

Library Senate Poll Regarding Reorganization  
April 26, 2011

	<b>Question</b>	<b>Total responses</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1	Do you support the current reorganization proposal?	41	13	31.71%	21	51.22%	7	17.07%
2	Do you feel that some change (whether it be reprioritization within the current library structure, a partial or a full reorganization) is necessary?	40	32	80.00%	3	7.50%	5	12.50%
3	Do you agree with the constitution of the departments as laid out in the reorganization proposal?	39	9	23.08%	26	66.67%	4	10.26%
4	Do you agree with the exclusion of some faculty members and functions from the department structure (i.e., some faculty members are not part of a department and report directly to an AUL)?	38	13	34.21%	18	47.37%	7	18.42%
5	Do you agree that the reorganization will improve the Library's ability to provide services to users?	37	9	24.32%	24	64.86%	4	10.81%
6	Do you agree that the reorganization will result in cost savings?	37	10	27.03%	21	56.76%	6	16.22%
7	Do you agree that a reorganization is necessary to achieve streamlining and efficiencies and to enable greater flexibility and facilitate cross-training?	36	11	30.56%	22	61.11%	3	8.33%
8	Does the reorganization group similar functions?	36	8	22.22%	22	61.11%	6	16.67%
9	Do you agree that the elimination of division heads and consolidation into fewer departments improves the management-to-staff ratio?	36	12	33.33%	21	58.33%	3	8.33%
10	Has the Library Administration fully explored all of the possible reorganization options?	36	6	16.67%	19	52.78%	11	30.56%
11	Does the reorganization proposal effectively address its stated goals, as articulated in the narrative?	36	7	19.44%	21	58.33%	8	22.22%
12	Does the reorganization address the fundamental issue of lack of resources within the Library to carry out its mission?	36	5	13.89%	27	75.00%	4	11.11%
13	Does the reorganization achieve the stated aim of allowing the Library to focus on strategic priorities	36	10	27.78%	20	55.56%	6	16.67%
14	Is the timing of the reorganization optimal, given that the University Librarian has indicated that she will retire soon, and the two Associate University Librarians are both interim appointees?	36	7	19.44%	23	63.89%	6	16.67%
15	Do the anticipated outcomes of the reorganization justify the time and energy spent on it thus far and the additional time and energy required to implement it?	35	8	22.86%	21	60.00%	6	17.14%

## Library Senate Poll Regarding Reorganization - Comments

<b>1. Do you support the current reorganization proposal?</b>
It is poorly conceived. Goals are amorphous. It lacks a mechanism for evaluation.
Not sure
An interim UL with interim AULs should not be entertaining a reorganization at this time.
Particularly the proposal to merge the Asia Collection, the Hawaiian and Pacific Collection, and Government Documents.
The idea of reorg is okay...but it needs much more work.
There are parts that I support, and parts of the proposal that I have reservations about. I support the idea of a reorganization, but not 100% in the current format.
As currently proposed, the reorganization does nothing to improve services to the students, faculty and staff of the university, and could in fact harm those services. In its current form, it is poorly conceived, and contrary to Library Administration claims, faculty has had no real input on the document -- the "14 months of consultations" were not consultations on this proposal itself ... faculty and staff of the library have been given one month to submit written commentary, which the administration has already indicated may or may not (and probably not) be incorporated into the proposal -- for the past 14 months, all discussion of the reorganization has been characterized as "fluid" by the University Librarian, and indeed the specifics have changed seemingly from day to day, and depending on who the University Librarian happens to be speaking to at that moment. This "draft" proposal is the first concrete proposal faculty and staff of the library have been presented with, it is deeply flawed, doesn't address the essential problems the library faces, presents no evidence as to how it will bring about the positive changes it purports to effect, provides no indication as to how the reorganized departments are supposed to function, widens the "management gap" it purports to close ... the list goes on and on.
The proposal seems designed for the benefit of only a handful of people. It ignores completely the services that the 150 or so non-LET librarians and staff perform.
With qualifications. The reorg as it affects me is okay. We are together with other sections which have related or similar research focus. As the reorg affects others in the library, I do not think it is adequately thought out.
I might support parts of the proposal (with modifications). Some parts seem problematic. There are significant underlying problems, the proposed reorganization would not address or resolve.
See intranet comments
I support some kind of reorganization, but not this particular version.
The library administration has failed to provide reasons why this reorganization should take place. There has been no review of the present organization. What's wrong with the present organization? If it has failings, can they remedied short of reorganizing?
<b>2. Do you feel that some change (whether it be reprioritization within the current library structure, a partial or a full reorganization) is necessary?</b>
Nothing is going to change because the problems in the library are mainly caused by the personnel problems rather than the structural problems.
The library has to first demonstrate that change is necessary and why. After that, if it is clear that problems do exist, the library should consider how to resolve those matters without reorganization -- through other means that address the problem. If, and only if, alternatives do not address the problem, then the library should work with departments to collaboratively negotiate structural change.
probably the biggest concern is to keep up with the current technology developments...but we also need to address glaring problems which reorg might not fix
The library clearly does need to change: Staff and budget have been cut dramatically over the years, while services have been added -- this in itself is not sustainable. At the same time, I doubt there is anyone in the library who would say that the library does not have a responsibility to adapt itself to the changing information

