

Minutes

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Library Faculty Meeting
March 9, 2016
3:02-4:32
126 GSLIS

1. John Wilkin called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.
- 2.1 The Agenda of the meeting was accepted as distributed.
- 2.2 A motion by Mary Laskowski and seconded by Michael Norman called for approval of the minutes of the December 2, 2015 and February 10, 2016. No action was taken on the motion.
- 2.3 Introductions. There were no introductions to be made at this meeting.
- 2.4 Report of the University Librarian. Wilkin reported that the Library had been given a deadline of March 28 for submission of the FY17 budget to the campus administration. The document is currently well in hand. We have been asked to present models for 3, 5 and 7 percent reductions and to “speak to” the possibility of a rescission of 12.5 to 25 percent, but he is optimistic that there will not be a rescission and that the collection budget will be “protected.” He called for the Library to get out of the “hunkering down” mode and instead talk about what the Library is and what it can do with the resources it does have. This is reflected, for example, in the draft budget document which by discussing the CARE Center in Grainger suggests a role for the Library in the tutoring process. Furthermore, we are emphasizing the Library’s work in partnering with campus units. The budget hearing will be April 12.
- 2.5 Report of the Executive Committee. Kirstin Dougan summarized topics at the two meetings of the Executive Committee that had occurred since the last faculty meeting. These included: communication processes used by the EC; budget; merger of the Human Resources and Business Office; forthcoming closure of some of the Residence Hall libraries; divisional placement for some units within the Research Office; call for the Bylaws Committee to review current policies for zero percent-time appointments. In addition, the EC has reviewed or acted on several reports including: an Innovation Fund progress report; the Reproduction Fee task force recommendations; the ClimateQual study; approval of a charge for a digital humanities needs assessment group; Library emeriti faculty benefits; and a charge for a New Service Model team to examine the Classics Library.

Becky Smith requested that one further week be provided for responses to the Classics Library NSM charge. After some discussion about the relation of the timing for that NSM and an interview for a Classics related position, it was agreed that Dougan would send out an announcement if the EC agrees to extend that deadline for comment.

3. Discussion and Questions on Matters of Interest to Faculty and Academic Professionals.

Wilkin noted that the core of the March Faculty Meeting was to be devoted to an open discussion of issues related to communication and structure among related administrative and governance groups within the Library. To engage in the discussion and respond to questions, Wilkin asked the following AULs and EC members to join him at the front of the room: Kirstin Dougan, MJ Han, JoAnn Jacoby, Mary Laskowski, Lori Mestre, Bill Mischo, Beth Namachchivaya, Nancy O'Brien, Lynne Rudasill, and Sarah Williams.

In advance of the meeting a brief call had been sent out to the Library listserv to elicit questions for this meeting's open discussion. He noted that one concerned the relationship between the Executive Committee and the Administrative Council, and he said that the difference was rather clearly laid out in the Bylaws. As to the "Cabinet," he stated that it was his recent invention, but one he does not want to elevate with a formal structure. Rather, the name is merely a "handle" to describe the group of Associate University Librarians, and the Assistant Deans convened for discussions when there is an intersection of operational responsibilities. Although advice is provided through the Cabinet, as per the Bylaws and the *University Statutes*, the Executive Committee is the primary advisory body.

Hinchliffe noted that the past year had witnessed confusion regarding which matters went to the EC vs. the AC. She expressed concern that for some matters which had gone to the AC, they later were routed to the EC for what seemed to be an effort to provide a higher level review. Wilkin asked members of the EC to comment on Hinchliffe's question. Laskowski noted that in the case of the Fees Schedule, this had been a matter which began by a question that came to the EC so it was logical for it to then come back to EC as an informational item. William Maher objected saying that the EC report that had been presented in Item 2.5 above described the EC's action as "approved" and that, regardless, such documents and reports historically have been the purview of the Administrative Council, not the Executive Committee. Dougan noted that perhaps her word "approved" had not been well chosen, and Kim Matherly stated that the minutes of the EC meeting in question had used the word "accepted."

Tim Cole reminded the body that historically the Executive Committee was not the only group that issued charges for committees, and that the Administrative Council often has charged committees. He stressed that attention should be paid not just to the Bylaws but to the *Statutes* which have precedence over the Bylaws. The Executive Committee's role comes from the *Statutes* whereas the Administrative Council is strictly a creature of the Library. Mischo noted that having an Administrative Council is not entirely anomalous since someone had once said it was "like a curriculum committee" and curriculum committees exist through most of the campus colleges. Wilkin acknowledged that he was still trying to learn the system, and that he was comfortable with the Administrative Council doing policy approvals.

