

Achieving More With Less
- Challenges and Opportunities
Records Management Association of Australia
8th National Convention, Darwin, 1991

C. Hurley
Chief Archivist, Public Record Office of Victoria

When the title of this paper was suggested to me, I was reminded of the episode of "Yes, Prime Minister" called 'Man Overboard'. You may remember that Jim Hacker (by now Prime Minister) has persuaded Cabinet to relocate most of the armed forces from the south of England to the north, in order (he thinks) to solve the unemployment problem. The Minister for Defence, however, holds out against the idea. The minutes record that only one member of Cabinet is not in favour of the idea. "The one member," the Defence Secretary remarks petulantly, "is the member whose Department would have to be reorganised. It's quite a problem".

"I began to feel impatient with Max" (Hacker records in his diary). "May I urge the Secretary of State for Defence to remember that every problem is also an opportunity?" Sir Humphrey Appleby (the perfect public servant) intervenes : "I think, Prime Minister, that the Secretary of State for Defence fears that this plan may create some insoluble opportunities."

Achieving more (with the resources one has) or managing with less are two challenges which many managers (not just managers of records) face at this time - and it may create some insoluble opportunities. The linkage which jargon creates between more productivity and fewer resources to make the little cant phrase which gives me today's theme is not a necessary one. Achieving more while at the same time having less to do it with merely doubles the challenge. And possibly makes the challenge insoluble.

We should be cautious about taking these words at their face value. In our simplicity we might believe that to survive in straightened times, all we need to do is "lift our game", to do better what we already do well and face up to the challenge of doing it with less.

Don't you believe it. The allocation of limited resources to established functions is under threat. Records management is perceived (like it or not) as an established function. Our masters believe they know what records management is and the "image" they have of it is not always healthy (from our point of view). When management says to us (as it says to others in charge of established or "traditional" functions) "you must achieve more with less", as often as not it is a challenge to make do with less as best we can because our established role is not going to get priority in the cut-throat competition for funds. At its most brutal, this involves no concern at all whether we achieve more, so long as we make do with less. Once you find yourself in

this situation, it may be a mistake to suppose that you will be O.K. if you take up the challenge and give them more of the same with fewer resources.

The real challenge in this situation involves choosing between two ways of dealing with organisational threat. You can either :

- change the perception of what you do so that it receives higher priority within the corporate goals; or
- change what you do so that you are delivering a product which attracts more corporate support.

These choices can be very threatening.

Traditionally, records managers are service-oriented. Despite much talk over the years about the need to "sell" records management, this seldom amounts to much more than attempts to persuade managers of the inherent virtue of the services we offer in terms of efficiency, reliability and cost-effectiveness. The time demands we be aware that current corporate culture no longer values these things for themselves. The virtues of efficient, reliable, cost-effective service were valued in a by-gone age - no more.

Our first task, then, is to keep abreast of contemporary corporate values and to "sell" records management (if we can) by reference to achievements relevant to them - to change the appearance of what we do to match the aspirations of those who employ us. Keeping up with change does not mean simply keeping up with technological developments - though often it is tempting to think so. It's important to do that too but such knowledge and skill is practically irrelevant in a "managing with less" environment except as a tactical weapon in the service of a successful survival strategy.

At its most cynical, keeping abreast of corporate values involves nothing more than lying about what you do so that it gives the appearance of supporting current management pre-occupations even though you go on doing exactly what you always did. More positively, you can try to reveal to management that what you do really does fit into their corporate strategy by presenting its virtues to them in a new light.

But people who lie usually get found out (as politicians in several states have found out recently). Better to try to alter their view of us by "tuning in" to current management pre-occupations and presenting what we do in terms which convinces them that what we do supports and advances their priorities.

- I come before you this afternoon as the Machiavelli of records management. The objection to dishonesty is strictly utilitarian. Too much danger of being found out. Too dangerous in consequence if you are.
- It will not always be possible to stay relevant if we adhere to the established methods of records management. The hardest thing is to actually change what we do to keep it a relevant and wanted service within the organisations we serve.

Fred Diers has told us of a new breed of manager whose priority lies with their data and the document. They look upon the management of records as peripheral, not central. We say "records management" - they hear us say "black hole".

He has advised us (wisely) of the folly of trying to change those views. First, we have to recognise them when we encounter them. Then, before we can combat them (not change) we have to understand them.

