"Who's Gonna Take out the Garbage When I'm Dead and Gone?":

New Roles for Leaders

by *John Lubans, Jr.*

My recent article (see abstract in footnote) on the meaning of leadership in teams prompted an unusual amount of interest and comment by readers in different types of libraries.[1] Several concurred with my thoughts about the uncertainty and imprecision of working as managers with "empowered" staffs. The response confirmed for me that the dilemma of leading so-called empowered staffs is just as widely prevalent in traditional organizations as it may be in one of "self-managing" teams — the organizational model I described in the article. It seems we are all on the same journey in this era of uncertain transition in the library workplace and a subsequent greater reliance on staff. Many of us have moments of self-doubt in leading staff along an unpredictable path; perhaps this is what it feels like to "lead by following."

If the academic library ever was something monastic — away from the bothers of everyday life — it no longer can be. Because we are insulated from change by the academy, we were, and perhaps some of us still are, more impervious to change than other institutions. But the academy, too, is under stress, with change being called for at an unprecedented rate by many stakeholders, including parents, legislators, governors, and foundations. Most of us have no choice but to change. Like sledge hammers, societal and economic realities and the demands inspired by

technological opportunities are pounding on our hallowed doors. A survey report, "To Dance with Change" from the Pew Charitable Trusts, concludes that change in higher education *must* be engaged. If we demur to "dance," we "let someone else choose (our) partner as well as call the tune."

And, likewise, Massy and Zemsky conclude, "the potential for increased learning productivity through technology is too great for higher education to ignore. If colleges and universities fail to adapt effectively, other kinds of institutions will take up the challenge."[2]

Often in discussions about what we should be doing during what some claim to be the end of the paper era and the dawn of the electronic, we appear to be in a state of *denial*. We speak of transition, while clinging to our personal bit of reality, the way it is/was, and make little progress toward the new era. *"No one wants to read a book on a screen!"* is the imprecation we hurl into the gale storm winds of the future. Yet, what does the trend of declining reference questions mean? What implications are there for us in the factoid that electronic mail messages exceeded postal mail messages by 10 billion in 1995? When our users prefer the World Wide Web to browsing the stacks, regardless of the Web's inefficiencies, what does that portend?

We think that we are at the top of what can be described by an S-shaped curve, yet we are uncertain about when and how to leap onto the next ascend-

ing curve.[3] Recently, we have tempered the clash between the traditional and the modern with calls for balance, a moving toward the center, a DMZ in which to avoid the conflict. Is this a realistic compromise, or is it a political one, more evidence of just how difficult this change is going to be?

At Duke University Library, we have sought to achieve an organizational resiliency to anticipate and meet the changing needs of our users and to seize upon the many information opportunities coming on line. We are doing so through a team-based organizational structure, relying on Total Quality Management (TQM) or, as we call it, Continuous Improvement (CI), concepts to help us make the most of our resources. Our approach is not unique, but what sets our experience apart from other organizational restructuring is that we chose to assure greater team empowerment by cutting direct reporting relationships to the Executive Group. We did this to achieve a more nimble organization than we thought possible if we kept the old reporting relationships in place. Over a span of two years, we attempted to answer the question, "What do managers do when the traditional supervisory strings are cut?" I noted in the paper that:

> It was as if we had removed the communications wiring connecting the departments to the administration and made that communication, somehow,

wireless. The complication was that we had yet to invent the technology to do this; however we were confident in our ability to do so. The home teams and quality circles, in spite of their shiny new names, remained, to a large extent, *hard wired* within their working groups.[4]

This unprecedented role for the Executive Group was problematic for more than a few staff, supporters and detractors alike, and raised many questions about the purpose and utility of the upper administration in a team structure.

One letter among those that I received after the article came out resonated for me. It came from a former boss, Ellsworth Mason. He observed that:

> You obviously in the rethinking (good for anything) defined some inefficiencies that were remedied. You give credit for this to the new system (self managing teams). Does it actually deserve this?... If this system works, you can easily be replaced by someone with half the skills, experience, and knowledge you have, after they have had specialized training in a few fields.

