Inclusion in Governance Task Force Report

Submitted on: December 22, 2021

Submitted by: John Laskowski (Chair)

Charge and Membership

In August 2021 the Library Executive Committee charged a task force to explore how it might foster a more inclusive environment around governance and decision-making. Membership of the task force would include one faculty representative from the Library's Executive Committee (EC), one faculty representative from the Library's Bylaws Committee, one member -at-large from the faculty, one Civil Service representative from the Library Staff Support Committee, one member at-large from the Civil Service (CS) personnel, one Academic Professional representative from the Library Committee of Academic Professionals and one at-large Academic Professional (AP).

"The Library is charging a task force to explore how the Library can be more inclusive across employment classifications in governance and decision making. The task force will gather data on existing governance structures within the Library, governance structures in other units on campus, how other academic libraries promote inclusion in governance, and how individuals within the various employment classifications would like to be involved in governance and decision-making. The task force will develop a set of recommendations to institute inclusion in Library governance, to be shared with EC, L-CAP (Library Committee of Academic Professionals), and LSSC (Library Staff Support Committee) by December 22, 2021."[1]

Task force members include: Sara Benson (Bylaws representative), Gregg Homerding (at-large CS representative), Erik Chapman (LSSC representative), Sarah Christensen (at-large AP representative), Joanne Kaczmarek (at-large faculty representative), Joe Lenkart (EC representative), and John Laskowski (L-CAP representative and Task Force Chair).

---

[1] https://www.library.illinois.edu/staff/committee/inclusion-in-governance-task-force/

Table of Contents

Work of the Task Force

The Task Force held regular meetings through Zoom during Fall 2021. Through its deliberations, the Task Force developed a plan to collect information about existing governance structures both within the University and the Library, as well as outside of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC). There was strong consensus among Task Force members that any recommendations put forth must reflect ideas and perspectives from Library personnel. The members organized a series of focus group discussions and invited employees in the Library to participate in surveys. The Task Force encouraged participation during the "Hangout" sessions and through Libnews. Information from focus group discussions and the surveys was then aggregated, reviewed and used to guide deliberations, and enabled the Task Force to formulate a set of recommendations for the University Library.

Overview of the Library's Current Governance Structure

The Bylaws of the Library play a pivotal role in shaping the current governance structure of the University Library, as they define the rights and responsibilities of the University Librarian and the Faculty.[2] The governance structure is further extended to include, directly or indirectly, Assistant and Associate University Librarians (AULs), Directors, the Executive Committee (EC), the Administrative Council (AC), Library Divisions, the Cabinet, Unit Heads, Library Committee of Academic Professionals (L-CAP), and the Library Staff Support Committee (LSSC).

In 2014 (revised in 2016) the University Librarian made revisions and structural changes to the governance structure through a document titled *Organizational Restructuring in Support of Strategic Leadership of the University of Illinois Library.*[3] This document articulates the University Librarian's vision for governance and reporting lines within the Library, as well as the introduction of the Cabinet, a body consisting of the University Librarian, AULs and Assistant Deans, and now includes Directors. Unlike other committees and advisory bodies, the Cabinet operates without a charge and does not share documentation with Library personnel. Similarly, the Budget Group is not represented on the Library organizational chart or committee pages.[4]

Descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of the University Librarian, Executive Committee, Divisions, and various committees including the Administrative Council can be found in the Library's bylaws.

---

[2] https://www.library.illinois.edu/staff/bylaws-the-library-university-of-illinois-at-urbana-champaign/
[3] https://uofi.box.com/s/tujtaaqixjmu63f6fccimatqr98wooyc
[4] https://www.library.illinois.edu/staff/administration/orgchart/

Investigation of Existing Inclusive Governance Models

Inclusive governance models on the UIUC Campus

The Inclusive Governance Taskforce queried the UIUC Academic Senate about other campus units with bylaws demonstrating inclusion across job classifications that the Library could use as exemplars. This inquiry yielded ten responses, including bylaws from eight campus departments and guidelines from University Extension. The Task Force received bylaws from the following departments: the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Science (NRES), the Economics Department, Linguistics, Aerospace Engineering, Theater, Political Science, History, and Agricultural and Consumer Economics.

