment we now operate trying to determine those things may, in any event, be impossible. The present organizational has shown itself to be adaptable the uncertain environment we operate in. There is no compelling reason to change it and the library administration offers except cliched rhetoric in support of its reorganization plan.

<p><b>Question 5</b>  <b>In the reorganization proposal's narrative, the following question and answer appears on page 5:F. <i>QUESTION: Outline the benefits that will be achieved by the reorganization, including efficiencies and service improvements. Explain whether the supervisor/subordinate reporting relationships are properly identified and whether the reorganization will minimize confusion over authority, roles, and responsibilities. ANSWER: It is hoped that through the consolidation of departments into larger entities that greater flexibility will be realized, cross training will be facilitated more easily and the ability to adapt to changing technologies will be enhanced. Additionally, reporting lines will be more direct, there will be no intermediate layer of "division" level faculty heads. Do you agree that these benefits can be realized through the proposed reorganization? Why or why not?</i></b></p>	
Response 1	Yes, The division heads have been removed and, as much as possible, similar or complimentary tasks are grouped together. New dynamic teams have been created that bode well for innovation in the future. The reorganization is not perfect but it is probably the best that can be done with the existing personnel.
Response 2	Not at all. After the reorg, people have to report to someone who has no idea what those people's jobs are about. How does it achieve efficiencies and service improvements? Since the Preservation Dept is going to be part of the Spacial Research Collection, how can we be sure if other collections' preservation would be efficiently and effectively implemented?
Response 3	The benefits here are undefined and vague. If by "flexibility" and "cross-training" it means that people can do more than their existing jobs, yes that's possible. But the proposal does not create more hours in the day, so people will still only be able to do what they can do in 8 hours a day. Regarding ability to adapt to changing technologies, I have no idea how this reorganization can effect that, and the proposal offers no explanations of this. These are training and process issues. We can have everyone knowing how to do everyone's jobs, but until the library decides which jobs really need to be done and which do not or can not be done anymore, it won't matter. Library admin may have some outstanding ideas about how to improve processes and training, but the reorganization proposal has been issued without them. The absence of this information makes it exceedingly difficult to accept the reorg, which on its face promises to be an extraordinarily disruptive departmental shuffle that offers increased responsibilities, services and programs, with no means to support them. It will compound our problems.
Response 4	No, I don't see this happening. Within the different groups there will be opportunities to work in different areas (e.g. science librarian working with humanities class?)

Response 5	No, the respective roles of department heads and those who supervise units within departments are not clear
Response 6	Larger departments within which functions stay essentially the same does not create flexibility, coss-training opportunities or access to changing technologies. On the other hand, changing workflows within existing departments might very well achieve those goals without reorganization. Moving from a system where a dozen or less staff report to a department head, and 3 to 7 department heads report to a division head - to one where 40 or more staff theoretically report to one department head may appear to be more "direct" but is not likely to result in *better* communication, esp. since the one department head is almost never going to have a strong understanding of all the areas in the huge combined unit. Therefore staff in functional areas (formerly known as departments) will probably have to end up with a "coordinator" who will do the work of a department head without the recognition or financial reward.
Response 7	No, I do not agree. It isn't clear to me what is meant by "flexibility" and it is difficult to understand how the proposed reorganization (or any reorganization, for that matter) would facilitate or even affect the ability to adapt to new technology. The drafters of the proposal need to learn that conclusions should follow from premises. I was not aware that cross training was an administrative priority. If that's the case, it could be addressed without reorganizing the entire library.
Response 8	Cross training as a slogan has been around since Gary McMillen's [former Associate University Librarian for Processing, Operations, and Automation] day. It sounds nice, but as we move more and more into the digital world I think it becomes less and less likely. The technical demands of checking in serials, paying bills, ordering books, etc. are so complex that cross training is almost counter productive. Probably the only way this works is to cross train people within a department or section. The concepts of more with less and anybody can do anything are laughable.
Response 9	[SKIPPED]
Response 10	So much to say about this one, it sounds so empty and like administrative jargon. I think there may be some alternate reason they want to do this, but they don't want to reveal it. That is a cause for concern. But on the other hand, we do not do much collaboration between departments. I would like to have some silos removed but not all, since this is a basis of operations in any library. I would not go and cross train in another department that I know nothing about, nor would I help them with their technologies. Sounds like the wrong connections are being facilitated in this statement, but I am in agreement to have more connections among us.