His question about who should get the credit held special meaning for me. It crystallized that amorphous feeling in the back of my mind while I wrote the paper — about *my* (and by extrapolation, any leader's) role in achieving the harvest of improvements that moved us ahead of many of our peers in the speed, volume, and capacity with which we process materials for everyone's benefit.

I think that Ellsworth Mason was pointing out the role that individual leaders can play in accomplishing organizational objectives. Perhaps, I was discounting too much the influence of strong individual leadership. In reflection, I can argue with an increased confidence that the individual does make a major difference in whether a team or department accomplishes what it is trying to do. Individual leadership is the

Individual leadership is the "make or break" aspect for bringing about change.

"make or break" aspect for bringing about change. Even when redistributing power in order to achieve some organizational goal, it is the leader's conscious decision, hardly free of risk, to empower *selective* staff by surrendering power, to trust in them. So, while many of the elements of a system of management, be it TQM or MBO or Reengineering, can be useful in improving and keeping an organization moving, "on-site" leadership probably has more to do with achieving momentum than any one "system" of management.[5] In other words, these systems are effective tools in the hands of good leaders. The tools themselves do not make anything happen, which, when you think about it, explains why installations of any management system, without wholehearted executive support, always fail.

My view on the importance of leadership has come full circle, or so it seems. Some years ago, I gave a talk about creativity and the uncertain value of a leader taking the initiative when the organization was literally stuck in tradition. The example I used was about a leader's dramatic display to an entrenched administrative staff that a new process was vastly superior to the old way. At the time, I thought this was problematic because we were seeing a demonstration of the *leader's* creativity and daring, not the group's. I thought then that such a demonstration could lead to a dependency on the leader for creative solutions. Now, I think that this type of action may inspire one or two of the "entrenched" to dare to do something, to be less afraid to venture. The leader's *taking action* and carrying out her conviction can make the difference in an organization's moving forward. So, what might be regarded as grandstanding is actually leadership at the highest level: Teaching and Encouraging by example.

Peter Clayton, writing about innovation in libraries, identifies the importance of leadership in the successful introduction and acceptance of innovation. To that he adds a new dimension — the personal qualities and contributions of *individuals* appear to be a crucial component (to the successful adoption of a new process). In his research studies, champions of the innovation were not necessarily "leaders."[6] For me, this strengthens the point about the power of individuals in championing change. It demonstrates the quintessential role of leaders providing

support for *non-leaders* as change agents.

As implied above, when we made the major organizational shifts at Duke, we did not experience an immediate flowering of empowered teams working in partnership with the upper administration. Largely, what occurred during the first year was a consolidation and continuation of traditional approaches. A few team leaders took the new distribution of power and kept it within their bailiwicks, ignoring to a considerable extent the opportunity to work with the administration in its new coaching capacity. This response to our sincere efforts at empowerment was unexpected and led us to wonder about the consultant's reassurances that one's power would grow by giving it away! At times, we felt like the hapless scientists attempting to replicate the 1989 "cold fusion" phenomenon.

At the same time, several team leaders did embrace team concepts, working assiduously at applying them in their teams. Interestingly enough, they were the first to express that they felt adrift and that they were separated from the University Librarian by the void that had previously been filled by the administrative group. For them, the communication links were noticeably disrupted. Those team leaders who could take the larger organizational view felt themselves short circuited but worked closely with the new structure as best they could. Deeper in the organization, several leaders of support staff teams have assumed a strong coaching and mentoring approach with their teams; it is among the self-managed support staff teams that some of the most productive benefits of team work are found.

While much progress has been made by over two-thirds of the teams in empowering staff, there remains some unwillingness to look at "process." This lacuna occurs at the expense of improving the quality of our product, since truly effective teams do not come about by accident — the best ones address the *how* of working together just as earnestly as they work through the procedures and responsibilities of their work.