Helpful provisions include:
- NRES has an Academic Professional Advisory Committee composed of four AP members. In addition to a Faculty Grievance Committee, they have an AP Grievance Committee composed of two faculty members and two AP members. They also have a Graduate Assistant Grievance Committee comprising two faculty members and two graduate student members.
- Economics has an advisory committee composed of three tenured faculty members, two tenure-track assistant professors, two specialized faculty members at any rank, and two staff members (either AP or Civil Service). The Advisory Committee essentially functions the same as the Library's current Executive Committee. Note that the Advisory Committee has two staff members. Economics also has an Appeals Committee (or grievance committee) comprised of one staff member in addition to two tenured faculty members, one tenure track professor, and one specialized faculty member.

The Task Force also solicited input from individuals and organizations on campus about their experiences with governance. Focus was on Academic Professionals, Civil Service staff, and Graduate Assistants[5]. A few personal observations were received; the most salient of which include:
- When a governance group is charged with providing "input" rather than having "authority" it has less impact.
- Two-way communication builds trust, and effective governance requires trust.
- If real authority beyond an advisory role is delegated to a governance group, the group can implement policy effectively only if resources and time are also provided.

---

[5] Resources provided include:

Illinois IT Governance (This resource was acknowledge as a sustainable and effective model of inclusive governance): https://techservices.illinois.edu/illinois-it-governance/
Council of Academic Professionals (CAP): https://cap.illinois.edu/
Chancellor's committees: http://chancellor.illinois.edu/committees.html
Provost's committees: https://provost.illinois.edu/about/committees/
VC for Student Affairs committees: http://studentaffairs.illinois.edu/committees/student-affairs-committees
Senate: https://senate.illinois.edu/constitution.asp
Technology Accessibility Review Committee: https://cam.illinois.edu/policies/hr-86/

Inclusive governance models at other academic libraries

Based on governance models that include Academic Professionals (AP) and Civil Service (CS) staff, The Task Force met with representatives from Milner Library at Illinois State University and from the College of New Jersey.

In response to a campus-wide initiative for more inclusion in governance at the College of New Jersey, the R. Barbara Gitenstein Library Governance document[6] was drafted in 2012 after nearly two years of revisions. Outcomes included a staff senate at the campus level (in this model APs and CS are grouped together) as well as advisory committees at the college/Library level composed of employees from every classification. It is worth noting that graduate and undergraduate students are eligible to serve on these advisory committees in voting roles. All levels of employment have an opportunity to participate and to voice concerns. Advisory committees handle all policy, programming, and strategic planning initiatives. Through our discussion we found that tension between CS and Faculty-level employees exists within these structures; some CS staff report feeling like second class citizens, and that it can be difficult to elicit participation from them because they lack incentive to serve (as in our Library, CS committee work is done in addition to daily work, without any monetary, status, or promotional benefits). However, a recent rise in CS staff with advanced degrees appears to correlate with a rise in CS participation in Library governance.

At Illinois State University (ISU), Milner Library uses a Library Council comprising three representatives from faculty, AP, and CS employment categories, as well as a student representative.[7] The Council acts in an advisory capacity to the Library Dean, and focuses on areas such as strategic planning, community-building, and creating campus partnerships. ISU noted other efforts to promote shared governance, including changing ad hoc committees to standing committees, and making Library Council meetings open to everyone to attend (which has become popular through using Zoom). The Library is also working to change the election process to make sure that those remaining on the ballot are willing to serve. Noted challenges to shared governance include there being no incentive for AP and CS staff to serve (while faculty get a letter for their tenure package), and that inclusivity and change depend on the current Council leadership.

Methodology for Collecting University Library data

The Task Force focused on collecting as many first-hand responses from University Library employees as possible in ways that considered varied communication preferences and protected anonymity. It conducted two rounds of data collection, with analysis from the first round informing questions asked for the survey and focus groups during the second round. Participants were recruited through Libnews, Library hangouts, and word of mouth.

