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OVERVIEW

This plan documents the results of a planning process undertaken in the 2009-2010 period for more effectively structuring departments, staff, and operations of the University of North Texas Libraries. This planning process was initiated at the request of the new UNT Dean of Libraries Dr. Martin Halbert when he was appointed in October 2009. An Organizational Structure Working Group (OSWG) was convened in November 2009 to examine the existing structure and reporting lines of the Libraries. The OSWG was chaired by Susan Paz, and comprised of librarians and staff. An external consultant was also contracted to provide advice and recommendations to the working group and the Dean concerning organizational structure. The reports of both the OSWG and the consultant informed this organizational structure plan, and are included as appendices.

BACKGROUND

The UNT Libraries organizational structure that was in place in late 2009 included sixteen direct reports to the Dean, ranging from individuals to Assistant Deans supervising multiple departments. The structure was extremely uneven and unwieldy. Further, an exercise conducted at a meeting of library supervisors in the fall of 2009 demonstrated that there was great confusion concerning the current status of the organization chart of the libraries. The need for a reorganization of the libraries’ structure was marked by virtually the entire staff.

In order to begin analyzing possible ways of remediating this organizational structure, Dean Halbert directed that a library Organizational Structure Working Group be formed to examine the issue and also contracted with an external consultant, Katherine Kott of Stanford University. Kott visited UNT on two occasions in fall 2009, and produced a report that made a variety of recommendations (the report is included as an appendix). One of the primary recommendations was that the organizational structure be consolidated into a smaller number of organizational units with more consistent scope and numerical composition of staff. The library organizational structure working group used Kott’s report in studying the relevant issues, and produced a set of more specific recommendations for the Dean in the spring of 2010. Both Kott’s report and the recommendations of the working group have been taken into account to develop this document, a new plan for library organizational structure to be implemented before the fall of 2010 and the beginning of the university’s next fiscal year.

GOALS OF THIS REORGANIZATION

This reorganization of the UNT libraries’ overall structure is intended to accomplish a number of different goals, shaping library operations in coming months and years. The primary goals of this reorganization are as follow:

- Consolidate the senior management of the libraries into a significantly smaller group
- Enable the Dean to focus on external aims, including fund-raising and strategic directions
- Create an organizational structure that is effective, functional, and clearer to understand
- Utilize staff resources efficiently, saving money through consolidation of roles and salaries while simultaneously providing growth opportunities for talented managers currently available in the libraries
- Align library organizational structure with the library’s role in campus strategic priorities
This plan will focus on the “top level” of the libraries. This top level is comprised of the largest organizational structures, divisions and offices, which are in turn composed of subsidiary units such as departments and individuals. While reporting lines for all existing staff will be specified, this plan is not intended to be the final word regarding placement of such subsidiary units or individuals. Indeed, the expectation is that after top level managers are recruited, that there will be some shifting of staff to more effectively meet the needs of the new functional structures created in the libraries.

**Top Level Organizational Structure**

The new organizational structure includes four divisions and four offices, all of which jointly report to the Associate Dean and the Dean. In this arrangement the Dean will act as Chief Executive Officer and will deal primarily with external functions, while the Associate Dean will act as Chief Operating Officer and will deal primarily with internal functions. The Associate Dean will serve as the manager of daily operations and direct supervisor of the eight top level managers. While the Dean will also direct these top level managers as well as the Associate Dean, the intent of this structure is to allow the Dean to focus on external stakeholders and strategy.

All current staff and operations will be reorganized within these top level functional units as described in the remainder of this plan. One of these top level units, the Research Support Office, is prospective and will not be immediately staffed; it anticipates a function and funding stream that will grow over time as sponsored funding and collaborative research between the faculty and the library expands. The following are descriptions of the seven top level units created in this structure.

Two types of top level units are being created, divisions and offices. Divisions are the largest organizational structures, fulfill core library functions, and are similar in scale to academic departments in colleges of the university. Offices are somewhat smaller than divisions, and fulfill various library administrative functions. Divisions will be led by librarians, while offices may be led by either librarians or senior staff.
**Public Services Division**

This division acts as the primary interface with the UNT community as a whole, as well as constituencies external to UNT (the public, scholars of other universities, etc.) that may be served by the UNT Libraries. As the primary point of contact with the UNT community and largest division, this group will be key to library success. The Public Services Division encompasses the functions and current staff of the following departments:

- **Research and Instructional Services:** This group will be reorganized, and some librarians currently in RIS will likely be transferred to comprise the new Collection Development department (see below).
- **Government Documents:** As a prominent feature of the UNT Libraries, the government documents department will continue to build on successful recent acquisitions. This department is situated in Public Services (rather than the Special Libraries Division) because it serves virtually all UNT and external clienteles, and includes non-unique materials in all subjects and formats.
- **Circulation:** A major point of contact with the community and essential to good public service. This department includes remote storage retrieval and courier services.
- **Interlibrary Loan and Document Delivery:** Obtaining an enormous range of materials for the UNT community, will also collaborate with Collection Management to identify gaps in the current collections.
- **ISB Library Services:** Creative new public service spaces and functions are a hallmark of ISB.

**Collection Management Division**

This new division is responsible for strategically developing and managing the collections of the UNT Libraries. Special focus and attention will be devoted by this division to strengthening library collections in support of a key strategic goal of the UNT Libraries, the upcoming membership application to the Association of Research Libraries, which is in turn an element of the UNT campus strategic research plan to achieve top tier status as a Texas emerging research institution. The Collection Management Division encompasses the functions and current staff of the following departments:

- **Collection Development:** This new department is being created to address needs for balanced collection development, with special attention to gap analysis and comparisons with peer institutions designated by the THECB. Librarians making up this department will likely be drawn from the current RIS department.
- **Technical Services:** This large department will continue to be a critical foundational element of library operations and the effective processing of information resources.
- **Preservation:** Preserving materials for the future is critical to long term access to library collections.

