

## Assessing the Effectiveness of Team-Based Structures in Libraries

---

By: Rosann Bazirjian and Nancy Markle Stanley

Bazirjian, Rosann and Nancy Markle Stanley. "Assessing the Effectiveness of Team-Based Structures in Libraries." Library Collections, Acquisitions and Technical Services 25(2): 131-157 (2001).

**\*\*\*Note: Appendices A-E missing for this format of the document**

### 1. Introduction

Margaret Wheatley says that to live in a quantum world, we need to "become savvy about how to build relationships." We need to stop describing tasks and instead facilitate process" [1]. She continues to relate her theory to workplace organization. The workplace needs to organize itself into relationships, not hierarchies, tasks or functions. The quality of those relationships gives power to an organization [2]. It is against a backdrop of dynamic theories such as these that Penn State embarked upon the process of developing a team structure for technical services.

### 2. Background

The idea of team-based structures was initiated in the Acquisitions Department during the early 1990s shortly after the adoption of Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI is a version of Total Quality Management) at Penn State. Such a suggestion rose to the surface during re-organizational discussions that came about as a result of frustrations and feelings of lack of communications with the deeply hierarchical organizational structure that prevailed at that time [3]. A department head vacancy also provided an opportunity to focus on the organizational structure. With the appointment of a Steering Committee and resulting Design Team, team structures were pursued in earnest and adopted in July 1994. The trend spread quickly to Cataloging and ILL within the next year and a half. The process of moving to teams was different for each department. Acquisitions began with a brainstorming session involving everyone in the department, which ignited the idea of a team-based structure. Subsequent discussions ensued and a feasibility survey of staff on the issue was conducted by a steering committee composed of library administrators. The steering group appointed a design team, representing Acquisitions and their customers, to re-organize the department into team-based structures. An extensive training package was developed and delivered. Cataloging, on the other hand, eliminated the steering committee and the survey and simply engaged all members of the staff throughout the organization in discussions about moving to teams with minimal training. Acquisitions and Cataloging eventually added "Services" to their departmental names to remind everyone in Technical Services of the need to maintain a customer-oriented focus.

The anticipated advantages of this new structure were first and foremost improved communications and enhanced customer service. It should be noted, however, that there is no firm base line data against which to measure the outcome of team reorganization. Driven by

economics, the University Libraries also hoped to reduce staffing costs through process improvement and employee empowerment. In addition, there was an earnest desire to improve staff morale [4]. Significant process improvements have been achieved by employing “quality” techniques and by the implementation of new technologies. Over time staff has been reduced by approximately 25%, which was achieved primarily through attrition. At the onset, it was understood that human resources policies and guidelines would be challenged, risks would be taken, and mistakes made. With the establishment of teams, employee empowerment was to take the shape of self-directed work teams (SDWT), a new concept for Penn State. A SDWT is “an intact group of employees who are responsible for a whole work process” [5] including handling day-to-day processes, setting their own goals, training fellow team mates in procedures, and providing feedback to team mates on performance, both informally and through the performance appraisal process. Although self-directed teams were developed, there was an informal understanding that “self-directed” was to be a target or goal. Department Heads conduct all formal disciplinary activity. Union issues are not addressed because the departments involved are not unionized.

Department heads have been the designated as the formal team leaders. However, leadership in the form of “Administrator of the Month” (AOM) or “Coordinator of the Month” (COM) was established to provide an opportunity for shared leadership within the team. The function is rotated among only those team members who volunteer for this activity and has been well received and effective. Generally, faculty are not interested in serving in this capacity because of the time involved. In the beginning, rotating every month was seen as a way to avoid anyone establishing “defacto” leadership, which the Design Team had to eliminate. Serving as AOM or COM requires significant time involvement, depending on a team’s range of activities for a given month, and detracts the individual from helping with the processes. Even though most staff members truly enjoy the task, there is often an expression of relief when they are able to pass it along to someone else at the end of the month.