The **first round** of internal data collection consisted of an open-ended, anonymous survey, an open office hour, redacted exit interview data from Human Resources, a series of focus groups, and finally a second, anonymous survey which provided individuals the opportunity to respond to the same prompts used in the focus groups. These efforts were aimed at exploring the existing level of understanding of Library governance, what, if any, pain points exist with the current process, and what interest individual employees have in personally serving on a more-inclusive governance body.

---

[6] https://library.tcnj.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/226/2018/11/LibraryGovernanceDocument_newFinal.pdf
[7] https://library.illinoisstate.edu/about/committees/

While survey responses helped to establish some general trends or prejudices among Library employees on the state of governance, the focus groups were critical in delving into the issues underlying those general trends. Each focus group was led by two facilitators from the Task Force and was open to employees from all classifications. The role of the facilitators within the focus group was established at the beginning of each session: their primary role was as active listeners, but they would take detailed notes and ask follow-up questions as appropriate. Anonymity would be guaranteed, and participants were encouraged to consider the focus group a safe space for sharing experiences. Focus groups were scheduled online and in-person at various times, including lunch hours and after 5:00 pm to accommodate multiple schedules and attendance opportunities.

The **second round** of data collection asked for feedback through anonymous surveys and focus groups on two proposed models of governance devised by the Task Force, informed by the investigation of inclusive governance models on- and off-campus as well as from the first round of internal data collection. Additionally, we asked for further comments regarding several themes pulled from the previous surveys and focus groups. Models proposed by the Task Force were meant as suggestions designed to encourage brainstorming and feedback amongst respondents. Regardless of whether a new governance model is enacted or how it is composed, certain issues will need to be addressed.

Survey instruments, focus group prompts, participation rates, and descriptions of proposed shared governance models can be found in the appendices. However, raw data is not included. Participants afforded a great deal of trust to the Task Force, particularly in the focus groups, and with trust being the greatest commodity to ensuring the current and future engagement of all employees in an inclusive governance structure, the Task Force determined it inappropriate to share anyone's personal and potentially identifiable) comments.

Discussion

Several themes quickly established themselves as obstacles to greater inclusivity in governance among respondents: communication, the role of the unit head or direct supervisor, the relationship between the Dean and EC, transparency within governance structures, civil service inclusion, and who "does the work" of the Library. These issues are discussed below, followed by feedback about governance models from the last round of data collection.

Communication. Employees at all levels expressed a lack of consistent and transparent communication from Library administrators. While there was frustration expressed at various aspects of communication, demoralization due to a lack of transparency on issues where input was sought stood out. Granted, some information cannot be shared in any organization, but many respondents felt ignored or undervalued when discussing instances where they were asked to provide their thoughts on an issue and never heard any explanation for why a decision was reached. This felt particularly true when input was contrary to the final outcome. As one responded explained, "the goal needs to be more than just collecting ideas, but of understanding and addressing those ideas so that folks feel heard. People are more open to hearing why something cannot be done if they feel they have been heard thoroughly in the first place."

The role of the unit head. In focus groups and exit interviews, it quickly became clear how much influence unit heads or supervisors hold over employees' experience of the Library. When open dialog is encouraged, employees are more likely to extend their trust for a supervisor up the administrative chain. However, in an environment where dialogue is unwelcome, employees are more likely to filter all other inter-Library engagements through that same lens. Civil Service staff were particularly forthcoming with describing experiences when they were discouraged or "not allowed" to participate in Library opportunities. When speaking about Library hangouts, a CS wrote "Staff are further discouraged from participation by unit heads, who prefer to maintain a facade of perfect unit cohesion at all times, in an attempt to maintain their position in the Library's endless internal political jockeying. I'd like to see staff concerns addressed more seriously, in an environment that discourages unit heads from downplaying those concerns." When discussing communication within the Library, another employee expressed that "it really depends on the unit and the unit head." Another suggested that "there should be documentation about Library support for all staff to participate including who to talk to if you aren't "allowed" or are a unit head who needs help managing around staff participation."