**Special Libraries Division**

The Special Libraries Division includes libraries and departments with collections that are: a) focused on narrowly targeted subject domains and clienteles, b) specialized formats, and/or c) unique items not held by other libraries. The units comprising the division of special libraries offer customized services to their clienteles requiring far more specialized approaches than the broader kinds of services offered in other divisions. The Special Libraries Division encompasses the functions and current staff of the following departments:

- **Music Library:** One of the historically strongest units of the UNT Libraries, this unit will continue to collect extensively and work closely with the College of Music.
- **Discovery Park Library:** Provides specialized services and collections for co-located academic groups.
- **Archives and Rare Books:** Curates remarkably varied and rich specialty collections and services.
- **Media Library:** This unit works very closely with targeted segments of the UNT community to provide access to audiovisual media formats.
- **Microforms:** Provides access to specialized high-density information formats.
**Digital Libraries Division**

The Digital Libraries Division leads efforts to develop innovative new digital services and collections in collaboration with scholars and other external stakeholders. The UNT Libraries have established a premier infrastructure for digital libraries and this division will build on established strengths to further advance the accomplishments of UNT in this area and be a point of attraction for further external sponsored funding. The Digital Libraries Division encompasses the functions and current staff of the following departments:

- **User Interfaces**: This new department will include the current staff of the Multi-Media Development Lab, and will focus on developing and continuously improving user interfaces to various library online systems, for both library clientele and staff. It will include mash-up activities and integration of existing library systems to better address user needs, extensively utilizing usability testing as a methodology. This department will also include ILS staff functions, to improve the utility of the online catalog.
- **Digital Projects**: Building on a long history of successes, digital projects will continue to be enhanced.
- **Digital Library Development Team**: This new team will further cultivate the premier digital library infrastructure of the UNT Libraries, and create the next generation of specialized library applications.

**Facilities and Systems Office**

This new office will consolidate the various core elements of the libraries' infrastructure, from physical bricks and mortar facilities to specialized library server and desktop systems. The Facilities and Systems Office encompasses the functions and current staff of the following departments:

- **Library Facilities**: This functional area will encompass both day-to-day management functions as well as long-term planning and coordination with facilities groups of the campus as well as external consultants.
- **Library Systems**: This is a critical department to maintain library-specific systems, both servers and desktop units. The strength of this unit is another important foundational element of strong library services.
- **Photocopy Services**: Reliable and convenient reprographics are an expected service in any library.
- **24-Hour Access Lab**: As the most heavily used lab facility on campus, this lab needs to be well supported.

**External Relations Office**

This new office will take responsibility for a wide range of functions associated with interacting with external entities. While this office will initially be quite small, its growth will be key to success of the library as a whole. The items identified below will likely not be either departments or even full FTE commitments initially, but rather identify areas in which the office will grow into over time. The External Relations Office encompasses the functions and current staff of the following functional areas:

- **Sponsored Funding and Donor Relations**: Fundraising and grantsmanship will be a critically important area for this office to spearhead. Working effectively with the campus advancement division will be a vital responsibility of this office, and is aligned with the campus strategic plan for advancement.
- **Communication, Marketing, and Outreach Efforts**: This functional area is essential if the libraries are to better communicate both internally and externally. It will require proactive collaboration with many library groups and external agencies, ranging from other campus communications groups to news media.
- **Planning and Assessment**: Effectively managing external reporting (to both campus and external agencies) efforts will be an important element of this office’s responsibilities. The current assessment staff of the libraries will become part of this office.
- **Project Management and Research Support**: For the immediate future this office will manage sponsored projects and provide support for research efforts undertaken in the libraries. Especially as collaborative research projects with UNT faculty expand, research support and/or project management functions may move to the proposed Research Support Office (see below).
**Finance and Administration Office**

This office will formally consolidate financial and other administrative functions that have been loosely grouped together within the UNT Libraries for years. Providing effective oversight and coordination of these functions will be very important to effective and smooth operation of the libraries. This is the only one of the new top level positions which need not be recruited; Susan Paz already holds the position of Assistant Dean for Fiscal Resources, and has had senior leadership responsibilities for various administrative functions within the library for many years; she will continue in these roles formally as part of the new organizational structure. The Finance and Administration Office encompasses the functions and current staff of the following departments:

- **Finance and Budget**: Effective management of budgetary resources is a crucial element of operations.
- **Human Resources**: The libraries are composed of a large cluster of operational units with many specialized and complex human resource requirements.
- **Administrative Office and Cyber-Cafe Operations**: The libraries entail many subsidiary administrative functions, including the Willis Cyber-Café. Effective coordination of these administrative services and functions contributes to the overall success of the libraries.

**Research Support Office**

This office will not be staffed immediately, but instead looks forward to future growth of collaborative research projects with UNT faculty (see notes in External Relations Office above). The hope is that research grants received by the libraries may eventually fund staffing lines in this area in ways that will synergistically expand such endeavors. This is a particular area of future importance because of the campus-wide imperative to grow restricted research funding income for UNT.