Each team determines the role of their team AOM or COM; therefore, the assignments can vary significantly across teams. The primary function is organizing the team’s meetings (e.g., scheduling, providing agendas, leading, and recording them). Some teams authorize the AOM to respond to incoming e-mail requests for service and to serve as liaison across the department and with customers. The AOM may also coordinate projects for his or her team that occur during the month (e.g., collecting self-evaluations documents to submit to the department head). If a project is not completed within a month, then it simply is passed along to the next AOM or COM. Since this clearly is not a supervisory function but an organizing function, staff could provide this service to everyone on a team including faculty. As a side note, only Cataloging teams include faculty. In addition to being a member of a team, the faculty primarily serve as resource expert to his or her home team.

In some cases, teams have chosen to establish the role of Assistant AOM or COM to lessen the challenging workloads of the AOM. The Assistant AOM often is filled by the few who do not wish to serve in the capacity of AOM or COM because they are not comfortable with tasks such as leading meetings. Typically the assistant may collect and broadcast agendas, respond to e-mail requests from customers and/or perform other similar tasks. The internship or learning period for the AOM or COM is approximately one month. The assumption is that the individual possesses

the software and writing skills required to carry out the duties. Requirements for such skills are included in job advertisements and are needed to carry a number of other assignments in the team.

Informal leadership also can shift naturally based on individual expertise to resolve various problems. Employee empowerment also has been achieved by employing representative groups to decide the appropriate distribution of resources (e.g., equipment, wage, space, etc.). Staff and quality issues were to be managed utilizing quality techniques, such as establishing ground rules for communications and behaviors and standards for assuring speedy processes with quality results (i.e., “doing it right the first time”).

### 3. Survey of literature

At the onset of projects, organizations invest a high level of resources to effect structural changes, assuring that all of the pieces are in place, including needs analyses, research and design, implementation, and training. The shortage of available literature regarding libraries that have assessed the effectiveness of team-based structures suggests that libraries may be either taking very little time to engage in assessing their teams or, if they do, to report on their work in the literature. It is important to assess and understand why someone or something behaves in an unexpected or even expected manner. It is important to answer the “why” that revolves around staff morale, organizational culture, organization structures and learning [6]. “Getting to a team-based organization is a long, protracted and difficult process, but it will provide [the mechanisms] for building an organization that can survive and thrive in the changing world of libraries [7].”

The literature tells us that among the many characteristics of high performing teams are clear mission, vision, goals, action plans and success measures. Members must have clearly defined roles and responsibilities for the team, clearly defined expectations for each other and be able to provide and receive feedback effectively [8]. In addition, there should be a feature for “monitoring individual performance” in providing feedback [9]. Restructuring to teams brings about a major cultural change and requires considerable patience. It often requires many years to achieve a successful restructuring to teams, provide appropriate training, and develop excellent communication skills within and across teams [10].

### 4. Current organizational structure

“When the need changes, so does organizational structure [11].” As a result of a new re-organization beginning January 2000, there are now three technical services departments organized in self-directed work teams, including Acquisitions Services, Cataloging Services and the Serials Department. Each department has a department head, a librarian who is expected to provide leadership, coordinate activities, advocate for resources, and assure excellent customer service. (See [Appendix A](#)) This latest re-organization came about as a result of interviews and task force recommendation conducted by the new Assistant Dean of Technical and Access Services in January 2000. The Serials Department emerged in response to the University Libraries’ escalating focus on electronic and print serials, which challenges all libraries today. In

Acquisitions Services, there are three teams focused on monograph acquisitions addressing firm orders, approval plans, and gift processing for twenty-one Penn State locations. The teams order material in all formats except serials. Cataloging Services is composed of five teams, primarily organized by format, including the monographs, special collections, maps, music and audio-visual, and marking Teams. The new Serials Department brings together the acquiring and cataloging processes into one unit and is composed of three teams.

## 5. Interviews

Between June 1999 and September 1999, the new Assistant Dean for Technical and Access Services met with individual members of the teams. During that period of time, she met with eight technical service faculty, fourteen teams, twelve individual team members, eight public service faculty and two portions of teams. These meetings were basically designed to hear from the team members' perspectives about what was working and what was not. In addition to questions that allowed her to get to know the staff better, i.e., tell me about yourself, past experiences, work background, etc, she wanted to focus on what were considered to be the core questions regarding the team structure. She wanted to know what they liked or disliked about the team structure, what they would change or not change, what were some issues of concern and what they felt should be her primary focus regarding the team structure.