The relationship of the Dean and EC. Due to overwhelming feedback, members of the Task Force began to refer to this undercurrent as "the story of the two mountains" due to the unique executive/advisory relationship between the Dean and the Executive Committee each party will, in actuality or in perception, continue to expand their individual spheres of influence to counter-balance the decision-making power of the other. This relationship has left little room for other appointed and elected bodies in the Library to establish their own role in governance or for voices outside of this relationship to be heard. Specifically, Administrative Council (AC) is a group charged with advising the Dean on the day-to-day operations of the Library, yet rarely meets. One faculty member wrote about the current structure:

> There are numerous committees that are advisory to the Dean or to various AULs, but the conversations within are rarely brought to the faculty (or others) as a whole for anything other than info sharing/reporting, and are left to be reported piecemeal through Divisions (sometimes) or Libnews (sometimes) or online minutes (sometimes). Faculty meetings (of which we have fewer and fewer) rarely involve discussion, voting, or direction setting for the Library. Some of the committees are less than useful in that they are frequently canceled or are held without an agenda so that no meaningful work or discussion occurs, wasting everyone's time. And if you aren't "lucky" enough to be on EC or on other higher level committees, or in other small side groups, you don't have a seat at the table where decisions about allocating resources or other important topics are discussed…True governance and communication at all levels of the organization would help this. The general hangouts help to a degree, but we need to take a look at how organizational decisions are prioritized, discussed, and made, because it isn't through shared governance.

Transparency within Governance Structures. The overall sense of a lack of transparency stood out as a major theme in the data, encompassing communication issue but also within the Library's organizational chart. This document does not include the Cabinet or Budget group, which are understood to be decision making bodies. Additionally, neither body has a page on the staff website or any known charge. In a focus group, one participant called the Cabinet the "black box" of decision making, while another noted that the Cabinet "works on its own to make major decisions as far as I can tell." Another commented on the scope of EC and the Cabinet, saying "what decisions go to EC and what goes to Cabinet and which of those, if either, really have power to change beyond the decision of the Dean (i.e. are both just advisory?) is unclear." Many participants expressed a desire for more transparency on how budget decisions are made, in particular for GA allocation.

Figure 1: Word cloud in response to questions about improving the governance process to make it more inclusive

Civil Service Inclusion. Many employees have expressed a sense of disconnect among supervisors as to the perceived needs of their units and what we have begun to call The Capital 'L' Library. Greater emphasis must be placed on the entire Library as an organization without sacrificing the services of the individual units. Library administration can emphasize the need for more CS participation in governance by cross-training staff from different units or allocating resources for hourly workers if necessary to ensure CS staff and their supervisors are not put under undue stress.

"Doing the work." This phrase came up numerous times in surveys and focus groups, and highlights the disconnect many employees feel between those making policy and those working directly with patrons. Additionally, it serves to highlight a general lack of understanding regarding what constitutes Library "work." One employee wrote: "during the pandemic…administration handed down so many poor policy decisions without staff input, decisions that would have benefited from the experience and firsthand knowledge of those same staff. Staff and patrons were left to shoulder the burdens and untangle the mess." Another noted: "I would hope for a governance structure that centers the perspectives of those actually performing the work when making major decisions ..." In a survey, a respondent said "I'd like to see every employee in the Library, from the Dean on down, work two hours a week at a circulation or reference desk. I absolutely believe that everyone who makes major decisions for the Library has how [sic] to help the patrons for whom this Library exists."

Governance Models.
While noting that the survey was not a true vote, participants were asked to indicate their preference for one of the governance models. Of the 44 respondents, 52.3% were in favor of Model 2 over Model 1 or maintaining the status quo. This was also the clear choice between Civil Service Employees (60%) and faculty (57%).

	Totals		APs		CSs		Faculty		GAs	
Models	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Remain as it currently is	1	2.3%	0		0		1	5%	0	
Expand Executive Committee	8	18.1%	5	56%	1	10%	2	9.5%	0	
Reconstitute Administrative Council	23	52.3%	1	11%	6	60%	12	57%	4	100%
Other	12	27.3%	3	33%	3	30%	6	28.5%	0	

Table 1: Governance Model Support

Participants were encouraged to include explanatory comments in their survey responses. Several issues mentioned by multiple respondents are worth noting here:

- Many wrote in favor of expanding EC, however it is probably not feasible because it would conflict with the University Statutes.
- While there was widespread support for greater inclusion of non-faculty in the decision-making process, many faculty reiterated strong support for maintaining faculty majority control of Library governance.
- Support was shown for including graduate assistant representation on a reconstituted Administrative Council, but there was a great deal of pushback against assigning a number of seats for this group based on proportional representation. These objections focused largely around the heavy and unfair workload this would place on student representatives as well as their lack of experience and relatively short employment with the Library.