**Lateral Coordinating Groups**

The examination of organizational structure in the library has highlighted the need for effective cross-divisional or “lateral” coordination of efforts. This functional need is not directly addressed in this organizational plan, but our expectation is that the new top-level of management recruited will take up this issue immediately. For example, a function that was frequently cited as requiring effective lateral coordination by virtually everyone is the subject liaison program. Lateral coordinating groups and mechanisms will be cultivated in a subsequent planning stage by the new top level management team, once it is in place.

**Process for Recruiting Top Level Managers**

Internal recruitment is the process envisioned for populating the top level of library leadership identified in this plan. Position announcements for the new division and office leader positions will be posted with the intent that internal candidates receive first consideration. There are several reasons for pursuing this strategy.

First, there are many strong leaders in mid-level management positions within the library that can be grown into senior leadership roles. Cultivation of internal library leaders is simultaneously a way of maximizing our existing staff resources while also instilling a sense of advancement within the staff of the libraries.

Second, this course of action will reduce the impact on the library budget by not creating a series of new positions. Instead, some funding from existing salary lines of recent senior retirees will be utilized to appropriately supplement existing managers’ salary lines as they step up to new responsibilities. Every effort to ensure reasonable equity and fairness in these appointments will be made.
Third, internal recruitments will be the fastest path to move forward, a pressing need in this period of rapid change for the UNT Libraries. Positions will be posted and recruited quickly, with the intent of concluding all searches by the mid-point of 2010, if not sooner. This will enable serious planning on next steps for the libraries to be undertaken by the beginning of the fall semester.

**Next Steps**

Position descriptions and the necessary processes for announcement of these positions will be forthcoming. The libraries will coordinate with both the Provost’s office and campus Human Resources to proceed with these internal recruitment efforts. Interested library staff should stay posted for position announcements and should follow application procedures described in these announcements when they appear.

This new organizational structure has been created with broad involvement by library staff, and holds great promise for more effective library operations that are better aligned with campus priorities. The UNT Libraries looks forward to implementation of this plan and a smoother, more effective organizational structure.
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Report from the UNT Libraries’ Organizational Structure Working Group

Members of Working Group:

Susan Paz, Chair
Beth Avery
Jean Harden
Scott Jackson

Sue Parks
Mark Phillips
Jennifer Sheehan

Overview

In November Dean Halbert began a strategic planning process for UNT Libraries. As part of strategic planning, the Organizational Structure Working Group (WG) was formed and charged with examining the existing structure and reporting lines of the Libraries. An external consultant, Katherine Kott, was engaged and came for two site visits. Her report is attached as an addendum to this report.

As she explains in her report, Kott worked from a stance of appreciative inquiry in which an organization’s strengths are identified and an effort is made to build on these strengths. The Working Group also took this stance. Kott’s report identifies a number of strengths including new leadership, a strong Digital Projects Unit, Government Documents department and Music Library. The Working Group agrees with these strengths and also identified all the departments -- Archives and Rare Books, Government Documents, Media Library, Music Library -- known collectively as Special Collections as strengths.

The WG also decided that the somewhat decentralized, distributed model currently in use in the Libraries for circulation, cataloging, collection development, and preservation was generally successful and should be continued. Circulation activities occur in General Collections and Special Collections and in the Digital Projects Unit. Collection development activities occur throughout the libraries. Cataloging and Metadata activities take place in Technical Services, Government Documents, the Media Library, the Music Library, Rare Books and the Digital Projects Unit.

Several clear goals in the organizational redesign process emerged. One was that a better-balanced organizational structure was needed with fewer direct reports to the Dean. Another was that lateral communicating groups with clear charges and authority were needed. And a third was that better communication, both internally and externally, was needed.

Early in the process the Working Group agreed that a model common to Libraries in which the Dean acts as Chief Executive Officer and deals primarily with external functions and the Associate Dean acts as Chief Operating Officer and deals primarily with internal functions would work well for UNT Libraries. Kott notes in her report that the Dean might choose to make several short term changes to relieve the immediate pressure of day-to-day operations. If an internal promotion is made, we would expect the new Associate Dean to work closely with the Dean in implementing further organizational changes.
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We would like to emphasize that we see the recommendations in this report as only a first step in the organizational redesign process. Organizational structure is not static and will continue to evolve as new services and technologies expand the scope of the library. One area in which decisions will need to be made is that of the number and composition of the lateral coordinating groups. As an example, the reporting lines and charge to the Subject Librarian LCG will be dependent on decisions made about the responsibilities of the group. These decisions need to be made soon.

The WG has chosen to present its recommendations in organizational charts that incorporate those features on which the group came to consensus. The recommendations focus on the need for an Associate Dean, the need to create a new management level, and on the way lateral communicating groups are formed and charged.

Although we had discussions in the group about possible reorganizations of departments and these discussions are described below we make no specific departmental recommendations believing that this is something that must be done in collaboration between the Dean, Associate Dean, and new Division Heads.

The difference between the two charts we are presenting centers around the role of ILS in the Libraries. There was extensive discussion of this and no final agreement was reached.
Notes on the Organizational Chart 1:

The recommended structure is a hybrid, as is the current one. It has features of both functional and divisional structures. Kathryn Kott supplied the WG with organizational charts from seven other academic libraries. As far as the WG can determine, there are almost as many possible structures for academic libraries as there are libraries. No gold standard seems to exist. Our recommendations strive to combine the best features of the current organization with changes designed to improve lateral communication and create a more balanced load for all.

A new management level has been created. Departments are grouped into six divisions with heads, either Assistant Deans or Directors, who report to the Associate Dean. The Associate Dean reports to the Dean. The new division heads along with the Associate Dean would act as an advisory group or cabinet to the Dean. It will be critical that this group communicate very well with each other and that each of the Division Heads communicates well with the departments reporting to him/her.