I explained in the paper that my job description was evolving into four major categories: **coaching, consulting, encouraging,** and **leading.** This was in contrast to the management norms of the past, going back at least sixty years. PODSCORB, or planning, organizing, directing, staffing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting, is what managers do.[7] It is not that we have stopped doing these traditional

activities, but it is that the system in which we work is no longer the same; the traditional approaches are less dominant.

Illustration 1 displays the most recent iteration of my personally derived *taxonomy* of what leaders at all levels are learning to do.

Illustration 1

Changing Roles

Leading:
  Eliminating barriers.
  Catalyzing. (Stimulating the consideration of alternatives)
  Recommending (and persisting in) fundamental changes to systems.
  Walking about (being visible) and **listening** to what staff and **customers** have to say, **understanding** what they regard as important.
  Translating the leader's vision of the future into objectives that move us forward

Coaching:
  Helping others to focus and to improve their performance, especially in making databased decisions.
  Encouraging.
  Challenging teams to question assumptions and goals.
  Bringing teams to an awareness that they have what it takes.

Consulting:
  Investigating new ways of doing things and **bringing** this information to teams.
  Intervening with troubled teams.
  Managing the "hand offs" between teams that are prone to fumbles.

I have spotlighted activities, under each of the major categories below, to illustrate and clarify the category and to emphasize what is especially crucial to help libraries engage, in positive ways, the numerous opportunities for change:

Leading

Peter Senge suggests that leaders freed up to spend more time on higher level leadership roles should be focusing on several systemic problems.[8] I have provided some library examples under Senge's rubrics:

Shifting the burden

An example, is using book dollars to pay for staff during a budget cut. In some instances, this could symbolize a losing sight of the purposes of the library and spending its capital without taking a hard look at other expenditure areas. Instead of looking at long-range implications, the choice is made to mortgage the future. I have seen that without "leadership," particularly a vision-inspired leadership, groups assigned budgetary responsibility will not be able to free up as much as a one-percent sliver to shift dollars into new initiatives. It is not a question of freedom or permission to do this; it is the lack of decisive and persuasive leadership to counter the incrementalism, the sacred cows, and the turf issues that are present at any budget discussion.

Another less explicit example is the practice (in large libraries) of central human resources staff solving personnel problems instead of local managers dealing with them and learning in the process. Unintentionally, this practice can remove from team leaders a major challenge well worth keeping — dealing with problem team members in productive ways and, in doing so, modeling for team members how to do it.

Growth and underinvestment

An example in this category is the stopping of a user education program because it is not well regarded by staff and many of the students. Given this response, the rationale is that this form of marketing our products is no longer needed. This is a shortsighted approach, particularly if it does not look at root causes of why students and faculty do not relish a library skills class. Maybe their disinclination is caused by the way we teach. The decision to stop a program can lead to two side issues, an aggravation of misuse and too little understanding of how to find and use information critically. We also may be failing to reap, at considerable institutional cost, the benefits of enabling users with an improved level of competency and independence.

Eroding goals

An example of an eroding goal is losing sight of any of the very basic functions in a library, such as getting books on the shelves and keeping those shelves in order. It is hard to imagine anything more basic than that, yet slow shelving times and out-of-order shelves are easily forgotten as core issues. What may have been a "drop everything" mandate for all staff has been relegated as a problem for solution to the one group charged with stacks maintenance, the Circulation Department. The reasoning goes that since "shelf failure" is institutionalized, viz. people have always had difficulty finding books, it is the sole responsibility of the one department. This failure of community diminishes our effectiveness, real and perceived, to our clientele.

Coaching

Leaders may find their perspective out of alignment with that of the staff they are encouraging to accept an innovation. Experientially, I think of being on a rock slope and looking *down* that slope across a crevasse recently traversed. From where I sit, the crevasse now looks like a small crack in the ground, at most a few feet across, easily crossed over in a single leap. I tend to forget the fear and anxiety that stopped me in my tracks an hour or so ago on the other side. I forget what it took me to conquer my inner fears. The staff member's perspective, *looking up the slope*, across the crevasse, is now markedly different from mine: the gap is jagged, dark, deep and wide. How do I get her to make that leap, to engage the called-for change?

