



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Start Date: March 1st 2007

Estimated Project Completion Date: September 7th 2007

Project Mission:

To analyze and assess London Public Library's organizational capacity to manage and provide library services through a 16-branch infrastructure in a cost effective and relevant manner while maintaining high-quality service standards. Provide recommendations on how to optimize library service and maximize the customer experience.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES (What will the project accomplish; performance expected – clear & measurable?)

1. To transform our Library Service Delivery Model / Capacity to be able to provide electronic information, collections, supportive and hard infrastructure, access to service, expertise and funding to deliver equitable access to all Londoners and a superior library experience in a fiscally responsible and relevant way.
2. To conduct:
 - ♦ Workload review of library service
 - ♦ Hours of Service & Service Usage review
 - ♦ Operational costs and capital investment analysis by service location
 - ♦ Alternate service delivery analysis
 - ♦ Cost containment reviews
 - ♦ A review of the delivery of Non-Branch Services, such as virtual branch, visiting library service, telefact, community outreach, etc., in the context of the larger study.
3. To undertake a consultative review with key stakeholder groups to solicit input into the review process, needs / expectations and to identify priorities and goals.
4. To transform LPL to position London Public Library to effectively serve customers at a time when traditional customers are becoming seniors, young Ontario residents are growing up with fundamentally different information needs, people have diverse needs and increasing expectations, and newcomers will drive much of London's population growth.
5. To ensure London Public Library can provide new or expanded services to attract new customers when funds to serve even traditional users are limited.



PROJECT MEASUREMENTS (How will we know if the project is successful? Quantifiable Measurements of success, such as ROI; Percentage increase in service Levels; Quality or Productivity Targets, etc.)			
Key Measurements	Owner	Desired Target	Target Achievement Date
Customer Satisfaction Scores	Senior Team	Satisfaction Scores	2009
Library utilization – system-wide and by branch <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Branch attendance ◆ E-Visits ◆ Community Outreach 		Increase <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 5% ◆ 15% ◆ 15% 	
Cost Containment – achieve annual budget targets		On Target	
Productivity Improvements – transaction processing (i.e. holds processing)		Improve	
Circulation		Increase 10%	
Capacity to provide new or expanded services to respond to emerging needs		Capacity available	

PROJECT SCOPE (What tangibles will this project deliver? What is out of the scope of the project? Are there any risks associated with the project?)
<p>Deliverables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ A business case, with recommendations that will ensure the sustainability of a superior library system, serving London residents. ◆ Alternate solutions, including service and branch infrastructure status quo, rationalization, harmonization and expansion alternatives. ◆ Recommended Service Delivery Model including tiers of service, hours, staffing and service locations. ◆ Recommended process for implementation of the model.
<p>Exclusions, Special Considerations and Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Excludes development of Service Excellence Models – design and implementation ◆ Ideally, we can access consulting support (i.e. through university) to assist with the analysis. ◆ Resource constraints – time and people resources



PROJECT TEAM MEMBERSHIP	
Role on Team	Name
Project Sponsor:	Library Board
Project Manager:	Anne Becker
Project Team Members:	Senior Team Members
RESOURCES TO THE PROJECT TEAM:	
Subject Matter Expertise	Name
Beth Whitney	Collections Management
Eeva Stierwalt	ILS data

PROJECT SIGN-OFF		
Project Sponsor: Anne Becker	Signature:	Date: February 12, 2007
Project Manager: ...[Click here and type]	Signature:	Date: ...[Click here and type]

BRIEF SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS (Qualitative analysis of the current situation and what you <u>desire</u> the situation to be.)
<p>Brief Description of Current Situation:</p> <p>London Public Library's vision is to be the Community Hub within London that strengthens individuals, families and neighbourhoods by connecting them to people and to relevant information, collections and resources.</p> <p>One of our strengths is our large reach. We offer Londoners 16 inviting and well-designed locations to choose from to access the rich resources of the Library. We have 320,000 square feet of physical space, most of which has been renovated in the last 10 years or newly constructed. Additional strengths include our staff, high public credibility and commitment to Libraries, proven trackrecord of fiscal accountability, demonstrated economic and social reach, partnership experience and network and our evolving culture and service delivery models.</p> <p>Some of the challenges we face are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Our expansive branch network spreads our human resources very thin. ♦ Customer needs are changing and they are expecting new and different things from the Library.



- ◆ London growth is primarily driven by newcomers who come with unique needs.
- ◆ Youth and children have unique needs that require different responses in order to achieve meaningful connections.
- ◆ The nature of library work and workers is changing.
- ◆ The importance of literacy continues to increase and the Library must place a greater emphasis on this service outcome.
- ◆ Technology expectations are huge --- just to keep up requires significant financial and human resources.
- ◆ Competition is widespread and accordingly, the Library must continually fight to stay relevant and to thrive.
- ◆ Funding and budget restraints are tighter than ever and are a limiting factor in how we respond to the broad range of service demands and needs. For example, our collections budget or number of FTE's has not kept pace with the square foot expansion. Our capital renewal budget does not meet needs – for example, we currently have \$550K of current capital renewal needs.

Accordingly, it is critical that London Public Library analyze how we deliver service to Londoners, in order to ensure that we optimize service delivery and maximize the service outcomes and benefits to Londoners.

Brief Description of Desired Situation:

Develop and implement a renewed service delivery and infrastructure model that will sustain London Public Library and ensure that we deliver superior library service to Londoners that will meet their current and emerging needs in a relevant and fiscally responsible manner.

ACTION PLAN (What actions are required in order to achieve our objectives?)

Task / Phase	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Owner	Progress Against Plan
Statement of Problem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Identify key issues and opportunities for improvement ◆ Identify any assumptions ◆ Identify root causes 	March 1 st	March 11 th	Anne Becker	
Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Conduct comprehensive analysis of Hours of Service, Attendance, Usage, Circulation, etc. by location / schedule of service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Quantitative ◆ Qualitative ◆ Conduct financial due diligence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Productivity ◆ Efficiency 	March 12 th	June 1 st	Anne Becker	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ ROI ◆ Gather qualitative intelligence via interviews, work sampling, focus groups, etc. 				
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Assess results from analysis ◆ Identify and evaluate key findings and trends 	June 1 st	June 15 th	Anne Becker	
Formulate Alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ What can be done to solve problems or capitalize on opportunities? ◆ Status Quo, Expansion, Rationalization, Integration, Harmonization, etc. 	June 16 th	July 15 th	Anne Becker	
Evaluate Alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Establish criterion for evaluating alternatives. ◆ What alternatives are feasible, compatible, and consistent with overarching goals? 	July 16 th	Sept. 1 st	Anne Becker	
Draft Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Which alternative(s) ◆ Rationale ◆ Possible stakeholder reactions ◆ Impacts ◆ Present to Board for approval ◆ If approved, present to City Council 	Sept. 2 nd	Sept. 15 th (present when possible)	Anne Becker	
Implementation & Reviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Resource allocations ◆ Management commitment ◆ Contingency plans ◆ Detailed steps, timetables, budget, etc. ◆ Develop metrics for review 	TBD			