The first rule of strategy, then : "know thine enemy".

There may still be some among you who feel we shouldn't have to compete for resources. Records management saves money. Everyone knows that. So, in times of shrinking resources you should spend more on RM. It's obvious really - save more money that way. Keep expanding RM till it's 100% of budget. Save a mint. The company will never be in the red again.

Wait a minute. That can't be right. The illogicality of that demonstrates that we must do more than demonstrate our value in terms of cost savings. In fighting for management's attention, we will encounter many rivals and enemies. We can't examine them all here. Let's get stuck into accountants. They come in all shapes and (dis)guises. In government, they're sometimes called budget officers.

Think of a man sitting at a table with a huge jar of beans. He pours them out into one big pile and then distributes them into 20/30 little ones. He spends his life moving beans from one pile to another. This is a budget officer. He is a bean counter. That's all he does. He doesn't care how many beans are on the table or what they're used for. If someone asks for an extra bean on one pile, he has to find it from another pile. Tell him you've found a way to reduce the number of beans next year or to use this year's beans more efficiently - he won't care. Why should he? He's a bean counter. That's all he does.

Apart from an in-born (and, let me say at once, wholly justified) scepticism, there are numerous reasons why bean counters are impervious to cost saving arguments from records managers. Let's pause briefly over 3 of them.

- First, we're not the only ones ramming cost saving schemes down their throats. Everybody's doing it. If it doesn't jump out and grab their attention or have top management support, we'll just be asked to take our place at the end of the queue.
- Second, not all costs are on the table in the form of beans. Despite all the nonsense that been said and written about program budgeting, full cost accounting, and three year budget cycles, there remains a chasm between "real" dollars in the budget appropriations and "notional costs" - dreadful phrase; if it's ever used, you'll know you're in trouble. If your proffered savings are on "notional costs", as records management savings sometimes are (often for no other reason than they are called something else in the budget), don't ask a bean counter for more appropriation ("real") dollars - or, what amounts to the same thing, immunity from cuts if your beans are wanted urgently elsewhere.

- Finally, even if the savings you offer are perceived to be in real beans, don't expect necessarily to win the prize. If RM creates a saving in beans in one pile, it's still no good to the bean counter unless he can grab them and put them into another pile. The sad fact is that large organisations (both public and private) have very poorly developed mechanisms for translating achieved savings into re-allocatable resources. Or, to put it in a bean counter's terms : "even if you do save the money, the bastards'll just spend it something else". In Victoria, we had to develop our own storage charges as a funds transfer mechanism back into consolidated revenue so that our storage program could be taken seriously.

Let's now go back to the problem of dealing with management. How do you get through to a Minister or a Chief Executive? I don't know. Write a briefing paper. "I can tell my Minister reads what I send him ... I've seen his lips move." Peter's excellent paper this morning offered grounds for optimism about our ability to win management commitment. I would disappoint a number of people here if I did not inject a note of pessimism.

I don't know how many of you read the literature airlines put out to help us pass the time when travelling. This month, one of them has an article¹ on change which sums up in a way what we have to deal with :-

- "Blame Aristotle for all our troubles [the article begins] ... We still haven't broken free of the two huge mistakes the greeks made in believing, and convincing others, that
 - a) we are at the centre of a stable universe, and
 - b)logical thinking is the best way to approach problems.
- "organisations which are able to sustain their success recognise that their customers are the heart of their business. They are "market-oriented" ... It's that simple, but it requires an anti-Aristotelean about-face which puts the market, not the company, at the centre of the universe.
- "but what are the manifestations of a market orientation? ... To actually become market-oriented, companies need to :
 - a) collect information about existing and potential customers and competitors;
 - b) disseminate that information internally so it can be usefully deployed;
 - c) create services and products which provide the value that customers are seeking (in a way that differentiates the organisation from its competitors); and
 - d) ensure the organisation has the internal structures and capability to deliver.
- "several Australian companies are taking the information stage very seriously."

The author cites the example of Jones Lang Wootton (a real estate firm described in the article, and presumably by themselves, as property consultants). JLW has taken five years to develop a database from publicly available information about every commercial property in key areas of Sydney, the article continues :-

¹ . Abby Day *Change by Choice Flight Deck* (September 1991) pp.18-22.