Many who favored an "other" model of governance noted that these do not have to be mutually exclusive changes.

	Totals		APs		CSs		Faculty		GAs	
Issues	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Communication	32	73%	7	78%	8	80%	13	62%	4	100%
Greater support for CS inclusion	29	66%	7	78%	10	100%	9	43%	3	75%
Better documentation of governance	34	77%	8	89%	7	70%	17	81%	2	50%
Consistency in transparency	28	64%	7	78%	8	80%	10	48%	3	75%
EC and the open meetings policy	29	66%	8	89%	8	80%	10	48%	3	75%

Table 2: Support for improving individual issues regardless of governance model

Additionally, over half of all respondents agreed with each of the general comments on Communication (73%); Greater support for CS inclusion (66%); Better documentation of governance (77%); Consistency in transparency (64%); and EC and the Open Meetings Policy (66%)[2].

Recommendations

The Inclusion in Governance Task Force recommends the following actions:

1. Charge a task force composed of Library Civil Service, Academic Professionals, and Faculty to draft a new Administrative Council. This task force will need to address the following specifics:
   a. Charge.
      i. The current charge addresses AC's advisory goal in "the promulgation and implementation of standards, regulations and procedures that relate to the general operating policies of the Library."
      ii. Work with Executive Committee to
         1. Clarify areas of responsibility;
         2. Reconcile the role of Divisions and Division Coordinators in AC;
         3. Identify areas of potential overlap;
         4. Consider procedures for meeting in joint session should doing so be occasionally advantageous to the University Library;
         5. Explore innovative ways to solicit agenda items and continuous feedback to incorporate and deliberate on AC from Library employees.
   b. Membership.
      i. Number and allocation of seats including the following classifications:
         1. Library faculty;
         2. Academic and Civil Service Professionals;
         3. Civil Service employees.
      ii. Create a role for a graduate assistant representative.
      iii. Election process.
         1. Term limits;
         2. Restrictions on eligibility (visiting positions, rank or years of service, etc.);
      iv. Consider the role and make-up of Council officers;
      v. Consider the role of ex-officio members.
2. Communication.
   a. Create a "statement of principles" or "community agreement" (see Appendix 1) for all governance bodies such as EC and AC. This statement should not only underscore the commitment to inclusive, respectful conversation but also acknowledge deliberation as a safe space for disagreement. Constructive criticism is an important part of the deliberative process and comes from a desire to improve the entire organization.
   b. Strive to learn responsibilities and expectations of all employee classifications, so that there is a better understanding of the "work" of the Library beyond service desks. This could be encouraged through experiences such as "Random Coffee[8]."
   c. Commit to announcing governance bodies' decisions in a timely and clear manner whenever legally possible. If input was sought from non-members in the decision-making process, it is necessary for the announcement to recognize the decision may not represent the advice of all involved but was determined to be the best course of action.

---

[8] https://www.random-coffee.com/

d. Create and maintain a visual representation of Library governance separate from the organizational flowchart. This should show the relationship between the Dean and EC as well as any other governance bodies and what, if any, oversight they have over each other.

e. Establish transparency of the Cabinet and the Budget Group. This includes the creation of respective pages on the Staff site listing their charge, membership, and agendas/minutes.

f. Eliminate EC exemption to the Open Meetings Policy. Executive Committee meetings should no longer be held in "executive session," but maintain the right to go into "executive session" when agenda items require it.

3. Establish a support system for greater inclusion of Civil Service employees.

a. Issue a Library-wide statement indicating their support for all Civil Service employees' ability to serve on committees with CS representation, including the reconstituted Administrative Council.

b. Codify the ability for CS employees to serve on Library committees in their job descriptions. A certain percentage could be allocated to ensure judicious use of time.

c. Provide resources to ensure service points continue to operate effectively when CS staff are absent on committee business. Consider:

   i. Cross-training staff from other units for planned coverages.
   ii. Provide funds for hourly staff or additional graduate assistants as required.
   iii. Establish expectations of APs and Faculty members to maintain daily operations of the University Library and cover service points when necessary.