## 6. Issues of concern

The issues raised during these meetings seemed to focus in four broad areas: leadership and performance, morale, personnel and management/organization.

### 6.1. Leadership and performance issues

There are no designated team leaders in the self-directed team environment. The teams have administrators of the month (AOM). Activity is primarily team driven (e.g., setting priorities, etc.). Teams have no formal leadership, supervisory, or authority roles. In this area, individuals commented that there was no firm leadership in place, i.e., there was no acknowledged leader. Individuals indicated that they did not know what they should be doing because no one was setting priorities for them. There was no feeling of global, externally stipulated ordering of priorities. Since no point person within the team was designated responsible for assuring quality, it was not enforceable and was therefore not up to par. There was felt to be a lack of quality, accountability and authority. Individuals commented that the quality of work and performance standards was failing because no one was supervising their work. They claimed that it was hard to enforce performance standards when no one is in charge. Thus, not only was a lack of leadership felt to be problematical, but it was also felt to be adversely affecting performance.

### 6.2. Morale issues

Rather than working together as teammates to provide a pleasant working environment, individuals were complaining that certain team members often acted as "bullies." They

complained that their teammates were looking for errors in one another's work rather than praising each other. Team members were criticized for strong "egos" and aggressive behavior. Teams were criticized for getting into personnel issues; areas in which they feel the teams should not be involved. Finally, because of the team structure, some team members said they felt "balkanized," that there was no longer any departmental cohesiveness. They felt that the teams have broken up the department.

### 6.3. Personnel issues

Team members claimed that they were never taught how to handle human resource issues properly. Some requested that personnel matters be removed from their scope of responsibility.

### 6.4. Management/organizational issues

Issues here focused on the blurring that existed between responsibilities of the department heads versus the teams. They asked for clear-cut guidelines that define department head and team responsibilities. Team members claimed that they needed to know when they could "off load" problems. They wanted clearly defined boundaries. They felt that issues/problems were being thrown back to the teams as "your problem." They asked at what point does someone make a decision? Some team members called for stronger roles for the department heads. They claimed that department heads need to be the ones responsible for performance and personnel issues. The "hands-off" management style had not been working well. Policymaking happens by default and is not well coordinated.

The areas identified as problematic are not unusual. The SDWT is considered to be the most advanced form of empowerment [12]. Personnel and performance issues are the most difficult concepts for self-directed work teams to manage and incorporate into the team structure. Lubans states that the "most problematic and representative encounter" has been with performance appraisal [13]. It is clear, when looking at a team's continuum (See [Appendix B](#)), that these issues are at the furthest end of the "self-directed" team continuum. The upper right hand portion of the line represents the "growth [factors] of a mature work team" [14]. The SDWT can be found at the highest level of authority and assumes that the team has assumed 80% of job responsibility, including a "hefty portion of supervisory, managerial and functional group responsibilities [15]." This means that only the most advanced self-directed teams can effectively incorporate personnel and performance issues into the functions of the team. One could conclude that at Penn State the teams had assumed many personnel tasks shortly after transitioning to teams. This was perhaps too early in the process.

## 7. The process

While assessment of the structure was assumed, no satisfactory methodology has ever been introduced. Customer surveys have been issued almost annually but the return rate has been low. Because the surveys were often issued during the formal staff evaluation period, often those customers with only something very positive to say would respond, giving the operations a false sense of overall success.