How *does* a coach bring teams to an awareness that they do, indeed, have what it takes?[9] The experiential model of learning, applied above, can be useful to explain team work issues in a language that still has some freshness to it. Picture three rope circles, literally coiled concentrically on the ground. The inner one represents my *comfort zone*. This is what I am used to doing, how I perceive the world, how I look at others, what I am comfortable doing. It is full of what I know and what I value. The next circle, a slightly larger one, is the *stretch zone*, where I can experience new ideas, new thoughts, new people, new structures and, new ways of looking at and doing things. This zone includes possible shifts in how I regard the world, if I am willing to stretch. It can be something silly, like peeling and eating a banana with no hands, or adventurous, like the head of a department saying "I don't know" to a team expecting the leader to know all. Or it can be something challenging, like reading a compass and chart as a first-time navigator sailing at night.

The rope circle at the outer edge represents unexpected change, major

enough to induce panic, a wrenching away from my traditional norms and expectations, demanding a sink or swim adaptation to the conditions. Like a thunder storm on a sunny day that catches me on a ridge, exposed to the lightning crackling all about. While I might be challenged to find a survival strategy, my terror might also overwhelm me to the point of panic. In the workplace, an example would be being asked to take on a new job, one with high risks and some potential for failure.

Consulting

In *Fourth Generation Management*, Brian Joiner writes of an especially relevant quality of leadership, the questioning of assumptions and traditions:

> I can take any five problems
> from anywhere in a company
> and if I push deeper and deeper,
> I find that they all stem from
> the same core issues.
> ... Our work as managers is to
> become detectives, pursuing
> data to search for clues that lead
> us to such flaws. Solutions are
> often simple and obvious once
> a flaw is isolated.[10]

This is linked to finding ways to simplify what we do. Complexity is findable in the smallest function. It is of course present in most systems, and complexity will, without fail, have a ripple effect on the overall system. When someone delays for up to six months the processing of book orders because of elaborate checking mechanisms, that has implications throughout the library system, including a large negative impact on the turnaround time in getting materials to the shelves and the users. Or if revision of some process finds 99.7 % compliance with standards (i.e., less than half of a percentage point error rate) and it takes one and a half days to do this, we need to know that this is time added to the process *and* to the time it takes us to get these items to users. We may quarrel with the impossibility/desirability of achieving Zero Defects, but at least we should be knowledgeable about what it may cost. Robert Henri, writing about the art of applying oil to canvas, suggests that, "The easiest thing is the hardest. It is harder to be simple than it is to be complex."[11] Anyone who has sought to look through the convoluted flowcharts that most of us can produce for library processes has some apprecia-

tion of his paradoxical view.

At Duke, one of the primary approaches to our achieving large productivity gains was questioning traditional policies that were driving our work.[12] Probably of most importance to our streamlining efforts was the reduction of the well-intended but rococo like complexity designed into our work.

Internal Customers

Especially with empowered teams, leaders have a role of managing inside the interstices, in the "no man's land" where teams overlap, like the overlapping circles of a Venn diagram. Team A can believe itself to be outstanding but regards Team B, its internal customer, as not working at an acceptable level. The consulting role enters in because, in my experience, the two teams rarely talk about how they regard each other and what difficulties (rework and fumbled "handoffs") there are in the interstices. Occasionally, this approaches an arrogance that can be debilitating to the organization because blame for problems is placed on other teams and their members rather than the actual root causes. These root causes often exist in the *complaining* team.

In this situation, Team A "hands off" work to Team B and believes that the work was done exceedingly well. In truth, Team B may be finding Team A's work incomplete, irregular, and, at times, overly demanding, creating bottlenecks in Team B. Without two-way communication about what the causes are for this failure, Team A may wind up castigating team B for its "dropping the ball," its poor work flow, lack of understanding, and insensitivity to the needs of Team A!