environment. However, again, the current reorganization proposal does not accomplish this. A reprioritization process, in which the library administration clearly defined what the library will and will not be supporting going forward, should be the first place to start -- as it stands, the current reorganization proposal only speaks of adding new programs to an already unsustainable workload, and apparently is leaving it up to the faculty and staff to decide on their own what services will no longer be provided. This is in itself an abdication of one of the core job responsibilities of the University Librarian -- to provide guidance.

But the current proposed reorganization is a step backwards.

I do approve of the obtaining of two administrative positions of equal status. I think, however, that the balance of responsibility has not be adequately worked out.

The R2 report identifies areas and issues that might be addressed.

many R2 suggestions seemed reasonable to try without tossing the entire organization on it's head

Organizations can almost always be improved through a variety of means. No review of the present organization has occurred, so it's hard to say what, if any, change is needed.

3. Do you agree with the constitution of the departments as laid out in the reorganization proposal?

The responsibilities of 2 Interim University Librarians are not evenly divided and the proposed groupings doesn't make sense.

The structure seems based on giving the two associate deans an equal amount of staff.

Some yes, some no.

Departments have been grouped arbitrarily to fit a pre-established model that does not directly apply to how departments function and operate. It's a forced fit, that is not adequately thought through for the immediate future or for the long term.

some combinations seem screwy

This is one way to organize communication lines--maybe not the best but I don't have other suggestions

SRC is OK. no opinion about the rest

Some departments seem under-resourced. Some department consolidations seem to merge unlike units.

See intranet comments

The groupings are absurd. They seem to reflect the Interim University Librarian's predilection to work only with people who mostly agree with her.

4. Do you agree with the exclusion of some faculty members and functions from the department structure (i.e., some faculty members are not part of a department and report directly to an AUL)?

It is counter to the stated need for clear reporting lines and the desire to decrease direct reporting of units to the library administration.

While some of these arrangements may not make as much sense on paper, I understand why these adjustments were made. Many people fail to realize there are social factors at work in any organization (all management text books will tell you that). This means that functionally, person X and person Y should work in the same unit. But, it may be well known that, person X and Y cannot stand one another and it would create a hostile work environment if there were put together. So that will not work and management has to come up with a workable solution. In addition, some people have skills sets that vary and fits in a department may not be "perfect" so other adjustments need to be made. I think much thought and effort to deal with such problems has gone into the reorganization process. If the results are less than perfect, we need to keep in mind that we are not working with a perfect staff either. That is not a criticism, it is just a fact, no staff is ever perfect.

There is no given logic for this exclusion. The model is incoherent and actually limits the purported goals of the reorganization proposal, which is to encourage collaborative "synergy." This structure adds an uneven administrative layer that limits and obstructs a collegial work environment.

this has the potential to cause all sorts of problems

I think this is mixing up the VCAA mandated form with another issue. The library administration should have

been more sensitive but at the same time they are showing us what they will be submitting.

In most of our past org charts, there have been a few odd ones--but their roles should be described in a manner that justifies the exception...

See intranet comments

5. Do you agree that the reorganization will improve the Library's ability to provide services to users?

Hamilton Library is no longer considered a research library because the current administration team fails to recognize the expertise and specialization of librarians. The reorganization will minimize our services to users. There is no evidence in the plan of how students and faculty at the University will benefit.

Not sure

I had to check so I marked no, but my answer is Maybe, it would nice to see some specific goals with benchmarks

I should say Yes and No. Some portion may work but some may not. It is not even.