Further Recommendations for Greater Inclusion

1. Create a "Statement of Expectations." The Library should create a document outlining how Library employees are accountable to each other and the expectations we should maintain of each other (such as being punctual for scheduled shifts and attending meetings for which you accepted the invitation). This would be an excellent agenda item for a reconstituted Administrative Council.

2. Provide staff training on communicating effectively with supervisors and other situations involving power dynamics.

3. Invest in management training for unit heads.

   a. Provide leadership training for supervisors and unit heads.
   b. Ensure that all unit heads are acting consistently and in accordance with Library policy.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Library Assessment Committee "Community Agreement"

Listen Actively: Try to understand others before being understood.

Step In, Step Back: Step up and use your voice or Step Back and make space for others.

Speak from Your Own Lived Experience: Use "I" statements and refrain from telling other people's stories.

Invest in Yourself and Invest in Each Other: Honor our shared space and keep time in mind.

Think Beyond Binaries: Hold multiple perspectives at once.

Stories Stay, Lessons Go: Confidentiality and personal privacy.

Repair Harm: Seek space to repair harm when we mess up.

Recruitment email:

Good afternoon, everyone

The Library, as an organization and a culture, has dedicated itself to engaging new avenues of inclusion. As part of these engagements the Library Executive Committee (EC) has charged the Inclusion in Governance Task Force to explore how the Library can be more inclusive across employment classifications in governance and decision making.

The Task Force wants to hear from faculty members, civil service employees, graduate assistants, and academic professions on the topic of governance. We will be opening several avenues of communication and encourage you to take advantage of the ones with which you feel most comfortable.

Deliberately trying to avoid any question bias, we have created an anonymous from in Webtools allowing you to provide as much feedback as you wish on the current and future role of governance within the Library: https://forms.illinois.edu/sec/139135030.

Over the next three months you will also be notified of opportunities to participate in focus groups and attend office hours. More than anything our desire is to hear from as many of you as possible in order to provide the most thorough exploration of employee ideas and interest in inclusive governance.

Sincerely,

Sara Benson

Erik Chapman (co-chair)

Sarah Christensen

Gregg Homerding

Joanne Kaczmarek

John Laskowski (co-chair)

Joe Lenkart

Survey

Participants

Classification	N	%
Academic Professionals	6	21%
Civil Service Employees	12	41%
Faculty Members	8	28%
Graduate Students	3	10%

The Library Executive Committee (EC) has charged the Inclusion in Governance Task Force to explore how the Library can be more inclusive across employment classifications in governance and decision making.

It is important to define what we mean when discussing "governance." We are specifically investigating the process through which decisions are made that impact the entire Library as a whole. It is important to realize that the process involves a variety of policies and consultative bodies including existing statutes and policies, committees, divisions, and individuals, as well as formal and informal discussions and evidence-based data.

The current model of governance in the University Library is one of shared governance where the University Librarian is the Dean of the Library with the Executive Committee (elected members of the

Library faculty) serving as a principle advisory board with the University Librarian is the ex-officio member of the Executive Committee and serves as its chairperson. Other advisory bodies in the Library include the Administrative Council and "Cabinet."

When considering a more inclusive governance structure, we have taken Gary Olsen's definition from a 2009 blog post in The Chronicle of Higher Education as our guide, *"True shared governance attempts to balance maximum participation in decision making with clear accountability.... Genuine shared governance gives voice (but not necessarily ultimate authority) to concerns common to all constituencies as well as to issues unique to specific groups."*

Q1: Please identify your employment classification:
- ☐ Academic Professional
- ☐ Civil Service
- ☐ Faculty
- ☐ Graduate Student
- ☐ Other

Q2: Please use this space to give us your thoughts, questions, concerns, etc. on Library governance and the idea of greater inclusivity across employment classifications in Library governance.

Please feel free to use our statement above as a springboard to your own ideas if you'd like, but this is your space to use as you see fit. This is an anonymous survey, and we simply would like to get your honest feelings about the issue.