Based on the feedback received from the meetings with faculty and staff, we decided to go to Penn State's Human Resources Development Center (HRDC) to see if there were available assessment tools that could be used to determine the effectiveness of our teams. This would be the first time that the teams have been assessed since their inception in 1994 and 1995. It was also known that usually it takes a time span of two to five years to develop fully empowered teams because as "leadership and managerial responsibilities shift to the team, the team becomes more empowered and self-directed [16]." The manager of HRDC worked with us to design a survey instrument that would be effective in identifying the problems. The purpose of the proposed survey was to determine the operational strengths and needs of the teams in Acquisitions and Cataloging Services departments as perceived by faculty, staff and management in both departments. It was decided that HRDC would interview department heads, and survey faculty and staff. In September 1999, a draft survey was produced and shared with the department heads, assistant dean, associate dean and dean of the libraries for input. Based on the dean's input, an additional survey instrument was developed to assess team effectiveness as viewed by our customers, i.e., our colleagues in public services. It was felt that we needed to add a customer service dimension to the assessment. As a result two similar but separate surveys were developed, one for technical services and the other for public services.

The rationale for conducting this study is to assess the value of teams and the status of their development both from within and from a customer perspective. The purpose of the survey is to collect measurable data to help the organization change by knowing its strengths and capitalizing on them, designing or redesigning their processes, and, in general, providing opportunities for positive change and growth [17].

The technical services survey was developed (See [Appendix C](#)) and designed to obtain a more detailed and clearer understanding of the following issues:

- What is working well? What benefits have occurred as a result of the team environment?
- How is the level of functioning for performance being handled? What strategies exist for improvement in the following areas?
  - Setting performance standards
  - Prioritizing work
  - Handling shortcomings in individual performance
  - Assuring accountability and authority for decision-making
  - Assigning team responsibilities
  - Assuring appropriate resources available to the teams for support
  - Assuring good working relationships within teams

- Eliminating competition among individuals in the teams

In the hope of getting a high rate of returned responses, a much shorter set of questions was developed for the public service survey. These questions focused on productive working relationships, quality of service, effectiveness in meeting customer needs, goal setting, etc (See [Appendix D](#)). The Assistant Dean selected a representative group of twenty public service staff and faculty members from the main campus as well as other campus locations to receive the survey.

Employees need to be told about why testing and assessment are occurring, how the testing fits in with their work responsibilities and environment, and how the data that is collected will be used in the workplace [18]. To this end, in November 1999, a kick-off meeting was held to introduce the survey. At that meeting, the entire technical services division met with the manager of HRDC, the assistant dean and the department heads. The survey was distributed to everyone in attendance and the procedure was described. Expected results and follow through plans were presented, providing a good opportunity for everyone to ask questions. The teams' continuum was also described in great detail as background to the discussion. Staff was given two weeks to respond to the survey.

## 8. Summary of survey results

Based on normal survey response rates, the survey reaped a relatively good response. 66% of Acquisitions Services, 76% of Cataloging Services and 55% of Public Services responded to the survey instrument. The survey results were surprising in one way, and predictable in another way. We saw an unusually high number of narrative responses, indicating that respondents felt very strongly about the issues. In addition, the comments came from a high percentage of staff, not just a vocal few. Predictably, high priority improvement initiatives were identified as finding ways to handle poor performance and implement disciplinary action, and implementing a rewards and recognition program for individual and team accomplishments. Most employees indicated a preference for the self-directed team structure. This was not an expected response based on all that the Assistant Dean had been hearing. They also indicated that teams should be responsible for monitoring the completion of work and its quality (66.7% Acquisitions, 58.3% cataloging); for training team mates (44.4% Acquisitions, 58.3% Cataloging); for determining the priority of tasks to be completed by team members (57.9% Acquisitions, 68% Cataloging); for decision making related to tasks (68.8% Acquisitions, 75% Cataloging); for defining performance standards and expectations for work that is being completed (47.4% Acquisitions, 65.2% Cataloging); and for delegating responsibility to team members for completing a task and solving a problem (58.8% Acquisitions, 70.8% Cataloging). The survey responses indicated that the teams in both departments felt that it is the responsibility of the department head to handle poor performance and disciplinary issues (63.2% Acquisitions, 70.8% Cataloging).