- "Availability of information means that customer enquiries can be answered immediately ... It also gives JLW a lead in cold calling because they know when a lease is about to expire ... A few years ago customers were coming to them; now, it's the other way around.
- " `it's all about continually being able to make the switch to keep up with market changes' [a JLW executive is quoted as saying].
- "using information technology doesn't stop at the sales staff ... A massive training programme is ensuring that every employee has and uses a terminal to file information and communicate. Customer service is therefore improved by having all the up-to-date information ... Available to all key managers.
- "internal communications are now confined to electronic mailboxes - for everyone, right up to the chairman. If he doesn't log on, he doesn't get his memos ..."

The article concludes by examining strategic pathways to market-oriented approaches. We are urged to improve strategic planning by continuous market analysis :-

- "the purpose of the analysis isn't to tell us what is right or wrong ... Merely what is appropriate ...
 - "companies which are able to ... Keep fine-tuning as they go, are the ones with the capability to survive.
 - "and that includes public, as well as private, organisations.
-
- "companies that succeed today may not be here in two years' time ... It appears that those organisations with the willingness to **think** are the ones which get, and stay, ahead."

There are several things to notice about the quotes i've drawn from that article. I would like to draw your attention to two :-

- first, the importance, in the example chosen, of information;
- second, the emphasis on change.

Organisations (both public and private) will continue to resource those activities which are crucial (or which are judged to be crucial) to their core activities. Those functions won't really be asked to achieve more with less - they will be fostered and expanded. They will be expected to manage their resources efficiently but they won't be starved of the resources they need to function.

Functions which cannot demonstrate that they are core activities will be starved of resources. And no amount of achievement of more with less will save them. It is essential then not simply to do better what we have hitherto been used to doing. If what we do is not valued, the increase in productivity will avail us naught. We'll be chopped anyway. The first task, then, is not to get straight into efficiency and effectiveness. We have first to re-examine our activity as records managers to see if it is relevant to the organisation we serve. And, if it is not, we must either

- make it so; or
- convince the sceptical that it is so; or
- at worst, make it appear so.

The example before us should give us confidence. In order to remake itself and respond to its market, the company quoted in the article I have summarised is said to have concentrated its energies on its information base. Step forward, records manager. The company needs you. We have seen the way to the future and it lies through information. You, the records manager, are the most valuable person in our organisation.

Really? Perhaps not.

How many of us here today would expect to be called upon by our employers to manage the development of the two key information tools described - the data base on commercial properties and the electronic mail?

More typical, I suggest, are several examples I could cite of efficient and thriving records management units swept away to make savings while new technologies have been introduced around them by consultants or specialists in one or other of the new technologies. Records managers who have survived (otherwise than through the inertia of the organisations which employ them) have done so by taking the initiative in introducing new methods (such as imaging); or being accepted as the right person to manage the transition to new ways of dealing with information within the organisation.

But there is no sure path to success. We face fierce competition from product specialists and technologists (such as computer specialists) who generally would not regard themselves as records managers. We can try to become like them, but the success rate is not high. Even if we succeed, the chances are we will become trapped in a car speeding towards a cliff, as organisations themselves sometimes are, by the technologies we introduce.

We can find ourselves faced by a professional dilemma. To succeed, we have to give the customer what he wants - even if we know it is not what he needs. As records managers, we are tempted to tell the customer (in most cases our employers) what he may not want to hear. The Public Record Office is often asked to advise on optical disk systems, for example. Usually, the customer is already sold. Often we find that what they really find attractive is the information retrieval component of the system, not the imaging component. We point out that they could get that probably more cheaply by computerising without converting the documents to disk if only they put some money (less than they might otherwise spend) on proper document or record management systems.

These are instances where the index data base Tony Poynton spoke about is not just the most important part of the system, it's the only relevant part of the system. I'm not saying this always so, by the way, or that imaging systems don't have their place. What their place will be in the future, I don't know. We heard an interesting divergence of view on Monday. For what it's worth, I think optical disk technology (if the industry can overcome the problems of lack of standardisation) has great potential because :-

- a) it's a good storage medium for machine readable records; and

b) systems are already here allowing data crossover between computer and imaging systems.

But, just for now, imaging systems are not the best answer to every records management problem. And sometimes we have to say that.

But, if this is not what the customer wants to hear, you won't be heard. And you do your own cause no good in the long run. Matching user interest (or perception) to the skills we possess is not easy. As the airline article suggests, we can be correct in our professional judgements and still not survive if we can't satisfy our market that we are not only correct but useful. "Here lies the records manager who was never wrong and never won an argument".