Appendix 3: Survey 2 and Focus groups (November 1–November 10)

Recruitment email

Good morning, everyone,

Over the past two weeks we had several informative and enjoyable focus groups with employees from all classifications. As promised, we've created an anonymous survey with the same prompts we used in the focus groups. You are invited to provide your feedback to these prompts to be compiled with the feedback we received during our discussions. This survey opportunity will be available through Wednesday, November 10th. The survey is available here: https://ows.io/qs/07p7op8r.

Best,

Sara Benson

Erik Chapman

Sarah Christensen

Gregg Homerding

Joanne Kaczmarek

John Laskowski

Joe Lenkart

Survey

Participants

Classification	N	%
Academic Professionals	2	17%
Civil Services Employees	6	50%
Faculty Members	3	25%
Graduate Assistants	1	8%

Q1: Please identify your employment classification:
- ☐ Academic Professional
- ☐ Civil Service
- ☐ Faculty
- ☐ Graduate Student
- ☐ Other

Q2: How would you define the terms "Governance" and "Administration?" Would you make any distinction between those two terms?
NOTE: We are specifically focused on inclusion in terms of different employment classifications. Issues of diversity, equity, and accessibility are left to the DEIA Task Force.

Q3: How would you describe the current governance processes in the University Library?

Q4: What do you appreciate about the current governance processes in the University Library?

Q5: What would you like to see improved about the current governance processes in the University Library?

Q6: Do you have ideas/suggestions for making governance processes more inclusive?

Q7: Can you provide examples of topics/issues you'd like to see discussed in a more inclusive way?

Q8: Would you be interested in personally participating in a more inclusive governance process?

Q9: Please feel free to provide any additional feedback about governance and inclusion.

Focus Groups

(Questions the same as the survey)

October 21, 2021: 3 participants (1 faculty, 1 AP, 1 CSS)

October 26, 2021: 5 participants (2 faculty, 2 AP, 1 CSS)

October 27, 2021: 6 participants (1 faculty, 6 CSS)

October 28, 2021: 3 participants (2 CSS, 1 GA)

Appendix 4: Survey 3 and Focus Groups (November 30–December 10)

Recruitment email:

The members of the Inclusion in Governance Task Force want to thank all of you who took the time to share your thoughts on the current state of Library governance and your visions of how that governance could be more inclusive of all employment classifications.

The Task Force has been reviewing all of your feedback, as well as looking at inclusive governance elsewhere on campus and at other academic libraries across the country, and have identified two possible models for increasing inclusion in our governance structure. These models are concepts based on feedback we received, but neither of them is set in stone. It is also important to note elements of each model could be combined to create additional possibilities.

We are asking for your feedback and encourage you to share idea of your own for improving on these models or suggesting new ones.

It is important to note that this survey is not a vote to change the current structure or to implement a new model. This is a collective brainstorming session to better inform the final report of the Task Force to the Executive Committee.

The survey is anonymous and available from now through Friday, December 10th at https://surveys.illinois.edu/sec/1122706374.

We are also hosting three optional focus groups next week to which we invite you to come and share your thoughts on these models and your own ideas for making a more inclusive governance structure for the Library. We will be sending out an invitation to register for one of the focus groups in the next day or two.
Wednesday, December 8 from 12:00 – 1:00 pm in Main Library Room 106
Thursday, December 9 from 1:00 – 2:00 pm in Main Library Room 106
Thursday, December 9 from 6:00 – 7:00 pm via Zoom
Sincerely,
Sara Benson
Erik Chapman
Sarah Christensen
Gregg Homerding
Joanne Kaczmarek
John Laskowski
Joe Lenkart

Survey
Participants

Classification	N	%
Academic professionals	9	20%
Civil service staff	10	23%
Faculty members	21	48%
Graduate assistant	4	9%
Other	0	0

Q1: Please identify your employment classification:
- ☐ Academic Professional
- ☐ Civil Service
- ☐ Faculty
- ☐ Graduate Student
- ☐ Other

Q2: Please provide feedback on this model:

Expand the Executive Committee. The proposed expansion of EC would increase the number of members from 8 to 12, but would decrease the number of faculty members from 8 to 6. Six of these positions would remain faculty positions and would maintain the same rules for election and division representation. The 6 additional seats on EC would be allocated as follows: 3 Civil Service seats and 3 Academic Professional seats. Election to these seats would be open to all employees within those classifications without limitations of divisional representation. CS and AP members would serve two-year terms. This proposal would require a change to the bylaws of the Library, but the role of EC in Library governance would remain.

