

Mission Statement Development Process

Introduction

While engaged in planning for implementation of the Tampa Library's Institutional Effectiveness Program, we concluded that the library's mission statement was an inappropriate basis for the evaluative process. In essence, the statement was more akin to a vision statement and not subject to direct assessment. To remedy this situation, the library embarked upon a mission statement review and development process.

First Steps

In 2000, two librarians were assigned to coordinate the library's response to the university's Institutional Effectiveness (IE) and assessment program. Realizing that the visions and values statements were not amenable to direct assessment, these individuals initiated a review of the mission statements of representative Association of Research Library member libraries in an effort to derive a sense of the form of statements employed by organizations that the USF Tampa Library would view as aspirant institutions. A working mission statement was developed and used during the assessment process.

Beginning in March 2002, the Assistant Director for Research and Planning (ADRP) assumed responsibility for oversight of the IE and assessment process, with support from the librarians charged with IE coordination. The ADRP identified the pressing need for developing a wide consensus around a revised mission statement and implemented a process to accomplish this goal.

July 2002

In early July 2002, the ADRP met with the Tampa Library's administrative team to discuss the coming mission statement development process. This group included the Dean, the Director for Central Services, the Director of the Tampa Library, the Director of the Florida Studies Center, the Director of Library Advancement, the Human Resources Coordinator, the Coordinator of Publications, and the Director of the Division of Collection Management. This meeting included a summary of the need for a revision; a discussion of the function of a mission statement; and a proposal regarding the coming development process. Heavy emphasis was placed upon the need for each individual administrator to ensure that all of their respective constituencies were represented and all perspectives were discussed.

On July 12, an email message regarding the coming process was circulated to the Library Management Group (LMG), a group including the administrators listed above as well as all department heads; the Coordinator of Electronic Collections; and the Chairs of the USPS and faculty committees. The email communication described the process and provided materials to assist in executing the roles required of this group. Again, heavy emphasis was placed on the need for full participation of all constituents, with responsibility for ensuring this engagement placed upon the members of the LMG.

On the same date, an email message was distributed to all library employees to apprise them of the coming process and their respective roles in same. The membership of the LMG was identified as the contact points for all employees to provide their input. Early and frequent participation was strongly encouraged.

Communication: July 17-August 22

During the six weeks following the initial announcement of the mission statement development process, informative emails originating with the ADRP were circulated to the LMG and to the library staff in general. Periodic communications contained definitions of difficult terms or concepts, illustrations of work successfully concluded, and articles illustrating the desired outcomes. The ADRP responded to many questions and requests for meetings with departmental staff and constituencies.

The Process

Initially, the process was designed to encompass three related issues: 1) revision and adoption of an assessable library mission statement; 2) adoption of departmental mission statements to support the library's statement; and 3) revision of existing strategic goals in accordance with the newly adopted

mission statement. Following a meeting of the library's administration, it was decided to focus on items one and two and leave the strategic plan revision for a later date.

The process required LMG members to meet with the members of their respective constituencies to review the working mission statement and draft alternatives. Department heads had the additional responsibility to either review existing or to create new departmental mission statements consistent with the goals and objectives of the unit. A form was circulated to structure the process (see attached). This document required participants to consider and record appropriate goals; desired or intended outcomes (objectives); and criteria and methods of assessing same. The expectation was that the documents would not exceed a single page per unit and that all department heads and their staff met as frequently as needed to meet these objectives.

Once the initial draft of the document was available, department heads and members of the LMG were required to review the material with their next higher level of supervision. In this way, grass roots inputs were reviewed and accepted by the various levels of management. The vision originated with the rank and file, and was accepted by the management. Whenever disagreements arose, department heads would again meet with their respective units to discuss alternatives and reach a consensus. Throughout this process, the ADRP worked with all levels to ensure that everyone both understood and supported the process.

Inputs were considered complete once all levels of management certified that their subordinates had participated fully in preparation of the documents and that they supported the content. These completed documents were forwarded to the ADRP who collated the documents and resolved any loose ends.

The final document was forwarded back to the members of the LMG in preparation for a workshop during which the various alternatives for the library's mission statement would be discussed and a final version adopted. LMG members were encouraged to review the departmental mission statements, goals, and objectives and to comment as desired. LMG members were also asked to review the USF mission, goals, and objectives statements in preparation for the workshop. The goal was an informed body of individuals representing all facets of the library who could make a decision as to the final form of the mission statement.

Final Workshop

On August 22, the LMG met in the Florida Studies Center to discuss the various draft mission statements submitted by the LMG constituencies. All members of the group spoke in turn and all had the opportunity to comment on the input of their colleagues. A second round of commentary was invited to ensure that all views reached the table. In the end, a consensus was reached on a single mission statement as follows:

To support and strengthen the University's research, teaching, and service missions, the Tampa Library acquires, preserves, and provides access to resources and services for the research community.

At the conclusion of the Thursday workshop, LMG members were asked to return to their respective constituencies and relay the final outcome for comment and to review their departmental mission statements in light of the revised library statement. A full weekend was allowed to elapse to permit last minute commentary after which the final version was announced to all library staff and published on the Tampa Library website.

Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose

Library Mission Statement: <i>Statement of the Tampa Library's services and who we serve in support of the institution's mission.</i>				
Goal Statement	Objectives: Desired or Intended Outcomes	Assessment Method & Criteria	Assessment Results	Use of Results
Goal 1: <i>General statement of conditions intended to exist at a future time.</i> <u>Unit Mission Statement</u> <i>Statement of the unit's services in support of the library mission statement.</i>	1. <i>Descriptions of specific conditions that are intended to exist in the future that are measurably different than at present.</i> Include as many objectives as appropriate.	1. <i>Specific criteria implying methods of measuring success in meeting objectives; i.e. how do you know when you are successful.</i> Include as many assessment measures as appropriate, BUT all objectives must be assessed.	For future use.	For future use.
Goal 2: <u>Unit Mission Statement</u> <i>Statement of the unit's services in support of the library mission statement.</i>	Repeat above as appropriate for this goal.	Repeat above as appropriate for this goal.	For future use.	For future use.
Goal 3: <u>Unit Mission Statement</u> <i>Statement of the unit's services in support of the library mission statement.</i>	Repeat above as appropriate for this goal.	Repeat above as appropriate for this goal.	For future use.	For future use.
Goal 4: <u>Unit Mission Statement</u> <i>Statement of the unit's services in support of the library mission statement.</i>	Repeat above as appropriate for this goal.	Repeat above as appropriate for this goal.	For future use.	For future use.

All goals support the unit mission statement, all unit missions support the library mission, the library mission supports the institutional mission. At least one goal is required, but units should limit themselves to not more than 2-3 goal statements. This is manageable.