Response 11	In conversations with library administration, we have been assured that there will be ample opportunity to discuss and make decisions on concerns that cross departments and functions, for example issues of collection development and public services, because the department heads of all units concerned with these issues will meet to discuss and make decisions. This does not appear to "minimize confusion over authority, roles, and responsibilities." Regarding the elimination of an intermediate layer of heads, library administration does not accept the reality that there will be a layer of "informal" heads or managers of units who will not be compensated for their services. Reporting lines to the dean and associate deans will be flattened, but increased below their level.
Response 12	No. Everyone has to adapt to changing technologies, but cross-training doesn't work when you ask people to become proficient enough to do good work in too many differing areas at once. The old organization that put Copy Cataloging in Acquisitions for a while is a perfect example of failed cross-training. It takes years for library faculty to develop a high level of expertise in a speciality, say collection development and bibliographic expertise--don't spread them too thin or everyone gives only mediocre service. Worse, those in administrative positions sometimes fail to appreciate the differences and complexities of these specialties, and make bad decisions where an "intermediate head" might have been there to help them make a better one.
Response 13	Unfortunately, the department head is merely taking over for the division head without the benefit of librarians underneath who can be part of a collaborative team. This re-org really chokes the possibility for teams working together and puts the decision making power into very few hands. Cross training for staff is only a possibility after significant rewriting of job descriptions, which could also downgrade (and potentially upgrade, but usually not) their positions. Changing position descriptions makes some of these things easier, not the re-org in an of itself. I can tell you that as a librarian, I can see problems; if I was a staff member, I'd be counting down the days until I could retire.
Response 14	I don't know. I guess I'm still stuck on the form follows function idea.
Response 15	No. Library administration already had the capability to support flexibility, cross training, adapting to changing technologies, and creating logical reporting lines. Reorganization does not address long standing problems with personnel and functions. The "division" level was an artificial, temporary solution for a period when there were no incumbents in the assistant and associate university librarian positions. Now that those positions are filled, there is no longer any need for the temporary "division heads."

Response 16	I do not agree that this reorganization creates a higher probability for those stated benefits, or that they can't be achieved other ways. First though I would need to know what "greater flexibility" means and what it will be used for. I would need to know what the cross training is for and why that is automatically beneficial. The reporting lines comment is just incorrect.
Response 17	No, I don't agree. Indeed, I believe the opposite. In my view, based on academic study and personal experience, the larger the department the less flexibility will be realized. Further, the elimination of a few department heads will not result in less intermediate staff. Although the nouns we use for our departments and department heads will change, the work will not go away. Thus, in newly developed larger departments with disparate tasks, we will have created the need for a new intermediate layer of quasi-department heads ('team leaders' or whatever noun is used to describe their coordinating role). Several of these positions are likely to be faculty. Thus more faculty time (rather than less) is quite likely to be diverted to administrative-related activities. However, these faculty members are not likely to be compensated because they will not be 'department heads.' Further, the larger the department and the more disparate the activities, the less likely the department head is to be intimately familiar with the contract renewal, promotion, or tenure candidate's contributions. The department head is likely to rely on the assessment of the 'team leader' rather than their own direct observations. Thus in my view the proposed reorganization does not include personnel efficiencies.
Response 18	I agree that greater flexibility and adaptability can be achieved through the proposed reorg.
Response 19	No
Response 20	No. They will be worse. In some areas there will be less coordination. I have heard that Systems will be buried and even further away from management. This makes no sense at all, particularly for a department that provides systemwide operations for our day to day jobs. In other departments there is a loss of service to our students and faculty, since there will be a loss of coordination. All for a savings of a little over \$20,000. Paying the extra for a little more coordination is well worth it. The reorganization proposal is one that will create less efficiency and will degrade service. The phrase, "adapt to changing technologies will be enhanced" is jargon. This is the kind of phrase that is added without much thought. It's something I would expect from a sales pitch. Reporting lines will not be more direct, in fact some will be farther removed and decisions will have to go through additional layers. There will be less coordination, which will make for chaos however.