There is no documentation that the library is not providing excellent service to users, given the severe budget and staffing limitations. The library has not demonstrated that the re-organization will address the existing limitations in order to improve services to users. The users have not been consulted, such as the faculty and students, prior to the reorganization proposal. Instead, the structural changes are for the convenience of library administrators and not done in order to serve our users better.

probably most of us feel we do our best to help faculty and students...although years of budget downturns have not helped

Services such as department liaisons will be weakened but other services such as strategically building the collections, building digital initiatives will be strengthened

The only "data" we have seen is the administrations saying that the reorg will improve services.

It is likely the reorganization will have little effect on services and resources. But only time will tell.

There is no compelling argument made for how that would be so, and nothing in the narrative indicates that service provision would be assessed post-reorg so there is no way to tell if improvement did take place

I don't see any concrete connections between this reorganization and improved services. In fact, there are elements that are missing from this plan, such as liaison work, that may disconnect us even more from our constituency even more. There's no mention of how "improvement" would even be defined!

There's no proof of this. The reorganization proposal provides no details how it will improve services.

6. Do you agree that the reorganization will result in cost savings?

NOT AT ALL. The saving from reducing the number of departments from 14 to 5 (\$300/month stipends) is not even enough to hire a librarian.

The actual \$ amount is minuscule compared to the library's budget, and may not be saved because dept heads may receive increased stipends.

Not sure.

Sure -- but not significant

this reorganization proposal, can't expect to save significant amount of money.

The cost savings did figure may not have accounted for the expense of printing new business cards for the affected individuals.

The minimal cost savings, which were miscalculated in the proposal documents, are not sufficient reason for the reorganization. Furthermore, there are many hidden costs that a reorganization will initiate (i.e. stationary, business cards, time spent to revise our webpages, etc.) that have not been accounted for at all in the proposal only for the number of dept heads being less

But not a great deal.

No to any significant degree, esp. if the numerous positions slated for redescription simultaneously with reorg

result in higher pay classifications.
The only cost savings indicated in the reorganization proposal were a few department head stipends--a minor amount given the magnitude of funding problems. Library Administration wasn't clear what the stipend savings would be used for.
Insofar as there are less department head stipends. but no mention has been made of the hidden costs of reorganization, such as the incredible amount of time very highly paid people have been spending on this over the past 18 months. Or however long it has been.
So miniscule as to be essentially non-existent. What added costs will reorganization bring? Again, no discussion, no answers.

<b>7. Do you agree that a reorganization is necessary to achieve streamlining and efficiencies and to enable greater flexibility and facilitate cross-training?</b>
NOT AT ALL. The proposed reorganization fails to present concrete solutions to solve existing issues and problems in the library. The long existed problems are on the personnel's that the current library administration has not been able to solve for a very long time.
This is an assumption not based on a clear plan.
Again yes and no. Some may work but some may not. Partial reorg is more efficient.
It is important to first identify the blocks in the current organization, and then to address how to streamline and improve efficiency. Is the streamlining and efficiency a library-wide problem or limited to particular departments, or processes within a department. It is hard to imagine achieving streamlining and efficiency if one cannot identify what and why something needs to be streamlined.
Has the library proved that the library faculty and staff are not flexible while performing their professional responsibilities? The reorganization proposal does answer this question. Flexibility and cross-training amounts to de-professionalization and generalization, disregarding professional training and depth of experience. Furthermore, there is not recognition of the how flexibility and cross-training has different meaning for staff and faculty.
talk of cross-training has been an issue since the 1980s and never seems to be realized
As with all of the other claims in the current reorganization proposal, there is nothing in any of the documentation that proves (or even attempts to describe) how streamlining, efficiencies, greater flexibility and cross-training will be enhanced. It is an empty claim.
There are other less drastic methods to achieve streamlined processes, more efficient workflows and cross training which have not been tried on any consistent long term basis.
Because Library Administration did not explain how the reorganization would "achieve streamlining and efficiencies and to enable greater flexibility and facilitate cross-training."
Not at all.