Tension builds since Team A's criticism of Team B is promptly fed back to it via the organizational grapevine. Of course, Team B may remain silent (avoiding conflict) or it may send out counter charges, along the grapevine, about how Team A is actually the source of the problem, etc. At the macro level, this can be found in the institutionalized but tacit tension between public and technical services staff in many libraries.

It was situations like this, and many of a less combustible variety, that led us to develop the **Internal Customer Feedback** form (see Appendix) for feedback and problem catching and resolution between teams. It works well when used collaboratively by mature teams to improve overall work flows for the organization. The process asks that each

---

Coaching, metaphorically

(Excerpted, with permission, from an expeditioner's diary)

I am near the top of the cliff face, secure as one can be on a narrow supporting ledge of rock 80 feet above the quarry's floor, littered with broken blocks of granite. I rest against my safety rope and wonder. The coach's voice hails me from above. "See the rope? Grab it and I'll pull you up!"

To the right, several feet away and up, there is a sturdy looking rope with a knot tied in the end.

"You'll have to jump to catch it" advises the voice.

Jump?

"To the side. You can do it."

What and leave the safety of this ledge?

"Sure, I think you're ready to stretch yourself Try it"

What if I miss?

My first shaky try fails and I swing against the granite, cursing, scrambling back to the safety of my ledge. I count my bruises and compose myself£

I hear the encouraging shouts of my team mates.

The voice again, from above. "Nice try. Think about where you want to go and how to get there. Use your resources. Now, tell me a joke."

I don't want to tell anyone a joke.

"OK, take your time." He hauls up the rope.

It gets quiet, the beauty of the day sinks into me.

Gee, there's got to be a joke I can tell. Oh, yeah, the one about the armadillos.

My tearn mates hoot and holler.

My coach lowers the rope.

I think about what it will take to make this leap.

I tell myself: "Up and to the side, and close to the cliff."

With a prayer, I launch myself and soar like an eagle across the miles between me and that rope.

---

team understand that processes can be improved and do require regular attention. By both teams focusing on the process, personality conflicts can be avoided and major redundancies eliminated, work flow smoothed, and improved turnaround times gained.

Non-intuitive learning for new leaders

One of the staples of any successful change effort is recognition by all of the need for staff development and educational opportunities. Expecting a staff to shift, intuitively, from a historic model to another, without providing the training and time for staff to understand the what and how of the new, is courting certain failure.

Because we had introduced new responsibilities for team leaders, we knew that it was incumbent upon us to provide developmental feedback to the team leaders, along with identifying additional leader-training needs. We asked staff several questions about how the team leaders were doing (using a neutral scale for scoring) and to show what *staff* needs were in that team for training as team members.

Our Home Team Leader Assessment was based on the stated expectations for both team members and leaders, with clusters of questions covering the team members' perception about their leader's:

1. **job competence**
2. application of **continuous improvement concepts** (using new models, factual approaches, customer inputs, etc.)
3. **coaching abilities**
4. **leadership**
5. **empowerment of team members**
6. **customer service**

For the most part, the staff demonstrated positive support for their team leaders, but also revealed some unfamiliarity with the terms used in the questionnaire. This underlined, once again, our need to provide more training so that everyone would understand the new organizational model beyond the superficial. Once understood, the knowledgeable applications can result in superior team performance. This success then puts positive pressure on the team to keep the process going — the ante is raised for both the leader and the members. Still, the feedback for most of our team leaders was quite accurate in pointing out genuine areas for improvement. To date, we have resisted successfully the misplaced urging by some staff

to rank home team leaders according to their scores and/or assign "mentors" to those receiving "low" scores!

Conclusion

While writing this article, I have realized that when we work in a team-based structure, it is not expected or appropriate for leaders to resign themselves or to be relegated to an organizationally subordinate position. When the power is shifted, one can expect some rushing in to fill the *perceived* power vacuum. Since you no longer appear to have "it," there are people who will seek to reduce your involvement even further. This can occur when staff misunderstand what your role was in the first place and have neither the inclination or experience to move beyond this misinformed perspective. This is because there really is no distinct management culture in the library field, except for that of the hierarchical model. For the most part, our understanding of management is grounded in the PODSCORB model, as influenced by our mentor relationships — some that can be exciting in their vision of library service and some, frankly, stultifying in what they suggest libraries and library leaders are about.