There were some areas where there were noted discrepancies between team and faculty responses regarding who should be responsible for a particular function/action. For example, in Acquisitions Services, the department head indicated that teams should be responsible for handling poor performance and disciplinary actions, however, only 5.3% of the team members felt that it should be their responsibility. In Cataloging Services, there was no discrepancy in this

area. Both the department head and team members felt that this should be the responsibility of the department head. Another discrepancy occurred regarding the responses to the question on increasing collaboration/coordination and decreasing competition among teams. In Acquisitions Services, both the department head and teams agreed that this should be the responsibility of the department head. However, in Cataloging Services, the department head indicated that this should be the department head's responsibility, whereas team members felt that this should be a shared responsibility. Regarding rewards and recognition for individual accomplishments, it was noted that, while there are clear needs to address this area; there was no consensus as to who should have primary responsibility. Another surprise in the responses was found in the area of annual performance assessment. In Cataloging Services, for example, the percentage of faculty and staff who favor reviewing the performance of each person and each team is the same as the percent of people who favor reviewing only the performance of the team.

Public Service perceptions of the quality of work in technical services were much lower than technical service staff and faculty with scores coming in just above and below the mean. This is a grave concern. Although there was a 55% response rate from public services only 11, of the 20 key people selected for the survey, provided feedback. While it is understood that some of the responses reflect the collective response of certain groups, these number are small relative to the overall size of the technical services' customer base at Penn State. Clarifications of customer issues will be pursued with a brainstorming session and perhaps another survey that seeks a broader base for comment. The narrative responses often note that Acquisitions and Cataloging Services departments have been located remotely from the main library for two to three years while major renovations are underway, which has negatively affected communications with public services. Hopefully, the move to the new and renovated facilities within the main library building, anticipate in late Summer 2000, will satisfy some but certainly not all of the concerns.

## 9. Action items

Department Heads and the Assistant Dean met to develop some action items to respond to what was revealed from the teams assessment survey.

### 9.1. Determine what can be done to improve service for our public service customers

One suggestion called for improved communication on the part of technical services. There was a belief that, in general, public service personnel do not know what is happening in technical services and that those units need to tell their stories, i.e., "toot their own horn." Another suggestion was to meet with Public Service areas to help identify specific ways to improve service (e.g., use a 3<sup>rd</sup> party to collect data, or emphasize that data will be used to prioritize improvements and not to evaluate performance, etc.). Finally, informal strategies are being considered for gathering customer feedback (frequent interactions). A follow-up survey also will be considered once technical services has returned to the main library and has been reintegrated.

## 9.2. There is a tendency for managers to rate efficiency of their departments higher than staff

This is a predictable pattern also witnessed by the survey results. Managers feel ownership (“I own it”) and a sense of well being (“I feel good about it,” “I am optimistic about it”). However, this could also be an indication that there is not enough communication between department heads and staff. Department heads need to get closer in touch with the staff since they are not seeing things in the same way. They need to experience what the staff is seeing. One suggestion was to make the department head more visible and to communicate more with the staff. It was felt that management, by walking around and getting “out there” everyday to ask the teams how things are going, would be useful. Also, an anonymous suggestion box was recommended. Department heads also need to seek clear and open feedback from customers.

## 9.3. Need to take actions to reduce levels of stress

Stress levels are likely to be high due to the amount of major changes occurring within the libraries (e.g., building renovations, systems evaluation and implementation, reorganization, etc.) and also because of an inadequate training and adjustment to the team structures. It was recommended that both department heads and teams be sent to various HRDC workshops, such as those on “Time Management and Organizational Skills,” “Humor in the Workplace,” “Leading Change,” and “Going with the Flow of Change.” Team members could be reminded of the benefits of exercise, cutting down on caffeine, insuring a balance between home and work, and practicing affective support (i.e., caring about each other—especially as our lives become more hectic). Supervisors need to model a sense of confidence, e.g., “we will be able to handle this” or “we have thought about it and are certain we will have a good strategy in place for dealing with it.” It is important to take opportunities to build in positive emotion *strategies*, e.g., humor and taking time to celebrate.