The Working Group recommends that searches be undertaken for each of the cabinet positions. While for many of the positions strong internal candidates exist, advertising open positions for which internal candidates could apply confirms the strength and suitability of these internal candidates. However, we realize that searches, whether national or local, can be costly and time-consuming and recognize that in some cases a promotion rather than a search would be appropriate.

The organizational chart also identifies a number of lateral communicating groups (LCGS). The Libraries’ existing work groups already function as LCGS but without clear charges or authority. To remedy this, it is recommended that the charge for all working groups comes from the Dean and that each working group is either chaired by the appropriate division head or has a chair that reports to this division head. The working groups recommended were created by a form of gap analysis. As a group, we identified areas in which the Libraries could function more effectively if lateral communication were improved.

Lateral Coordinating Groups need to be flexible. The Libraries may need LCGS in addition to those identified in the charts. Some LCGS will probably be no longer needed as the Libraries grow and change. It is possible that communication needs filled initially by an LCG may eventually be filled by a new position. There will also be a need for project-oriented task forces that are formed to achieve a particular task and dissolved when the task is completed.

It is further recommended that an Office of Development be created. This office would report directly to the Dean and coordinate research, assessment, and marketing and communication activities. Marketing, along with communication, was one of the gaps identified by the WG. Identifying an office with specific responsibility for marketing activities should create more professional and coordinated efforts in this area.
Notes on Organizational Chart 2

In this organizational chart, ILS is located in the Digital Services area. There is no ILS LCG and the Metadata/Cataloging LCG is chaired by the ILS Librarian. The focus of WG discussions was on whether the ILS Librarian’s responsibility were primarily for catalog maintenance and maintenance of other IILS modules or whether the phrase “Integrated Library System” should also encompass the larger role of providing access to both traditional and digital collections.

No agreement was reached on this issue or on whether an ILS LCG was needed. Some members argued that an LCG was still needed to collaborate on catalog appearance, functionality, and usability and to discuss specific modules and features that can/should be implemented. Others felt that the ILS Librarian should work with the various Lateral Coordinating Groups in those areas relevant to their respective charges. In Org Chart 2, this communication provides the needed lateral communication on ILS issues.

The second organizational chart reflects the WG’s desire to bring attention to this area of non-consensus.

Discussions:

Some things discussed in WG meetings:

Cataloging and Metadata activities are intertwined and need to be considered together.

The role and composition of the Subject Librarians Group needs to be clarified. Some of the comments the Working Group received concerned the many activities—class pages, subject guides, instruction, collection management, faculty and student research support—that different subject librarians engage in to varied degrees. There were also comments about the need for stronger research support for faculty applying for research funds and engaging in more research and scholarly activities.

One suggested model for the Public Services Division was to create a Research Librarians Unit under Public Services. In this model, the Subject Librarians would report to the head of Public Services.

Because of time constraints, the WG did no detailed analysis of successful models used at other universities. Going forward this analysis could be useful. One model that the WG did not recommend that might be examined as the organization evolves is a cabinet model that contains more than one associate dean.

On page 8 of her report, Kott states that “…This would be a good time for the library to create structures and processes to support a robust collection development program situated in the libraries.” While collection development activities currently take place and will continue to take place throughout the Libraries, the Organizational Charts presented here identify a function in the Collection Management division named “Collection Development” and the WG sees collection development and the alignment of the materials budget with collection development goals as an important focus of future activity.
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As part of the work of the WG comments about organizational redesign were solicited from all library employees. These comments are included as Addendum 2 to this report.

This draft report has been reviewed by ex-officio members of the Working Group. Comments received by these members are included in Addendum 3.

Dean’s Response to Draft of this report:

Dean Halbert reviewed a draft of this report. We are including in the final version a summary of this response:

As a next step, the Dean will respond to the recommendations in this report with his own plan for organizational redesign. The Organizational Structure Working Group’s report will inform his plan and serve as an addendum to it, just as Katherine Kott’s recommendations form an addendum to the WG’s report. The organizational structure ultimately implemented by the Dean will largely be based on the structure of the WG plan, but may diverge in some ways to address pressing needs. He will present his plan to the Working Group and to the Libraries for review and comment.

Of necessity, implementation of changes will be in steps and gradual. As a new Libraries’ management team is put together, it will participate in the change process and assist with decisions about departmental and working group changes. The Provost’s Office will also be involved as implementation moves ahead.

The Dean has confirmed that lateral coordinating groups will receive immediate attention as a next step after the Cabinet has been recruited.

The Organizational Structure Working Group will remain as a working group and will be asked to assist with decisions on the lateral coordinating groups and other implementation matters. New members may be added to the group.
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Executive Summary

By invitation of Dr. Martin Halbert, Dean of Libraries at University of North Texas Libraries, I have prepared the following report, based on findings from an organizational assessment site visit in January 2010. I focused on organizational design, with particular attention to two areas of concern; organizational structure and the Personnel Action Committee (PAC) process.

The Libraries have strengths to build upon, energetic new leadership, and challenges to face. This report creates a framework for thinking about organizational issues for the Libraries and suggests short and long term strategies for addressing them.