Leaders have the opportunity (and one could say the responsibility) to drive desired organizational breakthroughs. The tough questions, the hard (and career jeopardizing) choices made, the arguments put forth that shift the status quo — all take courage and integrity. This is leadership, in the finest sense. Without the vision or knowing or wanting something different on the part of leaders, little will be accomplished. One of Duke library's major leadership actions was genuinely empowering very good people for solving problems that we as leaders knew had to be solved. The decision to turn them loose was considered over a several month period; it was not done haphazardly. Our choice was based on the model that we believed would give optimal value to the organization. We knew from the start that most would react in positive ways; those that we expected would not, we thought could be brought along. Besides, their *loyal* opposition would be helpful in refining the design of the new organization.

We decided in November 1995 to reinstate the formal reporting relationships. These relationships of course have changed palpably and ineffably in substance and style during the two-year hiatus. The reinstatement feels like a change for the better, but we recognize that

what we have is essentially a *new* relationship. That it is *new* is a measure of how extensive the organizational change has been. We reinstated this measure of accountability for several reasons. Among them was the inauguration of a new university administration, one with its own perspective on management and leadership. And it mattered to us that there were few others on campus working with TQM strategies or self-managing teams. The university's incipient individual performance appraisal process, requiring supervisory "sign offs," also played a role in our decision to make staff accountable. But more important was the "expressed desire of a number of team leaders to reestablish these relationships in order to provide better accountability, communication, and support. Thus, this action is meant to strengthen the leadership, coaching, encouraging, and consulting roles of the (upper administration) throughout the organization."[13]

Our interpretation of the term *empowerment* is becoming more explicit. We did this to clarify some of the confusion about this word, which has had the unfortunate fate, like any overused word or phrase, of being rendered, in effect, meaningless. To help understand what is meant by empowerment, envision a pendulum's arc with degrees inscribed all along it. For a few, empowerment means a revolutionary release from accountability — everyone is his or her own boss. In an organization of over 200 people, anarchy is probably the best description of the result of this interpretation.

At the other extreme is a rigidly controlled environment by the few in which most staff have little leeway to deviate from orders or written procedures or from consulting the boss or "expert" for permission to act. In organizations composed of intelligent, motivated staff, restricting decisions to the few would be a misuse of a quintessential resource — the staff's experience, skills, and ability. Too-tight control has also been shown in research studies to be counterproductive and discouraging of any improvements over the status quo.

The Perkins Library version of empowerment can be found somewhere along the middle of the arc, well between the extreme interpretations. This point is not static; it can and does move, based on the situation. It has been our intent all along (actually, since our participatory efforts began in 1985) that staff explore the various central points on the empowerment arc and to

think about and to discuss the implications for team leader and team member. This central point is well within the parameters of MacGregor's Theory Y.[14] In this interpretation, the respective *reporting* roles of team members and team leaders do not change. The team leader remains accountable and has the necessary authority to carry out the work of the team.

In closing, I have found a personally relevant quotation for thinking about our new role and the largeness of our charge:

> It is in the darkness of their eyes that people lose their way, and not, as they suppose, in any darkness that shrouds the path."
> – Black Elk,
> a Native American leader

Leaders can enlighten groups to find their way, or they can choose to believe that darkness does indeed shroud the path. The three roles of leading, coaching, and consulting, once we assume and understand them, can enlighten *us* and our colleagues during this transformational era.

References

1 John Lubans, Jr., "'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* 10 (Winter 1996): 28 - 40. A personal perspective on what managers do in an organization of self-managing teams. Largely a case study of the Duke Library's organizational strategies from 1985 through 1995, it illustrates the complexities and difficulties of shifting from the comfortable hierarchical model to a much looser and flatter one of teams. Specifically, the role of the upper administrative group is examined when boss/subordinate relationships are eliminated. The conclusion includes an assessment of this type of research library organizational structure.