## 10. Utilizing the management system for performance

The University never supported Deming’s notion that the performance appraisal systems should be abolished because staff reviews are inextricably linked to other human resource processes. Instead the Libraries’ human resource manager has worked toward modifying the annual review process to meet team needs. [19]. To address performance related issues, managers worked with HRDC to develop a tool called the “Management System for Performance” (See [Appendix E](#)), which was designed to supplement and enhance the annual process. This tool will address performance and performance issues, rewards and recognition and the annual review process by interweaving the entire process and making it as seamless as possible. The tool will help to identify areas of poor performance and performance standards. It delineates a clear understanding of the levels of responsibility between team members and department heads when performance exceeds or falls short of expectations. It also seamlessly incorporates annual assessment into the entire process. It is hoped that the tool will enable us to provide a structure against which various activities can take place. The teams will learn to work through all sections of the tool with facilitated sessions conducted by HRDC. These sessions will also refocus participants on team building skills, conflict resolution as well as personal interaction.

The tool is divided into three sections. The first part is labeled “start-up activities.” This part of the tool is designed to ask the teams to list specific methods of rewarding and recognizing positive performance of individual team members. The teams are asked to make sure that whatever is listed can be done and is meaningful. This segment also asks team members to list behaviors/tasks where performance may not have met expectations for one or more team members. Finally, team members are asked to list specific standards for each area of performance that has fallen short. Performance measures include task-related skills, interpersonal skills (e.g., behavioral issues) and schedule and leave time management. It is also important in this start-up section to identify performance dimensions, which should be encouraged, such as customer service, creativity, office professionalism and exemplary working relationships. Teams will complete these sections, and then meet with their respective department heads for discussion until consensus is met. It is anticipated that the start up activities will be completed during a three-month period.

The second part of the performance tool is labeled “daily activities.” It is broken up into two parts: occasions where performance exceeds the standards defined in the start up activities, and occasions when performance has fallen short. The following sequences were defined for exceeding performance standards:

Individual team member observes instance of teammate’s positive performance that exceeds standards or significantly contributes to team and/or departmental goals. The team member who observes this positive performance gives verbal recognition to team member on a one-to-one context. The team member records the instance in writing for discussion with the team. If appropriate, the team member also gives verbal recognition to teammate in the context of a group meeting, and sends a note to the department head describing the exemplary performance. The team may also record the instance of positive performance for input into the annual staff review. The *team also can* reinforce positive performance by offering a specific method of reward and recognition, as defined in the start up activities. The department head may also observe and respond to a team/team member’s positive performance. If appropriate, the department head notifies the assistant dean of exemplary performance on the part of the team or team member.

The second section of daily activities outlines procedures when performance has fallen short of expectations. When an individual team member observes an instance of a teammate’s negative performance, he or she provides verbal feedback in a one-to-one context. If appropriate, this discussion moves to a group meeting. The team would then address relevant issues to deter recurrence of the negative performance. Team actions may include coaching, mentoring, collaborative problem solving, process improvement, and limit setting, etc. It is readily understood that the teams will need reinforced training in these areas, and HRDC will customize training sessions for the teams. We must equip the teams with necessary skills in “coaching, confrontation and counseling” [20] to assure that problem behavior can be addressed in a prompt, cordial and efficient manner. The team member, who noticed the negative performance, may verbally inform the department head. If appropriate, the department head can then discuss negative performance with the team member/team, and determine whether or not the occasion needs to be documented. Upon completion of these two parts of the performance plan, a clearly documented rewards and recognition plan will be outlined, as well as performance standards.

The third part of the “Management System for Performance” tool addresses the annual performance review process. While a few organizations dispensed with performance reviews and ratings for team-based organizations, most institutions depend on the review for determining merit pay and this is the case at Penn State. Although in most organizations teams do not assume a major role in appraising team and individual performance, many are now establishing a system for collecting peer comments from team members for the annual performance evaluation process [21]. Each team member completes their annual feedback review for all other teammates and sends their completed forms to the department head. They are asked to integrate the notes that they have made throughout the year about performance observations into the forms.