Response 21	No. The workload will not change. Larger departments does not necessary create greater flexibility. Administration needs to provide detailed examples of how this will be achieved. The new re-org does not create more direct reporting lines but creates an additional layer; department chairs in the new re-org will now report to an AUL instead of the University Librarian. The organization will move from a flatter organizational structure to a more hierarchical structure. Additionally, the "type" of reporting will change. Previously Division Heads were faculty members and therefore had a more representational role; as AULs the Division Heads will assume a supervisory role.
Response 22	Yes. I feel that it will help create a "team" of workers, instead of an "us versus them" attitude that smaller groups can create.
Response 23	[SKIPPED]
Response 24	Rather than engendering streamlining and efficiencies, these groupings are likely to result in some of the collections becoming neglected. Perhaps the intent is for certain collections to die from neglect, rather than killing them outright. Following the reorganization, a fundamental question remains: will the departments be allowed to determine how to fill vacancies, or will the Library Administration reallocate positions to other functions? This is a very important question, for certain activities cannot be sustained if the specialized personnel handling them are not replaced. The Library Administration apparently hopes that cross-training can compensate for the loss of specialists. I wonder how they expect other faculty members to cross-train in specializations such as China, Preservation, Congressional Archives, or Geospatial Services? It is not far-fetched to predict, for instance, that when the Russian Bibliographer retires, her position won't be replaced with another Russia specialist; the position will be used for a "Virtual Worlds Librarian" or a "Social Media Librarian." No assessment will be conducted to determine whether a Russian Bibliographer is needed to serve the faculty, students, and staff.
Response 25	Surely consolidation will bring the way to have better communication among the smaller functional units within the entity. But if you don't communicate or cooperative, there will be no benefit. New department heads should do major roles in order to facilitate communication and cooperation within the entity.

Response 26	<p>Larger entities more often than not result in a lack of flexibility because there are more competing interests that need to be taken into consideration and the operations of larger entities tend to more complex, making them difficult to change and ill suited to an unstable environment Small is better, because smaller units are more nimble and can react to change quickly. There is absolutely no evidence to conclude that larger entities will enhance the ability to adapt to changing technologies. The library administration is trying to justify a pre-conceived re-organization and then create justifications for it. In particular the mega dept. consisting of the present BHSD, SciTech, Access Services, Gov Docs and MAGIS [Maps, Aerials and GIS] with its diverse functions will likely result in confusing authority, roles, and responsibilities. It's really hard to see how such a dept. can possibly operate in an efficient, coherent manner. I agree that having 2 AULs rather than faculty division heads is an advantage, but instituting that change does not necessitate the other changes in the reorganization proposal.</p>
-------------	---

**Comment received from a senator independent of the survey**

My overall recommendation is for MFS to ask and provide Dr. David Lassner, VP for Information Technology & Chief Information Officer for the University of Hawaii, an opportunity to comment on the reorganization proposed for Systems, given the department's concerns. David has a systemwide perspective, credentials, a scholarly background and is a well respected in the area of IT in the industry.

Any system (hardware/software) or organizational change will have an impact on all faculty, staff and students systemwide. And actually, there should be a lot more people involved in the decision than just Hamilton library administration, particularly those whose day to day jobs depend on the system and the service provided by Systems.