The worst possible outcome is to be perceived as a luddite. "All this office automation stuff is very well in its way, but what good is it if the mail never gets opened! And what about the evidential value of records?" A gap has opened up between technological developments and the (still) sound principles of good records management because the role of the records manager has to some extent been usurped by technological advances which are assumed to deliver the benefits of efficient and effective information handling as well or better as more traditional records management techniques. The existence of this gap should not delude us into thinking we are indispensable. Information systems are developed in response to perceived organisational needs and quite often they do get it right. Some of the benefits of good old-fashioned records management are built in to computing, imaging, and office automation systems even though many of those who develop these systems have no records management background. This is simply because the systems are designed and managed by intelligent people who are aware of the need to develop systems to meet the same needs that records managers have always tried to meet.

In other words, the competition is stiff, but it ain't stupid. Someone earlier deplored the competition between RM and MIS. And they were right to do so. Alliance and friendship are perfectly acceptable strategic stepping stones to stabbing the opposition in the back. Joke! Joke! I'm reminded, however, of the old Ealing comedy "Kind Hearts and Coronets". You'll remember that the chief character systematically does away with a dozen or so people standing between him and a dukedom. And he remarks ruefully at one point : "It is so very difficult to murder someone with whom one is not on intimate terms". Enough of frivolity.

Of course, form alliances where you can. In the best of all worlds, this would result in a positive convergence (to use another current cant phrase) of the disciplines. But some people don't want to converge. Sometimes the bastards really are out to get you and you have no choice but to fight them for turf and shrinking resources. Then the old adage is true : "Stone dead hath no fellow" and those who succeed will be the cunning and the devious. So where does that leave records managers - naive and innocent as we are?

Back to basics. What is our product? In the delivery of what must we achieve more with less? Do we simply become product specialists or technologists or else perish? Now that disciplines have converged : "We have met the enemy and he is us".

Certainly, the necessary minimum for the records manager is to keep abreast of technology and to master it. In many organisations this will mean that Records Management can be the vehicle for improvement of systems. We can and should be agents for change and improvement. But, as Poynton reminded us, we can't hope to master every technology and anyway if we did technological change would by then already have overtaken us. Most records managers, who are not themselves specialists in one system or another, cannot compete with specialists at all levels. There are, however, at least four areas in which, I suggest, the records manager brings to the situation a grip on the problem of information technology where the product specialists and technologists often fail :-

- what to do with paper records (which every organisation still has);
- the document as evidence;
- the integration of systems throughout the organisation and evaluating system development proposals in terms of effective alternatives; and
- identifying and satisfying new uses for information not considered when the system was being developed.

Time does not permit us to explore these competitive advantages of the records manager now. It is enough to say here that, increasingly, our business may lie in exploiting them as the basis of our organisational survival.

My themes are flexibility and cunning.

Let me tell you the tale of the two archives. My examples this afternoon are drawn from archives - that's what I know best. But they merely illustrate my themes and they are relevant to us all.

Flexibility and cunning.

Amongst your conference handouts you will find publicity material routinely put about by my colleagues at Australian Archives². Very prominent is a slogan : "service is our business". The services are listed :-

- storage;
- retrieval;
- destruction;
- security;
- records management advice;
- appraisal;
- vital records;
- training;
- support.

A document like this is not just to advise potential clients. It's about promotion. It's about defining a mission or strategy and then re-enforcing the image through publicity.

Is it the right image?

². Australian Archives Records and Information Management Services

Maybe it is for Australian Archives. Maybe it isn't for other government archives which, with the possible exception of NSW, are too marginalised to credibly present themselves as service providers. And this is the worst possible economic climate to be investing in a new enterprise. Until recently the Victorian Public Record Office was trying to develop under a strategy of asset management - the creation of policies and procedures to maximise efficient use of records related resources (accommodation, equipment, staff) with minimum involvement by PRO in direct service delivery. More recently, we've adopted a cultural heritage strategy.

So, who's right, who's wrong? Does it matter? Isn't the important thing to have a strategic idea (any idea) and make it work? Possibly.

A few weeks ago I came home and turned on the news - only half listening (as you do) going about the chores. I found myself listening to a story about the troubled State Bank of South Australia. I gave it my full attention (we know something about failed state enterprises in Victoria). The South Australian bank had turned the corner (I heard). Everything would be all right from now on. What had happened? They had issued a new mission statement.