Wilkin stated that another question that had been submitted related to the nature of the advisory role of people on the Executive Committee. O'Brien noted that there has long been an issue of whether Executive Committee members represent themselves or the division from which they come, and stated that her sense was that it was some of both. Namachchivaya referenced an understanding from the time she first served on the EC some years ago that Divisional

representation was to occur through the Administrative Council, and Wilkin underscored his sense that the Administrative Council was really a representative body.

Tim Cole reminded the faculty that the entire Divisional structure emerged from the breakup (in the early 1990s) of the Library's statutory departments. Then, the idea had been that Divisions were to have a role in both administration and in faculty governance especially relating to promotion and tenure. The extent of this latter function has declined, and there is not really a good mechanism for people within Divisions to bring forward governance issues. Mischo noted that Divisions play a role by recommending names of outside reviewers for the promotion and tenure process and reminded the body that there had been a review of the Divisional structure, chaired by Lisa Hinchliffe, just a few years ago.

In response to a question from Laskowski about the differences of the governance roles in Departments vs. Divisions, Cole provided background to the 1992 change. Then Departments, which by terms of the *Statutes* could only be created, merged, deleted, or separated through a succession of votes, were abandoned because more flexibility was desired in organizing how the Library's program, policy, and operations were delivered. Hinchliffe mentioned that the recent Divisional Structures Task Force report also provided background on the early 1990s changes. While the current structure is not perfect, it did provide a good basis for work while resolving some of the old issues.

Wilkin stated that a further question received had asked about the recent reorganizations. Namachchivaya clarified that this concerned the fact that the reorganization plan had called for four AULs whereas only three are in place. This was because the Information Technology position had not been created, and there had been a plan to revise the plan document, but in the interim Tom Habing was acting in this capacity, indeed with quite an extensive portfolio. Hinchliffe questioned whether the plan should not have the IT person as part of the Cabinet. Wilkin stated that it was not necessary since technology permeates all that the Library does, and he does not want to segment it to one area—it is everyone's responsibility.

Jen-chien Yu noted that the current campus system indicates that shared governance was for faculty but wondered if there would be ways for more inclusive communication of ideas from Academic Professionals. (She later clarified that her inquiry was not just about communication from the Executive Committee but about communication in general.) Wilkin stated that this concerns him as well and that he hoped the recent recommendation to create an advisory body for APs could help. Cole said another facet was the lack of clarity and consistency in how we move forward and make decisions. For example, people are given a new task because someone else has left and then the responsibility is assigned by an AUL without any general announcement. Thus, this lack of communication is not limited to just APs. Dougan said this was how it had worked whether one is in a faculty or a non-faculty position, and Cole said the confusion came from the lack of a document laying things out.

After an extended digression regarding whether a team structure approach, such as had been applied in the Education and Social Science Library might provide a useful parallel for some of the shifts in personnel and functions about which Cole had expressed concern, the discussion

returned to the concern about inclusion first voiced by Jen-chien. In this regard, Cole reminded the body that there are certain things statutorily required to be done within the Executive Committee, but that now that the Library has more Academic Professionals, we may need some new structures.

As the discussion neared its conclusion, a few other matters were raised. Hinchliffe said that meaningful shared governance and a sense of community could be improved if the deadlines for comments and action were clearly noted in meeting minutes so people would know what to expect. Clara Chu noted that the campus process for zero percent-time appointments was straight-forward and already articulated in campus documents therefore the proposed review committee mentioned in Dougan's report would not be needed. Karen Hogenboom noted that Chu's comments illustrated that it was not possible for the Executive Committee to know or be aware of everything, and therefore the EC needed to put out information and the charges for groups to obtain feedback. Dougan noted that it was not possible to put out the charges for groups before all the individuals to be appointed had agreed to serve, but Joanne Kaczmarek said that EC could solve this problem by simply putting out the charges without the names. Wilkin, Dougan, and Lori Mestre commented that since it was not always possible to provide charges with no names listed, some flexibility was needed.

Wilkin said we could never have too much communication. Aaron McCollough commented that there was difficulty in the push-pull problem of information, especially with entropy setting in when one person is responsible for pushing everything out. We need to find ways to work more efficiently given the large amounts of data being distributed. Wilkin closed this agenda item by thanking the AULS and EC members and all those attending for participating in and contributing to this discussion, and he promised to do this again.

5. Announcements.

On the evening of March 9, there will be a session on micro-aggressions at the Undergraduate Library. Ingold announced that on Friday March 11:00 at 5:00 p.m. there would be a hearing conducted by the student committee looking into the question of a new mascot. Carissa Phillips reminded everyone that the Research and Publication Committee would welcome applications for funds for research projects.

6. Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:32 p.m.