

## IINTRODUCTION

Center belonging and activity profile


Center structure before management reform


Current structure do not meet the Center's needs and it's new role.
Departments disintegra
No clear interchange
Complicated hierarchy
Functions duplication
The Center management and structure need to be changed.


## Current problems: GOALS vs VALUES

| PRoblems at Science |  |  | PROBLEMS AT FORMAL AUTHORITY |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Science | Should be externalized in education | Education | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Formal authority } \\ \hline \text { Formal authority } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | Doesn't invest enough in | Science |
| Science | Meets opposition from services | Services |  |  | New education systems is hardly | Education |
| Science | Should be commercialized by | Business |  |  |  |  |
| Science | Should be granted by | Formal authority | Formal authority |  | Limits some business activities | Busine |
|  |  |  | Formal authority |  | Doesn't limit new | Service |
| Science | Should increase the Center's image | Nonformal authority | Formal authority |  | Supports the new direction board | Non- <br> formal |
| Science | Doesn't meet the socium needs | Socium | Formal authority |  | Realizes the need to change the industry | Socium |
| problems at education |  |  | PRoblems at socium |  |  |  |
| Education | Should be renovated based on | Science | Socium | Needs new innovations. It's ready to participate in research process |  | Science |
| Education | Should be promoted as a service | Services |  |  |  |  |
| Education | Can be commercialized | Business | Socium | Needs more flexible education that meet needs |  | Education |
| Education | Should adopted to the new education system | Formal authority | Socium | Is ready to participate at business process as a customer |  | Business |
| Education | Should provide opportunity for distant use | Nonformal authority | Socium |  |  | Service |
| Education | Should be flexible and meet needs | Socium | Socium | Is not ready to accept the optimization in healthcare |  | Formal authority |
| Problems at Service supply |  |  | Socium | Socium respects the nonformal authority |  | Nonformal authority |
| Service S | Should be changed based on innovations | s Science |  |  |  |  |
| Service N | New services can be used to optimize | Education | Problems at business |  |  |  |
| Service S | Should be promoted and commercialized | d Business | Business as a system doesn't exist at the Center while there are lot's of opportunities |  |  |  |
| Service S | Should meet the demands of | Formal authority |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service St | Should meet the demands of | Nonformal authority | PROBLEMS AT NON-FORMAL AUTHORITY |  |  |  |
| Service S | Should be reachable and easy to buy by | Socium | No problems are exist: non-formal authority is supported by forma authority and itself supports all positive changes at the Center |  |  |  |

## METHODOLOGY

Culture specific and departments profile based at Quinn's competitive values model


MANAGEMENT TASK: to keep the organization social values and make the structure an effective tool to reach Center's new goals.

## RESULTS

New target-oriented structure also negotiates the values of all audiences and helps to keep culture specificThe new organization structure is end to increase operative effectiveness due to the better communications and interaction between departments in both divisions - scientific and practical.

Center structure after management reform


## CONCLUSION

The Model of competing values is controversial by definition. The oxymoron is unusual for most organizations and business-processes. The uniqueness of the case study consists in it's applicability of the Model to the Organization profile. The Center-specific profile (Scientific and Practical) has collision in division's integrity and cross-
Organization specific and naturally complete divisions.
The case demecific and naturally complete divisions. organization structure.
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