Well, really!

If my old friend Aristotle were here I'm sure I would hear him mumbling about the dangers of leaving the middle term undistributed in syllogistic reasoning. Or (perhaps putting it more simply) "a mission statement may be necessary for success, but it's certainly not sufficient". Or (more simply still) "all style and no substance". A strategy or mission must have substance and some likelihood of success. It's no good, as James Thurber said, just casting your bread upon the waters and hoping it comes back sandwiches.

Would it be rude to ask, I wonder, whether what Australian Archives does now is so very different to what it used to do before it discovered that service was its business? Would it be subversive to ask whether the PRO is doing much differently since it moved from asset management to cultural heritage? Would it be dangerous to ask whether what we both do differs so very much from each other? Probably not, so long as other people don't ask these questions.

This brings me to the second of the two features of the article I quoted - the emphasis on change itself. You will all be aware of the trend towards what is sometimes called "corporatisation". The records management strengths I cited earlier are primarily those of a service-oriented unit with a brief which runs across the organisation. Corporatisation is tied up with the mania for deregulation. Organisations don't want prescriptive or legislative barriers to action.

Smaller administrative units are being formed within organisations with (it is claimed) greater autonomy in the running of their operations. Centralised functions are either being devolved to them or are themselves corporatised as "business centres" to thrive or shrivel depending on the demand for their services from other units within the organisation. Administrative units decide their own methods and priorities, centralised

regulatory or service units must assist them by delivering the services they ask for. It is the job of every business unit to survive and if they don't there are mechanisms (supposedly) which will punish them for their failure. Central service units don't enforce corporate goals in their areas of expertise, they help the administrative units to help themselves.

Responsibility is delegated to lower-levels, to the point where the service is delivered, making (it is claimed) for greater efficiency and effectiveness. Centralised procedures (e.g. accounting and purchasing procedures in government) are delegated making them less bureaucratic and flexible, providing for more cost-effective practices.

All this is clearly related to the quotations I read out earlier about abandoning Aristotelean logic and about not trying to analyse what is right or wrong about our business merely what is "appropriate". We were also urged, you will recall, to "think". You may feel, as I do, that there is no obvious conflict between thinking and logic, that if a thing is right it is probably also appropriate, and that what is inappropriate is probably wrong. But such thoughts may simply reveal an ancient crust of prejudice on my part.

The point is that such reasoning is used to promote change, just as the shifting pre-occupations of management theory are the vehicle for it. We can't stand in the way of it; nor should we make the mistake of being trapped inside it. One thing we can say to the evangelists of change with some confidence if we dare - that sooner or later they too will be overtaken by it. Corporatisation will come. Then, just as certainly it will go.

Our task is to adjust and survive. If I had a formula for general application which would tell you how to do that successfully, I wouldn't be here with you today. I'd be making a fortune somewhere as a consultant.

Let me conclude by building - with you - a theoretical model for the strategic development of a purely hypothetical government archives authority in some nameless bankrupt State south of the Murray. We will look only at the secondary storage side of the business. We won't go down the "service is our business" route or the cultural heritage route. I know, let's try asset management. We have three key parameters within which to work :

- user pays;
- privatisation;
- corporatisation.

Our primary goal is the identification, segregation and preservation of the archives for historical research. Good records management supports that goal as well as being a legitimate end in itself.

The traditional tools available to us have been :-

- control of appraisal/disposal;
- provision of secondary storage;
- legislative control over agency practices.

No records could be destroyed or otherwise disposed of without archives' approval. Agencies must transfer non-current records to the archives. Archives has a monopoly and storage is free.

First, user pays

If you're already big and successful, your first instinct is to resist the principle. It can only drive away established business and erode your existing role. If you're small and struggling, you may welcome it as a means of funds transfer into your budget from the budgets of client agencies (remember the bean counters). You always said your programme saved money, now you can offer up your revenue as budget offsets against increased expenditure on your programme.

Then you can start using storage charges as a tool. Your primary goal is the archives. This means that, as an archivist, you're not really interested in records already appraised as being of only temporary value. All you have to do is recover your costs on those and all additional savings can be left to the transferring agencies as a bonus. On unappraised secondary records, however, you impose penalty charges to encourage clients to co-operate in early appraisal. These penalty payments erode the benefits to them of the efficiency of your programme until they conform to your programme's need for appraisal action on their part.