<b>8. Does the reorganization group similar functions?</b>
Why are acquisitions/serials/cataloging units combined with public service units? Why are Asia/Govald and Maps/Hawn&Pac separated from the support services on which they depend, and from public service units with which they share functions?
Yes and no.
maybe some group does. but others don't
The reorganization groupings are a hodge-podge of public services units, collection services, and has removed IT from the structure. This configuration again serves the predetermined model that suits administration but does not suit the needs of our users.
sometimes it does; other times it doesn't

If there were a "yes and no" option, I would have chosen that. In some cases it does appear to group similar functions, in others it clearly does not. This is one of the reasons I support a partial reorganization as opposed to a full reorganization.
SRC is fine. but otherwise, no
Aspects of both public service and administrative functions are under each of the newly defined AULs.
Not always. See, for example, the groups that create metadata: cataloging, IR, Archives & Manuscripts.
In some cases it is difficult to tell because the new functions are not described in relation to current similar functions, in most cases it appears that the same org structure is being used, just mushed together and moved down a level on the org chart. The combinations appear to be less about grouping similar functions than simply grouping existing departments into bigger boxes and accomodating some pet projects.
No really. In fact it introduced more complex reporting structures and blurs responsibilities and reporting lines.
No, it doesn't

<b>9. Do you agree that the elimination of division heads and consolidation into fewer departments improves the management-to-staff ratio?</b>
Elimination of division heads creates greater confusion for everyone because each smaller unit within a huge department will have difficulty communicate with each other if everyone reports to the same department head.
While one department may have about twelve members, another may have forty--yet each department would get the same level of voice.
It creates a middle layer of unpaid managers/chairs. It places huge responsibilities on new department heads to represent their new departments.
Absolutely! This is very important and fundamental change. The current structure has some great managers, good managers, and indifferent managers as dept. heads. They are way too many of them and all are paid a very modest stipend and thus some do not put in much effort to lead (though some do). I believe this change will enable the Library to appoint serious leaders who will be accountable for outcomes, and be compensated accordingly. The current structure has produced very uneven results with little accountability. It must change if the Library is to meet the rapidly changing information access needs of our students and faculty.
Faculty division heads and department heads are not part of management.
Few departments, does not mean fewer staff -- in fact in the reorganization proposal the management-to-staff ratio is unmanageable -- for example, there may be fewer department heads reporting to the Interim Associate Librarian, but at the department head level the number reporting to that person will increase exponentially, which will be unmanageable. No effort has been to show how department heads with three times the library faculty and staff will manage the additional workload.
How could it?
Not in what used to be called technical services. The level of expertise and the nature of the issues and problems that have to be dealt with are complex and department specific. We will end up with de facto heads without the appropriate recognition, and paraprofessional staff loaded with far more responsibility than they are paid (and sometimes educated) to handle.
Depends on how you count.
although it all depends on what "management" means. it appears that the proposed reorg would leave many current department heads as some kind of "unit head" but without stipend or title; while in other cases it dismantles entire departments so that there is no unit level coordinator at all.
It actually creates a greater distance from the supervising head to the staff. This results in the head supervising faculty and staff with marginal expertise and knowledge across several areas.
This is the right direction, but goes too far.

<b>10. Has the Library Administration fully explored all of the possible reorganization options?</b>
The library administration has not fully explored other options with staff.

explored "all" possibilities....well of course not, how could they. But what is more concerning is I don't think they have even explored any others.
This is bit a of ridiculous question. Are there other organizational possibilities (known or unknown) in the Universe? Yes, of course. Could we spend a year, five years, or ten years, to consider more options? Yes, of course. And would this produce a better result? Who knows. The entire Library faculty and staff had been involved in many ways over the last two years to consider as many options as possible. The Administration has dealt with the staff in good faith. I think this is a REASONABLE and PRODUCTIVE reorganization that addresses MANY of the problems the library has faced over the years. It is not PERFECT! But we will all be retired or dead by the time the PERFECT reorganization occurs. I like MOST of what this plan has to offer and recommend we go with it. Organizations are not static and the system provides opportunities for minor adjustments in the future. I encourage my faculty colleagues to accept this reorganization.
I cannot tell what other possible reorganizations options Library Administration has explored, whether fully or partially.
The library administration has deliberately turned a deaf ear to all appeals and recommendations made at the department level in order to push through a model of management that is both incoherent and ineffective. In the process, there is no effort to consider the feedback and incorporate suggestions to revise the proposal. At this point, the Library Administration does not appear to have the trust of the faculty and staff to explore or consider any alternatives to their proposal.
probably they have explored them...but not taken them into account
The only other option presented in the reorganization proposal is, "doing nothing is always an option." While the document claims that the Library Administration has fully explored other options, none have been presented to library faculty. In cases where faculty feedback has been solicited (to the "fluid" reorganization proposals), that feedback has been almost universally ignored.
There are so many ways to reorganize I am sure that most possibilities have been examined. And the pendulum may swing back--old ways were not always bad.
I cannot say with certainty that they have or have not. Their efforts were quite hidden for about fourteen of the sixteen months in which reorganization has been going on. Except for the very beginning when we had our brainstorming sessions and the announcement of the time line and proposal, we have not heard much detail. What they considered, I do not know.
I don't know what options they have explored
see intranet comments
No. Library Administration's general reorganization proposal is very consistent with the ideas it first proposed. There was no serious discussion with or input from faculty and staff. They cherry-picked LibQual and R2 suggestions, while ignoring recommendation to support core functions of the library. Almost all of the reorganization ideas could have been tried out within the existing structure to see if they would work. Also, it seems that the the reorganization is arranged around personalities--to try to solve some of the personnel problems, as well as around the two interim-AULs.
No, it hasn't. On the contrary, it has deliberately not addressed other reorganization options or the need for reorganization at all. The agenda of the Interim University Library is highly suspect.