Key Findings

- The organizational structure has grown opportunistically and is not arranged according to any clear pattern.
- The Dean of Libraries has more direct reports than he can currently manage.
- Under the circumstances, it makes sense to take a somewhat conservative approach to organizational design.
- It has not been completely clear when decisions are within the purview of the Dean of Libraries and when they fall under the librarians’ charter or bylaws.
- The PAC process for librarians has been extended to cover evaluation of each librarian’s primary assignment, formerly the responsibility of the supervisor.
- Librarians find the process cumbersome and ineffective.
- For effective change, structure must flow from strategy and be supported by process, including clear decision-making processes and cross-functional group processes.
- I recommend a two-tiered approach for the UNT Libraries in the areas of organizational design.
  - Make several short term changes to relieve immediate pressure.
  - Make fundamental changes once the strategic planning process is finished.
- The strategic plan should inform the longer term structure.
- For geographically separate facilities, focus on service and think about how to use technology or other tools to bridge location gaps rather than attempting to organize geographically.
- What is most important is that the overall structure reflects the strategy and that the processes for decision making and cross-functional communication are well understood and robust.
- I would not recommend a matrix management solution for the UNT Libraries.
- Using the cross-functional working group lateral process to coordinate communication across functional boundaries would be a better option.
- It is important to review working groups on a regular basis to make sure they are still needed, and to be clear about their functions.
- This would be a good time for the library to create structures and processes to support a robust collection development program situated in the library.
- It is likely to be critical to the mission of the library to develop this capacity.
- The Libraries can be a “third-space” for the community as neutral physical and virtual space as well as the stewards of collections that fall outside of disciplinary areas.
- It will be important to look at the relationship between the Dean, the Administrative Council, and the professional librarians, be clear about what decisions and policies...
are within the purview of each, and think about what other authority will be delegated, and to what level.

- By removing review of the primary assignment from the PAC procedure, leaving that responsibility with the supervisor, the PAC procedure could become lighter weight right away.
- Within the context of the strategic plan, librarian status, performance evaluation, and promotion and reappointment processes should be reviewed along with the other reward structures for the organization.
- The reward structure should reinforce the priorities that the strategic plan emphasizes and should be flexible enough to be adjusted easily as specific goals are set each year.
- The influence different statuses for librarians and classified staff have on the organization as well as the political impact lack of faculty status for librarians might have on librarians' standing in the university should each be considered in designing a comprehensive reward system for the Libraries.
- A complete overhaul of the PAC Review process will be a major undertaking and could likely benefit from the services of an outside consultant.
Background

Dr. Martin Halbert, Dean of Libraries at University of North Texas invited me to assist with two components of a strategic planning process he introduced in late 2009, soon after he assumed his position. The Libraries have many strengths, including a robust Digital Projects Unit, a nationally recognized Government Documents Department, and an internationally renowned Music Department. Some areas need immediate attention, however. The Libraries require a more effective organizational design including an updated strategy and a revised structure. The organization needs a more efficient and effective evaluation and promotion process for librarians, including an answer to the question of whether or not librarians should hold faculty status or academic rank. By request, I have focused on organizational structure and the review process for librarians, and will highlight these two issues. This report creates a framework for thinking about organizational effectiveness and is designed to help Dr. Halbert move forward with the strategic planning process, and assist the Organizational Structure Working Group and the Personnel Affairs Committee (PAC) Procedures Working Group with their decision-making.

Current State

Although the organizational structure that was put into place by the previous Dean follows a Chief Executive Officer (Dean)/Chief Operating Officer (Associate Dean) pattern, the underlying reporting structures have grown opportunistically and are not arranged according to any clear pattern. The current structure contains elements of a functional organizational structure with aspects of an adhocracy. With the simultaneous retirements of both the previous dean and associate dean, Martin has an opportunity to restructure in a way that fits his management style and the emerging new strategic direction for the libraries. The chart below (Figure 1) was the official organization chart under the previous Dean. However, members of the Administrative Council drew a slightly different version of the chart on the white board when I asked what organizational structure is currently in effect. The chart they drew showed the functional areas that are blue on the published chart, Assistant Dean for Finance, Assistant Dean for Technology, and Assistant Dean for Facilities and Circulation clustered on the left, and the more divisional departments such as Government Documents, Media, and Music as well as physically separate units such as Discovery Park on the right. Whether the published version of the organizational chart or the whiteboard version is more representative, the Dean of Libraries has more direct reports than he can currently manage. The Assistant Dean for Facilities and Head of Access and Preservation will also be retiring soon, leaving a large functional gap and creating an additional range of needs and opportunities. In the interim, Dr. Halbert has decided to split Facilities from Access and Preservation, with each reporting directly to him. This interim solution creates an additional direct reporting relationship in the short term.

The UNT Libraries like most academic libraries have operated with a traditional hierarchical structure. Most academic libraries are organized either functionally or divisionally, but the UNT Libraries organization includes elements of each. While a few academic libraries, notably the University of Arizona, have experimented with alternative team-based organizational structures, most academic libraries continue to operate under more traditional hierarchical structures, organized by functional area or division. Martin Halbert is more comfortable with a more traditional structure than with alternative structures. Although academic libraries are under threat from changes in the environment due to technology changes and competition from commercial entities like Google, UNT libraries are more protected than most because most revenue comes from student fees and enrollment has been rising. Under these low risk circumstances, it makes sense to take a somewhat conservative approach to organizational design.
Librarians at UNT have a role in library governance but it has not been completely clear when decisions are within the purview of the Dean of Libraries and when they fall under the librarians’ charter or bylaws. One example of a change that was put to a vote by librarians was a modification to the PAC procedure that required the PAC to process primary assignment reviews for librarians in addition to processing promotion and retention recommendations. Librarians at UNT currently have faculty status and are promoted through various ranks and considered for reappointment using a process that mirrors the faculty promotion process, although librarians do not receive tenure. Based on the vote mentioned above, the PAC process for librarians has been extended to cover evaluation of each librarian’s primary assignment, formerly the responsibility of the supervisor. Librarians find the process cumbersome and ineffective. In addition, the Provost is interested in seeing it streamlined. The working group that is examining the process has been gathering information about the status of librarians in other academic libraries. So far they have discovered a range of options with no clear best practice having emerged.