2 Pew Higher Education Roundtable, "To Dance with Change," *Policy Perspectives*, 5 (April, 1994) 12A; and William F. Massy and Robert Zemsky, "Using Information Technology to Enhance Academic Productivity," White Paper from Educom's National Learning Infrastructure Initiative (Washington, DC: Educom, 1995), http://www.educom.edu.

3 Charles Handy, *The Age of Paradox* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press, 1994), 50 - 59.

4 Lubans, 31.

5 John Secor and Lynne Branche Brown, "Dry Bones, Part 2," *Signatures: YBP Occasional Papers* no.2 (1995).

6 Peter Clayton, "Implementation of Innovation: A Research Report," University of Canberra, Faculty of Communication, Centre for Communication Policy Research, Research Series, No. 1 (Canberra, Australia: University of Canberra, 1995), 3.

7 Luther Gulick set forth the acronym PODSCORB when he described the functions of the executive in his 1937 paper, "The Theory of Organization" as cited in *The Encyclopedia of Management*, edited by Carl Heyel, second edition (New York: Van Nostrand, 1973), 811-12.

8 Peter Senge, "The Leader's New Work: Building Learning Organizations," *Sloan Management Review* 22 (Fall 1990): 7- 23.

9 J. Sterling Livingston, "Pygmalion in Management," *Harvard Business Review* 88 (September-October 1988): 121-130. While this centers on the influence that leaders have for good or bad on individual development and performance, it can be extrapolated for teams.

10 Brian Joiner, *Fourth Generation Management* (New York: McGraw, 1994), and John Lubans, Jr., "Sherlock's Dog or Managers and Mess Finding," *Library Administration and Management* 8 (March 1994): 139-49.

11 Robert Henri, *The Art Spirit* (New York: Harper & Row, 1984), 167.

12 John Lubans, Jr. "A Decade of Change: Improving Operating Efficiency at Perkins Library," Memorandum to Library Council, Duke University, November 17, 1995.

13 Jerry Campbell, "Team Leader Reporting Relationships," Internal Memorandum to All Library Staff, Perkins Library, Duke University, October 27, 1995.

14 Douglas M. MacGregor, *The Human Side of Enterprise* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960).

Appendix:

Internal Customer Feedback

This is to help set out performance issues and to give feedback to and receive feedback from your internal customers. An internal customer is defined as one to whom you hand off work or information in a way that enables another to accomplish his or her job. It is important to quantify the amount of work and information you give or get from an internal customer so that some trends can be established to show improvements and areas in need of change, so do not ignore the facts.

Step I. As a team, list out your internal customers. Identify those with whom you have the most interactions that require rework or some significant clarification on your part to complete the work.

Step II. Send two of your team to talk with the internal customer about what they believe are their "performance indicators," i.e. what does — "doing a good job" — mean for them.

Step III. At the meeting with the internal customer, identify the important points of interaction (i.e., points where the exchange of materials or information affects significantly the work of each team) and discuss performance norms. Communicate this back to your team.

Step IV. Based on the results of your meeting with your Internal (IC) Customer, use the nominal group technique of brainstorming and multivoting to identify actions your team needs to take in two contrasting categories shown below. Quantify as much as possible.

1.	OR	2.
What should we do more of?		What should we do less of?
We need more help here?		We need less help here?
What are we doing well?		What could we be doing better
Successes?		Problems?
How the IC can help us?		How we can help the IC?
What does our IC like about we're doing?		What would our IC like to see us change?
What do we like about what our IC are doing?		What would we like to see changed?

Step V. Share the results with the IC and ask for similar feedback to you, their IC. Do so in a timely way, within a two-week span, preferably, so things remain fresh.

©1995 Duke University. Perkins Library. Implementation Planning Team
May 24, 1995