Each team member also completes his or her own self-evaluation with goals for the year. Development plans (goals) are written for each team member and discussed and reviewed as a team. Teammates offer suggestions for revision until consensus is achieved. The department head compiles all the input into a supervisory review document and assigns an overall rating for individual performance based on the available information. The department head also meets with each person to discuss the compiled feedback and to review the individual’s developmental goals for the coming year. It is felt that each team member not only needs to understand and support the team’s objectives, but also must define his/her own goals in support of the team’s processes. Each team sends their development plan to the department head, which then communicates with the individual/or team and provides feedback with the individual and/or team until consensus is reached. Based on the documentation, the department head submits the documents to the Library Administration and Library Human Resources who then checks for consistency. Once ratings are agreed upon, individuals are notified of their rating and invited to discuss them with the supervisor. Ratings are not negotiable but individuals obviously need to fully understand the rating based on the documentation.

Finally, to ensure implementation of the development plan, the team reviews each team member’s progress every three months. Throughout the year, revisions to the plan can be made as needed. Support for completing the plan is offered by the team and department head as appropriate. The team should inform the department head if progress on an individual or team’s development plans is not meeting expectations. This provides an opportunity for corrective actions. Obviously there are valid explanations as to why a plan cannot be met. The department head is expected to discuss progress on the plan for those individuals whose progress is not meeting expectations

## 11. Final comments

While technical services certainly demonstrates some levels of creativity to assigned tasks, it is primarily a process operation. Self-directed teams often work best in areas where supervision only gets in the way and where creativity rather than process and procedure are the norm. Such an environment is not characteristic of most library technical services operations. The fact that those items noted at the furthest end of the continuum were the same items identified in the survey as needing to be changed, only reiterates the idea that teams which are organized to do process oriented work are unlikely to be fully self-directed.

It was clear from this team assessment process that most technical services staff members want to remain in the team setting. The performance management tool provides for a coordinated way of maintaining the team structure while clearly defining the role of the department head versus the team. All three sections work with each other to provide a seamless tool for interweaving performance, rewards and recognition and the annual review. Completion of the Management System for Performance will require approximately one year. It is hoped that the facilitated process of working through the tool will re-build the team qualities that have been lacking, and provide the teams with a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities. Team work requires “a set of values that encourage listening and responding constructively to views expressed by others, giving others the benefit of the doubt, providing support and recognizing the interests and achievements of others [22].” This year we will work toward re-building those skills and concepts within a clearly defined boundary.

## References

1. Wheatley Margaret J. *Leadership, and the New Science; Learning About Organization from an Orderly Process*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc., 1992:38.
2. Ibid., p. 39.
3. N.M. Stanley and L. Branche-Brown, Reorganizing Acquisitions at the Pennsylvania State University Libraries: From Work Units to Teams. *Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory* **19** 4 (1995), p. 419.
4. Ibid., p. 422.
5. Wellins Richard S, et al. *Empowered Teams: Creating Self-Directed Work Groups that Improve Quality Productivity and Participation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1991:3.
6. Julie Todaro, The Beast Within. *Library Administration and Management* **13** 4 (1999), p. 192.
7. Irene Owens, The Impact of Change from Hierarchy to Teams. *College and Research Libraries* **60** 6 (1999), p. 579.
8. Blinn, Carla K. Developing High Performance Teams. Online. 1996:56.
9. Jaramillo George R. Utilization of Teams in an Academic Library Environment. *Colorado Libraries* 1996:19.
10. Joseph R. Diaz and Pintozzi Chestalene, Helping Teams Work: Lesson Learned from the University of Arizona Library Reorganization. *Library Administration and Management* **13** 1 (1999), p. 31.
11. Op Cit, Wheatley, p. 91.
12. Op Cit, Owens, p. 573.
13. Lubans John. I Ain't No Cowboy, I Just Found This Hat; Confessions of an Administrator in an Organization of Self-Managing Teams. *Library Administration, and Management* 1996;10(1):32.
14. Op Cit, Wellins, p. 27.
15. Ibid., p. 27.
16. Ibid., p. 31.
17. Op Cit, Todaro, p., 193.
18. Ibid., p. 193.
19. Zigon Jack. Making Performance Appraisal Work for Teams. *Training* 1994:60.
20. Op Cit, Lubans, p. 32.
21. Op Cit, Wellins, p. 55.
22. Op Cit, Owens, p. 573.

**\*\*\*Note: Appendices A-E missing for this format of the document**