Organizational Design and Structure

During my visit, I shared my perspective on organizational design with Dr. Halbert and his staff. I referred to Jay Galbraith’s Star Model (Figure 2), which advocates looking at strategy, structure, process, rewards, and people (Galbraith, n.d.).

I agree with Galbraith’s perspective that we often make the mistake of thinking restructuring is all that is needed for organizational change. However, for effective change, structure must flow from strategy and be supported by process, including clear decision-making processes and cross-functional group processes, called lateral links in the Star Model. Thus, my observations will include recommendations that apply to business processes and lateral links as well as the organizational structure and the reward system.

I used an Appreciative Inquiry framework for data gathering (Sullivan, 2004). Appreciative Inquiry looks at organizational strengths and how to build on them rather than using a diagnostic model that seeks to identify problems. Additional information about methodology and sample data is included in Appendix I.

Based on my findings, I recommend a two-tiered approach for the UNT Libraries in the areas of organizational design. By building on existing strengths and monitoring the emerging new strategic direction, Dean Halbert can make several short term changes to relieve immediate pressure without compromising his ability to make fundamental changes.
once the strategic planning process is finished and the full reports from the working groups are submitted. For example, moving a trusted and experienced staff member into an Acting Associate Dean position to absorb most of the burden of day-to-day operations is one idea that Martin might consider. This short-term strategy would provide immediate relief and allow for the longer term planning process to be completed in a thoughtful fashion.

The strategic plan should inform the longer term structure. In the past, the UNT Libraries seemed to be focused internally, on collection building and processing, although there is strong motivation for providing excellent services to the community. This dual focus could explain the current hybrid organizational structure. If the new strategic plan focuses on collection building and internal processing, a functional organizational structure would be a good solution. A functional structure reflects the way the work is organized. In a functional model, Technical Services, Public Services, Information Technology Services, and Administrative Services (Grants, Contracts, Facilities, Budget and Finance, Marketing and Outreach) could form the primary divisions (Figure 3). The heads of these divisions could report to an Associate Dean or form a cabinet for the Dean. Such a structure would gather functions at the administrative layer reporting to the Dean or Associate Dean, but the work itself might be quite distributed. It is possible that the functional arrangement would result in dual reporting for some people such as the music librarians who do both technical and public services work.

If the strategy emphasizes service to the community, a divisional structure might be a better choice. In this model, the structure reflects an outward focus and an emphasis on service. The structure could be geographic or subject based, or a combination of the two. Some libraries that use this type of model create departments for science and engineering, humanities and social sciences, business and law, special collections and archives, etc. (Figure 4). Another possibility would be to include services like distance education and remote campuses as another slice. Space constraints seem to have
influenced organizational structure decisions in the past, and geography is another way libraries divide up their organizations. For the UNT Libraries, rather than thinking about physical location as a way to structure the organization, I advise focusing on service and thinking about how to use technology or other tools to bridge the location gaps. There may be some exceptions to this general rule, such as Discovery Park, where there is some alignment between location and program. In any case, what is most important is that the overall structure reflects the strategy and that the processes for decision making and cross-functional communication are well understood and robust. Current vacancies should provide flexibility to fill organizational gaps in skills and experience, whether a functional or divisional model is chosen.

Although a matrix arrangement is sometimes considered as a third alternative structure for complex organizations, I would not recommend a matrix solution for the UNT Libraries. In a matrix structure, the organization would be divided into functional units across one axis and divisional units across another (Figure 5). In a matrix management organization, teams or groups can have dual reporting relationships, or report through a functional structure with weaker links to program areas. Effective matrix management requires a significant investment in lateral communication, often resulting in a large number of meetings. A better option for UNT Libraries might be to continue to use the cross-functional working group lateral process to coordinate communication across functional boundaries.

Once a clear functional or divisional organizational model is designed, it will be important to make a thorough review of the existing working groups. Some functions that working groups have managed, such as Communication and Outreach may be staffed, in which case the need for a working group could be reevaluated. In a new configuration, there may also be a need for working groups that do not exist in the current organization. It is important to review working groups on a regular basis to make sure they are still needed, and to be clear about their functions. Are they decision-making groups with final authority in some matters or are they advisory? The Collection Development Working Group is a case in point in the current configuration. Working group members reported that they have responsibility for collection development but that the budget is distributed to academic departments. Faculty expectations about control over collections budgets erodes the Collection Development Working Group’s authority over the collections budget. This creates a dilemma, especially when support for interdisciplinary materials are needed. Faculty are not always supportive of using funds they perceive as being allocated to their departments for interdisciplinary collection building. This would be a good time for the library to create structures and processes to support a robust collection development program situated in the
It will require strong leadership and excellent program development and interpersonal skills to do so, but it is likely to be critical to the mission of the library to develop this capacity. For the Libraries to take the position that it is the Libraries’ role to be stewards of the collections with a holistic view aligns with the vision of the Libraries as a neutral “third-space” for the community that was articulated clearly at the Academic Council session I attended. This is a compelling vision that may emerge and be strengthened through the strategic planning process. It is possible to think of this “third-space” in terms of physical and virtual space as well as collections that fall outside of disciplinary areas.