<b>11. Does the reorganization proposal effectively address its stated goals, as articulated in the narrative?</b>
The stated goals are not clear.
While goals are stated, the proposal addresses outcomes as hopes and maybes.
Not sure.
The reorganization obfuscates the narrative's stated goals by combining dissimilar departments together for the single purpose of "balancing" the number of FTE personnel rather than combining departments with similar objectives.
There is very little articulated about the ways and means of achieving the statements made in the narrative. There are too many assumptions that are not based on past practice or a vision for the future. What goals and objectives will be sacrificed in order to achieve other ones. There is no leadership or direction in the narrative that clearly states how the structure will improve our services and functions.

it's all very murky
The stated goals themselves are contradictory.
If providing sufficient detail and supporting documentation equals "effectively addresses," then the answer is "no." If "effectively addresses" amounts to simply stating in the proposal that the goals will be achieved, then "yes."
see intranet comments
The narrative is rather weak.
Are you kidding. There are nothing but assertions in the proposal with no evidence to back them up.

<b>12.</b> Does the reorganization address the fundamental issue of lack of resources within the Library to carry out its mission?
The Library Administration hopes to assume more with fewer resources.
Not sure.
The reorganization only addresses the cost savings of not having to pay department head stipends to 11 faculty.
This is a huge oversight -- grouping people into new structures does not assure that existing gaps in resources and funding will be filled. It is more likely that the gaps will widen -- instead of doing more with less, the proposed structure will create an environment of doing less with less.
a resounding NO
NO!!!
The solution of the library's problems as a Carnegie I Research Institute will not be the results of this reorg. Funding and UHM commitment to such will. The reorg will assist in the move the campus seems to desire: that the campus, except for a few select fields, will cease be a Carnegie I Research Institute and become a regular state university offering undergraduate degrees in a variety of fields, but without much special ranking for the majority of its graduate programs.
since library administration is using lack of resources as the rationale, then the narrative should explain how other alternatives do not address this issue as well as a total reorg supposedly would
There will never be enough resources. A lack of resources is a very good reason to look at a different way to organize based on strategic programs and priorities.

<b>13.</b> Does the reorganization achieve the stated aim of allowing the Library to focus on strategic priorities?
With no clear articulation of "strategic priorities", and no statement of projects and services on which the Library will focus, it is impossible to perceive whether the library will achieve anything.
The Library can achieve its strategic priorities with its current structure.
Across the University and even in the Library, there is a stated priority for areas of excellence, which is being ignored by the proposed reorganization. Name recognition of highly ranked collections is being disregarded. There is a marked disconnect between strategic priorities and the proposal.
it's not clear how this will play out..if the reorg will allow us to better achieve these priorities
It is probable that Hawaiian Collection will continue to thrive. Will the Pacific Collection and the specialized areas of Asia Collections also continue to thrive? This is much less clear. Reorganization is a smoke screen. The real issue is funding and the concurrent desire of state, system, and campus administrations to promote these research areas.
I'm not sure what the priorities are, other than to support more instruction.
because most staff are probably still as confused as I am about what our "strategic priorities" ARE and what it means, behaviorally and procedurally, to focus on them. Most esp. the topic of what NON-strategic activities are to be eliminated is not described at all.
If one can't say "yes", one has to say "no." All of it is untested.
It "may" do so, in that the plan specifically names initiatives and directs personnel to those areas explicitly.

It doesn't state what the strategic priorities are, much less how it would allow the library to focus on them.