Q3: Please provide feedback on this model:

Reconstitute the Administrative Council. The proposed reconstitution of AC would include two components. The first component would involve reconfiguring membership of AC to include representatives from Academic Professional and Civil Service classifications and remove the requirement that Faculty membership be explicitly represented by Division Coordinators. The number of seats on Academic Council would be increased from 9 to 13: 4 seats for Civil Service Staff; 3 seats from Faculty members; 3 seats for Academic Professionals; and 3 seats for Graduate Assistants. All interested parties from each classification would be eligible for election to 2-year terms, with the exception of Graduate Assistants who be eligible for 1-year terms, with sitting representative eligible for re-election (No Graduate Assistant can serve more than 2 consecutive 1-year terms). The second component would involve splitting EC responsibilities between AC and EC where AC would take on a more active role in the development and/or review of policies and procedures and their effect on the day-to-day operation of the Library. AC would also advise on:

1. the creation and make-up of Library committees (except those exclusively made up of faculty members),
2. non-faculty hiring and budgetary considerations impacting the day-to-day operation of the Library,
3. other advisory functions when requested by the Dean.

This proposal would require a change to the bylaws of the Library. It would also require EC (the membership of which would remain as-is) to refocus its attention on faculty-specific issues similar to the current operation of L-CAP and LSSC, leaving issues of Library-wide impact to Administrative Council.

Q4: Given the choice, what would be your preference?
- **Governance should remain as it currently is.**
- **Expand the Executive Committee**
- **Reconstitute the Administrative Council**
- **Other, please explain:**

Q5: There were also several selected constructive criticisms that emerged from our conversations that did not in themselves constitute new ways of governance but would improve governance regardless of the model.

Q5a: Please note if you agree with the following comment:

Communication. Many employees have voiced a concern that messaging is inconsistent; would like feedback from decision-makers on why certain decisions were made particularly if those decisions are adverse to solicited feedback (understanding that there are certain issues that must remain confidential); would like to have greater transparency when it comes to how decisions are made, including budgetary ones.

Q5b: Please note if you agree with the following comment:

Greater support of Civil Service inclusion. Many employees have expressed a sense of disconnect among supervisors as to the perceived needs of their units and what we have begun to call The Capital 'L' Library. We need to place greater emphasis on the entire Library as an organization without sacrificing the services of the individual units. Library administration can emphasize the need for more CS participation in governance by cross-training staff from different units or allocate resources for hourly workers if necessary to ensure CS staff and their supervisors are not put under undue stress.

Q5c: Please note if you agree with the following comment:

Better documentation of governance. We have an organizational chart but it is limited in scope. We need a document/graphic detailing a complete overview of governance bodies (EC, AC, L-CAP, LSSC, Cabinet, the Budget Committee, etc.) This document should detail the role each body plays in running the Library. It would also be an excellent tool for reviewing areas of overlap and maintain clear lines of distinction to avoid over-reach.

Q5d: Please note if you agree with the following comment:

Consistency in transparency. Many employees are concerned about the "shadowy" nature of "the Cabinet" and the Budget Group. Neither of these bodies have a page on the Staff web site or any known charge. Maintaining these groups as they are seems disconnected from the spirit of inclusive governance, and it would be best if they were as transparent in their role and actions as other bodies in the Library.

Q5e: Please note if you agree with the following comment:

EC and the Open Meetings Policy. The Library's Open Meetings Policy states that EC always meets in "executive session" which makes it exempt to the Open Meetings Policy. After reviewing several years of agendas, it is recommended this exemption be reconsidered and EC be required to adhere to the Open Meetings Policy while reserving the same right as all committees to use "executive session" when necessary.

Focus Groups

December 8, 2021: 5 participants (3 CSS, 2 faculty)

December 8, 2021 (afternoon): cancelled due to attendance

December 8, 2021 (evening): cancelled due to attendance