The Organizational Structure Working Group might proceed with a recommendation to Dean Halbert by settling on an organizational model and developing several scenarios for how departments and units could be organized within each division. Depending on the breadth of the working group charge, they might also consider what lateral communications would be needed given the recommended organizational structure, and suggest a slate of working groups that would create lateral links.

In academic settings, hybrid governance models are common. In the university at large, the faculty and the administration commonly share authority. Libraries sometimes shadow their parent organizations’ shared governance models. The UNT Libraries had some elements of a shared governance model in place under the previous administration. I heard several reports that decision-making authority was unclear in the previous administration. Budget authority was centralized at the highest level, but it was not always obvious when the Associate Dean could authorize an expenditure and when the Dean reserved the authority to decide. While outside the scope of this report, it will be important to look at the relationship between the Dean, the Administrative Council, and the professional librarians, be clear about what decisions and policies are within the purview of each, and think about what other authority will be delegated, and to what level.

Librarian Status, Promotion, and Reappointment

Similarly, the PAC Procedures Working Group has an opportunity for a quick short-term win that will buy them time for reflective consideration of the complex issues surrounding faculty status and academic rank. By removing review of the primary assignment from the PAC procedure, leaving that responsibility with the supervisor, the PAC procedure could become lighter weight right away. In addition, the PAC Working Group and the new Dean of Libraries could demonstrate to the Provost that they are capable of quick and decisive action. This change should be implemented as soon as is practical within the performance review cycle.

In exploring the history of librarian primary assignment review being bundled with the PAC process, I learned from the PAC Review Working Group that the change may have been a group process solution to an individual problem. In the past, one supervisor was perceived to be unfair in her evaluation of librarians who reported to her if she did not like them. Rather than grieving against this supervisor, there was a movement to take the primary assignment reviews through PAC as a corrective action. This suggested change was taken to the librarians for a vote, the majority of librarians voted for the change, and the primary assignment reviews became part of the PAC process. This story is instructive. It demonstrates what can happen when an individual problem is solved by creating extraneous procedures rather than using solutions that were put in place to deal with issues as they arise. This can happen in conflict-averse cultures if the procedure that is in place is perceived to be one that requires an individual to have an unpleasant exchange with another. Both the new Dean and members of working groups that are reviewing policies and procedures should be aware of this cultural tendency within the University of North Texas.
Libraries. The PAC system has also been constructed as a "corrective" against the tendency towards "grade inflation" or the Lake Wobegon effect. The problem is, no one wants to be "meeting expectations," everyone wants to be exceptional, and departments advocate for their employees. Rather than looking to the PAC process to correct this problem, one alternative would be to create a “curve” to make each area or district responsible for their own leveling.

The PAC Procedures Review Working Group and other groups looking at personnel procedures will want to think about training for supervisors who do performance assessments to give support for using the reviews as a positive tool. Training on how to have difficult conversations and handle conflict when sticky situations arise would also be helpful. Referring once again to the Star Model, training for supervisors is a link between reward systems and human resource management.

Within the context of the strategic plan, librarian status, performance evaluation, and promotion and reappointment processes should be reviewed along with the other reward structures for the organization. The reward structure should reinforce the priorities that the strategic plan emphasizes and should be flexible enough to be adjusted easily as specific goals are set each year. The PAC review procedure is a reward system element in the Star Model but does not encompass the reward system for the entire organization. How classified staff are rewarded must also be taken into account. At the open meeting on organizational change attended by classified staff as well as librarians, several classified staff observed that while librarians get credit for publishing papers and presenting at conferences, classified staff do not. What impact does the difference in status between librarians and classified staff have on organizational functioning? As the PAC Review Working Group looks at options for status, this will be a question to consider.

Members of the PAC Procedures Review Working Group noted that the current point system for promotion and retention assigns more points for individually authored works than for joint publications, although the organization espouses collaboration as a value. The annual merit review for classified staff and librarians evaluates performance of core responsibilities, while promotion and reappointment review for librarians look at scholarship and service as well. The PAC Review Working Group has been polling other departments on campus to compare criteria for scholarship and service evaluation and to compare the review processes other departments use with the Libraries’ process. So far they have found few common themes. Members of the PAC Review Working Group mentioned that faculty status enables librarians to participate as peers in faculty governance. One person observed that faculty appreciate librarians because librarians are well organized. Does librarian participation in faculty governance enhance the standing of librarians as scholars and partners in teaching and learning or do the teaching and research faculty perceive librarians as “staff” to faculty committees? The influence different statuses for librarians and classified staff have on the organization as well as the political impact lack of faculty status for librarians might have on librarians’ standing in the university should each be considered in designing a comprehensive reward system for the Libraries.

The PAC Procedures Review Working Group has decided to look first at status and then examine the options for rank and reappointment. The process for change is to make recommendations, and survey the librarians to determine general preference. The PAC Procedures Working Group seems to be hoping for a consensus or at least majority solution. However, one member of the group mentioned the possibility of a hybrid interim or transition solution, suggesting that there may not be general agreement among the librarians about a preferred solution. This report is intended to provide a framework for
examining the PAC Procedures Working Group process within the context of organizational design, not to weigh the pros and cons of the range of options for status, rank, and reappointment. The PAC Procedures Working Group has collected a wealth of materials that delve into the specific advantages and disadvantages for each. My personal perspective, having worked in organizations where librarians have faculty rank and a tenure process as well as organizations where librarians are staff or academic staff is that other factors are more important to successful collaboration between librarians, faculty (and others, such as learning technology professionals) than faculty status.

