"You want me to do WHAT? Communication, Governance and Distributed Responsibility."
issues related to system governance and shared responsibility for system support.
brief description of their local situation, highlighting strategies, best practices (worst practices) and the like. Goal of the
session is to stimulate discussion among the attendees.
The session is scheduled for Tuesday 4:15-5:15.

Background of local situation:

- Combined three separate NOTIS library systems into one bibliographic/authority environment (4 administratively separate libraries)
- NOTIS-centric and other committees all in need of reorganization and new membership
- Programmatic review begun late last summer.
- Added 2 III acquisitions operations into Aleph library management system
- Implementation process crossed library administrative boundaries, divisional boundaries, and special library boundaries. Everyone had to change
- Systems staff involved in but not directing implementation. Except for one student librarian/ programmer who joined our office last July, staffing is unchanged (2 librarian/analysts, 1 librarian/programmer, 2 programmers)

Where we are now:

Where we are now, briefly:
The Library Systems Office has the primary responsibility for **managing basic operations of Aleph**, its related operations and services, and **SFX**. We're a collaborative partner in this management process with two other units in Library Information Technology (Desktop Support for desktop hardware and the GUI client and Core Services for support of hardware and infrastructure). We collaborated with another LIT unit, Web Services, to create the OPAC, but we have responsibility for supporting that now. We have not changed staffing except to add a student intern for report writing.

Support and direction for **priorities, new features and releases, as well as changes to basic operations**, come from the newly developed structure of committees and working groups that are usually broader than Aleph or SFX. Basically that structure has a steering committee, called the **Electronic Resources Steering Committee**, composed of a chair and the chairs of three new committees and one existing committee:

- Metadata, Description and Records Committee (records)
- Public Access Resources Committee (public view)
- Library Technology Committee (technology)
- Central Electronic Resources Committee (content)

These committees have associated with them 13 working groups (some not yet formed or populated), as well as two functional groups (Documentation and Training and Aleph Service Pack Reviewers). The working groups cover more specific aspects, such as OPAC, Usability, E-Reserves, SFX, Institutional Repository, Campus integration, Search Tools, etc.

Functional units of the library also provide direction for Systems work that falls inside existing policies. They also may make proposals for changes and new policies via one of the working groups, the ECom team, Systems, or any other source. For example, changes to circulation policies would likely be suggested by a specific circulation unit, developed by a circulation working group, brought forward to Steering, and forwarded to Systems for implementation.

Current Issues:

Implementation teams have been replaced with similar teams and working groups of people, showing the same mix. Current issues for those groups, other units, and Systems are:

Communication:

- how/when/what/where/who to share information with patrons and staff and the role of a systems office in this process
- level of responsibility of recipients. If you provide info, will they read/listen/follow?
- tools and methods for communication: C-Tools, Footprints projects, websites

Policy making:

- who makes, communicates, and documents policy when a committee is in charge, when the administration has delegated decisions to a flatter organization
- how does a systems office know whether someone asking for work has the proper authority and how do we maintain good will while asking?
- how does the a systems office contribute to policy making

On-going nature of work vs. implementation project:

- Service pack mentality: almost everyone listens to change notices at the outset, but what about routine operations or recurring issues.
- Load, indexing, circulation routines: how to report problems and issues
- Report needs (GUI, ARC, other): how to separate routine from special and decide where best to run them and who should oversee

Management tools:

Footprints supports a continuum of work and needs: report requests, urgent problems, on-going efforts, questions, et al. (For Systems, this replaced a FileMaker Pro database used for reports)

- Shared projects, each managed by a specific unit, but crossing unit lines
- Public view of work and email exchanges
- Simple email and forms to ask questions, report problems, make DB changes, et al.

Websites: Systems maintains a site for operational and informational purposes.

C-Tools: Documentation, email tracked, specific

Training materials: Shared centrally during LMS implementation, but not being updated, while individual smaller unit websites are developing own materials which may conflict with new-born central policies

Best practices:

Being Open: Sharing information widely, but carefully, in terms understandable to most

> e.g. emails to cataloging managers
> e.g. information about monthly reports and next month's work on website and via email
> e.g. providing information about set policies on our website

Providing detailed information in easy-to-find places (e.g. public knowledge base, ticket details)

Being open to requests (e.g. Footprints email and forms, email, discussion)

> Expanding horizons: e.g. automated backlog searching expanded to automated searching of materials coming from Acquisitions

Providing direction for communication and governance paths, reinforcing whatever the structure is

> Engaging the requestor in the process

Responsibility and flexibility: Systems staff sharing responsibilities for overall office mission and goals, while maintaining specialties. Setting monthly 'work to do' goals and sharing that broadly. Changing goals to meet needs.

<u>**Committee structure:**</u>

Electronic Resources Steering Committee (composed of a chair and the chairs of PARC, MDRC, LTC, and Central E-team)
      Subordinate committees:
      Aleph ILL
      Chairs of individual subject E-[resource] teams

1. Public Access Resource Committee (chair, head of Grad Library Reference)
      OPAC working group (chair Head of Access)
      Usability working group (chair person in DLPS)
      E-Support working group (NRT Alert) (Chair PS person at the Medical library)
      Public Computing Working group (Chair PS person from Architecture & Engineering)
      E-Reserves   (chair PS person from Ugl.)
      Circulation (chairs, PS/Circ supervisors from Greaduate and Taubman medical.
      Blogs (chair Scholarly publishing office)
      Search tools Working group (Chair PS person from Arch.& Engineering)
      SFX working group (chair PS person from Science)
      Local Resources Integration Working group (chair head of Scholarly Publishing)
      Institutional Repository (chair head of special campus project, PS person from Arch & Engin)

2. Metadata, Description and Records Committee (chair, librarian from Mono Cat)
      Search tools Working group (Chair PS person from Arch.& Engineering)
      SFX working group (chair PS person from Science)
      Local Resources Integration Working group (chair head of Scholarly Publishing)
      Institutional Repository (chair head of special campus project, PS person from Arch & Engin)
      Campus Integration (not yet populated)
      Bibliographic Software (not yet populated)

3. Library Technology Committee (chair, librarian from Science)

4. Documentation and Training Working Group (chair, head of Library human resources)

5. Aleph Service Pack Reviewers (no chair, group of staff from functional areas)