**14.** Is the timing of the reorganization optimal, given that the University Librarian has indicated that she will retire soon, and the two Associate University Librarians are both interim appointees?

It is rather irresponsible for the Interim University Librarian to propose a reorganization when she is not even sure that she will be here to see the actual changes.

The University Librarian is irresponsible in proposing a total reorganization on the verge of her long promised retirement. The interim UL's should go through a formal, competitive hiring and appointment process, so it cannot be assumed that the reorganization will proceed past the UL's retirement.

We play with the hand we are dealt. This question seems to think that doing nothing is such a better option. If not now, WHEN?? The Library Faculty Senate excels at asking such supercilious questions because it never bears the responsibility for answering them.

All three EM positions are appointees that were not selected in a public search. The two interim appointees do not have the requisite minimum and desirable qualifications to serve as an AUL.

The "Interim" appointments without proper procedures for selection of individuals (application, interviews, etc.) in these positions demonstrates that the whole process is top-down. People with no experience in taking an organization this size forward, and who are not in permanent positions to see the process through does not inspire confidence.

Absolutely a crazy idea.

It is highly irresponsible of the Univ. Librarian to initiate a reorganization that she has no intention of seeing through. It has great potential to negatively impact the ability of the University to recruit a new University Librarian.

The sooner the better as implementing a reorganization takes ages and the real improvements are worth it, even if the rest is not perfect...

No, unless the dean stays on to supervise the transition for a couple of years, perhaps even to the final hiring of at least one of the AULs/Associate deans on a permanent basis.

Duh. Esp. since a major reorg takes at least a couple of years to even reach an approval level, and then several more to implement. Picking a smaller slice of the pie and working on an achievable shorter term reorg of some processes or units would make more sense given the interim nature of all 3 management positions

I strongly urge the LSEB to ask the University Librarian directly how long she intends to be at the Library after (if) the reorganization is approved. This campus has a history of long term interim appointments so I don't believe that the second part is a particular limitation.

The current UL has been in the position for over 4 years. She and LET have been working on this for a long time. They appreciate and value the past and are in excellent positions to look to the future. The responsibility for a successful implementation will be up to everyone in the library.

Very strange to be engaged in a reorganization at this time. The very best thing the University could do is start a national search for a University Librarian--someone with substantial experience running a university research library. Leave it up to that person to pick his or hers AULs and implement a vision for a reorganization, if necessary.

This is the part that bothers me the most. What are interim people doing, other than consolidating their own positions for the next UL?

Are we going to have to undergo another reorganization when a new UL is appointed? It's ridiculous.

**15.** Do the anticipated outcomes of the reorganization justify the time and energy spent on it thus far and the additional time and energy required to implement it?

We are wasting too much time on discussing the reorganization when the Interim University Librarian has already assumed that it is a done deal. The implementation will be extremely confusion and time consuming and she will not be here to see the chaos in the library.

We have already spent too much time, effort, and energy on a poor plan.
Not sure.
Well, doing nothing always requires less time and energy. But is that what we were hired to do? Why ask the question about what has already been past? We can't change it so it does not seem productive to opine about that at this point. I do not see that it will be that difficult or costly to implement. Things will change and I suppose that is everyone's greatest fear. Ours is a profession that does not attract risk takers. But, change happens whether we want to take the risk or not. Having witnessed a number of changes at UHM over the years I think we will look back on this in two to five years and wonder what all the fuss was about.
The library administration is paying lip service to an established time line for proposing reorganization, according to University standards, however it is not taking into serious consideration the consultative aspect of this reorganization. More steps have to be taken to take this discussion outside the library and involve other faculty and students who will all be affected negatively by this reorganization proposal, even if the library administration goes forward without considering faculty and staff input.
Library admin should have been focusing all efforts on getting the library back on the radar of the UH Admin. This reorg is such a futile effort.
No!!! All outcomes in the document have been characterized as "hoped for" outcomes -- they are not even presented as "anticipated" ... no evidence has been given that any outcomes will be achieved, and no plan has been made to do post-reorganization assessments.
Regardless of when the reorg takes place, time and energy must be expended. I do not think the time and energy expended so far has been wasted, nor will implementing necessarily be a waste of time and energy.
It is frustrating not to be able to spend as much time on "real work" as I could because of dealing with the ever-changing, shadowy nature of the "planning"
Maybe
Absolutely. Our future is worth it.
A huge waste of time.