Second, privatisation

Because you aren't really concerned about sentenced temporary records, you can let them go out to the private sector with very little regulation. If the organisation of which you are part will tolerate that degree of central agency interference, you can argue the merits of centralised contracting for commercial storage. But, if that's not appealing or doesn't fit in with corporate objectives, no harm is done in terms of ultimate programme goals by letting agencies contract separately. You will have to fight, though, to keep control of unsentenced records until they're appraised.

Third, corporatisation

This is where it gets tricky because the current trend towards corporatisation is going to be critical of such a role for the archives, supported - as it must be - by regulation. Ten years from now, it might all be different. They may be back, banging on your door, begging you to set up new centralised in-house government repositories to relieve them of the nightmare of expenditure on commercial storage. Who knows? Who cares? That might happen; it might not. If it does, you've got to have survived that long.

You might try doing this ; you can argue a good case against letting agencies build up in commercial storage facilities an open-ended government financial commitment for records which will be much harder to appraise once they leave government control. You can argue that without the financial disincentive of the archives penalty charge, agencies will go on expending money needlessly on unsentenced records.

The benefits of cheaper storage, you will argue, show up quickly. Agencies can be relied upon (in an environment structured to deliver back to managers the benefits of cost-saving initiatives) to choose the cheapest storage option. The costs of poor appraisal programmes take longer to manifest themselves. Without the archives penalty on unappraised non-current records, the system will actually encourage agencies to make the wrong choice - one which is more costly overall for government.

Your programme, you will argue, is consistent with the key parameters imposed by the organisation. Its whole purpose is to provide corporate entities within the organisation with the means to achieve (responsibly, in line with overall corporate objectives) autonomy in their choice of secondary storage :-

- the freedom to provide it for themselves (if they have appraised the records first);
- to use the archives (for a fee);
- or commercial storage (for a fee).

They achieve that freedom by appraising their records. If they decline and commit the resources of the organisation to unnecessary future expense, the system will punish them by imposing penalty charges on unsentenced records.

So far, so good. You might get away with it, even in a climate of deregulation and corporatisation. To succeed, however, the archives must have the storage capacity to make it work. That means large capital investment with a break even and profit point between five to six years in the future (maybe less depending on your facilities design). Some private companies will make that sort of investment decision, few governments will. You almost certainly won't get it in the current economic climate in government. If they're selling the trams and leasing them back, they're not going to invest in records storage to achieve medium to long term savings.

Can it be done any other way? Try this : they've got lease back trains. Why not lease back storage? If our archives can't get capital to build, let it be the contractor for commercial storage for unsentenced records. Same deal as before. An agency can regain the freedom to contract independently as soon as its records are appraised. Until then, it pays the cost of its failure to do - exacted through the archives charge (standard rate plus penalty) even though the records are actually in commercial storage leased on behalf of government by the archives.

It needs to be understood that the validity or otherwise of the parameters within which such models are developed is not our chief concern. The political policies or corporate strategies within which we must operate will be set by a process outside of our control but one with which we must learn how to deal if we are to survive. Since these policies and strategies are themselves subject to change, it would be foolish to link records management wholly to one or another. It is our task to recognise new policies and strategies as they emerge and adjust our programmes so that our services are delivered in ways that suit the times.

It is not my business, therefore, to say whether government should prefer its archives to be a centralised service provider (the short term costs/long term savings model) or a contractor of commercial storage (the short term savings/long term costs model) or to

develop along a "mixed" model. All models are possible and satisfactorily deliver the ultimate objectives of the archives and records management programmes in the area of secondary storage. Which model is chosen will depend largely upon the corporate strategies of those who hold the purse strings. We can certainly have a view (and argue) the merits of one model over the others. But the fact remains that the objectives of good archives and records management programmes can be achieved under any one of the models. It is our task to :-

- understand that;
- articulate how our programmes can deliver under each of the models;
- make it happen under whichever model is preferred.

I trust, therefore, that all this suggests a methodology, a way of adjusting an established function to the demands of contemporary management thinking, trying to make it relevant and responsive, seeking to demonstrate that it is worth investing in and doesn't just eat up resources in a futile attempt to deliver services that nobody wants any more - in short, how to do more with less.

© Chris Hurley 1991