Here again, it is very important to put this decision in the larger strategic context, and for everyone to understand who has the authority to make the decision. Is it the librarians under their charter or bylaws, or is it the Dean, or is it the Provost?1 If the Provost has certain parameters in mind beyond her concern about the time consuming nature of the review process, it would be beneficial to learn about those boundaries now rather than have the PAC Procedure Review Working Group consider recommendations that would be unacceptable to the administration. A complete overhaul of the PAC Review process will be a major undertaking and could likely benefit from the services of an outside consultant.

**Other Observations**

To insure transparency and an open organizational design process, all library staff were invited to participate in an open meeting to learn more about the strategic planning process. At the session, I introduced an organizational change model that shows the typical stages people in organizations go through when faced with significant change, such as a change in leadership, or changes in organizational design. Each staff member was invited to place a pink or yellow post-it note (with comments if they wished) on the chart at the place they thought best described where they fit in the change cycle.

![Figure 6 Organizational Change](image)

1 During my second site visit on February 1, 2010, The PAC Procedures Working Group Chair stated that they will make a recommendation to the Dean, who will make a decision, in consultation with the Provost.
The results of the exercise were encouraging (Figure 6) with a large number of participants indicating that they are already feeling enthusiasm and only one person still feeling anxious about the impending changes. Sample specific comments are included in Appendix I. The post-it note colors were not significant. The range of comments, including some that indicate the staff person was unaware of the impending changes suggest that internal communication may be uneven among various groups. This is not at all unusual but may merit some thought about the value of centralized communication by email to all staff on important issues. The level of enthusiasm and optimism among the staff bodes well for a successful organizational change process. During the open session, staff members showed interest and dedication by their level of engagement and positive suggestions. The University of North Texas library staff appear ready for Martin Halbert’s leadership and prepared to work with him on new strategies to insure the Libraries make a significant contribution to University of North Texas—an innovative student-centered research university.

**Conclusion**

This project is an organizational development consultant’s dream come true. The charge for the project came from library leadership, so there is commitment from the top, the organization has resources to act, although it is not without its difficulties, including space constraints, and the library staff is ready for change. In this report, I have provided a framework for considering key elements of organizational design, with a focus on structure and the PAC Review process. I hope this framework is helpful as you continue to develop a new strategy and create an organizational design to support it. I thoroughly enjoyed this engagement, and would welcome further opportunities to work with UNT Libraries. In particular, if more extensive work on organizational structure and processes or the rewards structure would be useful, I would be interested in assisting in those areas.
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Appendix I: Data Gathering Methodology and Notes from Site Visit

On January 11, 2010 I visited the libraries to meet with Martin, members of the PAC Procedures Working Group, the Organizational Structure Working Group, and Administrative Council. The visit included an orientation dinner with Susan Paz and Cathy Hartman as working group chairs, an orientation breakfast with Martin Halbert, and working sessions with each working group, the Administrative Council. I also facilitated an open session for library staff on organizational change, and a debriefing session with Martin Halbert.

I used an Appreciative Inquiry approach to gather information from session participants. Sample questions included:

1. What is this group’s role in the strategic planning process? Where are you with that effort?
2. What value do the libraries bring to the UNT community? At what do the libraries excel?
3. Could someone diagram the organizational structure and the important connections that link the different departments?
4. Are working groups a new or familiar mechanism for getting work done in the library?
   a. How are groups charged?
   b. Do they make recommendations?
   c. Are they expected to come to consensus on issues?
   d. Do the working groups have the potential to fill gaps in the organizational structure either temporarily or permanently?
   e. Is there enough leadership to go around?
   f. If not, what is the strategy for filling the gap?
5. Which parts of the organization are particularly effective at what they do? What is it about these areas that enable them to succeed?
6. What is the most valuable aspect of the current review process?
7. Are there aspects of the current process that must be retained for compliance with the UNT HR system?
8. What performance attributes are most important to the success of the libraries? How are those attributes recognized and rewarded in the review process?
9. What organizational purposes does the advancement in rank serve? Do library staff who are not classified as librarians (e.g. information technology professionals) have an opportunity to progress to a different job classification through a standard process? If not, is there a particular advantage to the organization to provide that opportunity to librarians but not to others?
10. What is it like to work here?
11. What gets you up in the morning to come here?
12. What are your hopes and dreams for the future of the UNT libraries?

In the open session, staff members were invited to post notes on a chart that shows the stages people often go through when experiencing change. As indicated in the report, many people have completed the cycle and are enthusiastic! Here are some of the comments that people posted:

- ANXIOUS!! Will our department be valued by the new dean? Will my job description change dramatically?
• Fear—afraid we will be homogenized into mediocrity
• Frustration
  o Let’s get going
  o Very confused
• Relief
  o Relief and stress
• Confusion
  o The memo announcing mtg was first I heard of reorg
  o Uncertain
• Stress
  o Stress
  o Stress!! Always
• Creativity
  o I did not really know we were going through a restructuring, but, I think Research & Instructional Services is at the creative level 😊
• Acceptance
  o Hopeful
  o Acceptance Impatience
• Hopeful
  o Hopeful
• Enthusiastic
  o Enthusiastically curious
  o Bring it on!
  o Enthusiastic (twice)
  o Optimistic

Themes

A couple of themes that do not quite fit within the context of the report emerged during the sessions. I will mention them briefly here so they will be captured for future consideration. One theme was the request for more transparency than there had been with previous administrations, especially in the areas of decision-making and resources, particularly budget. Another was the need to be more organized about reporting and assessment, and the importance of a cultural shift towards assessment that focuses on what the university administration is interested in measuring.