

LCP (formerly LCAP)

June 8, 2022, at 3:00PM via Zoom

**Present:** Susan Braxton (Chair), Heather Murphy, Megan N Pearson, Will Schlaack (*ex officio*), Jen-chien Yu

**Absent:** John Laskowski, Hoa Luong, Tracy Tolliver

**Minutes:** Megan N Pearson

Meeting called to order at 3:05PM.

1. Approval of May minutes: approved.
2. CAP updates: Will
  - a. Jake Metz is no longer *ex officio* on LCP as his CAP term has ended.
  - b. New District 9 rep is Eric Kurt (Media Commons Coordinator, Scholarly Commons, UIUC Library). Susan will talk to Library IT to update the distribution list as well as add Eric to upcoming meetings. There was some confusion among LCP members about this CAP election: no one saw a ballot (possibly Eric was the only applicant?), the timeline seemed to be delayed from previous years, and Eric's appointment was not announced to the District he represents. Will noted he would bring these constituent concerns to the CAP Chair (Rich Gegg).
  - c. Currently the AP Development Fund (APDF) position on CAP is open, so there are delays with fulfilling the requests; if there are questions on APDF, constituents should contact Will and he will help follow-up.
  - d. CAP are working on an *ad hoc* Employee Wellbeing Committee; currently in the planning phase of what this would look like (taking inspiration from [IHR Wellbeing site](#) and [University of Birmingham Wellbeing site](#)). Proposed by a new member, the committee would be a resource for APs to be aware of the wellbeing services resources on campus. Do not have to be a member of CAP to serve on the committee; can also reach out to CAP or Will if anyone has recommendations.
  - e. The Academic Senate–Faculty and Academic Staff Benefits subcommittee sent a letter to the provost requesting information about raises in the past: the subcommittee wants to look at equity and if salaries are keeping up with inflation – they are not, so there is a movement to raise awareness.
3. Guest Susan Breakenridge to discuss LCP meetings with candidates and the LCP role in the search process.
  - a. Breakenridge noted that her reason for attending unannounced a recent LCP meeting with a CSP candidate was to observe the interaction, see what information was being shared with the candidate, and see a CSP versus AP interview, but did not mean to interject and apologized for causing concern among LCP. Some information from campus regarding CSP classification has come down, so in the next few weeks Breakenridge hopes to discuss with Dean Wilkin the CSP hiring process and what can

be said to CSP candidates going forward, and how this would impact LCP in supporting future candidate searches.

- b. Breakenridge asked how LCP felt about participating in the search process for CSP and AP candidates; her impression is that LCP wants to participate and that it makes sense for LCP to do so, and if LCP agrees, she can collect data from the candidates to see if they find meeting with LCP valuable as well. Jen offered a bit of history for LCP's participation in the search process: previously, AP searches were modeled closely to those of Faculty searches, but roughly 10 years ago Josh Harris (AP and founding member of LCAP as it was known then) noted that most of the people he met with during his search process were Faculty, so it was challenging to not meet with people in the same classification as the position to discuss their experience as an AP working at the Library. This helped spur the creation of LCAP (in 2016), and it was not until Jake MacGregor joined LCAP that the Committee joined the search process for AP positions (approximately 2020): not evaluating the candidates, but meeting with them as a recruitment tactic. Susan concurred that it's really only the stakeholder group meetings (Divisions, etc.) in which the candidates are "grilled," and that the LCP meetings have evolved to be just informational for the candidates.
- c. Breakenridge noted the value of this idea, that candidates could speak with current employees in the same classification and feel a bit more connected to the organization, but her concern is with the CSP positions as it is a slightly different situation and should be careful with what is said during the meetings. Susan noted that LCP has a script that is used when talking to the CSP candidates (what supports are available, etc.); however, if the position is not eligible for the supports, then it would make sense that LCP would not need to meet with those candidates. But there is also concern with representation, as LCP has currently incorporated CSP positions into their constituency, but that might not be the best option. Breakenridge agreed that it is one thing for LCP to help recruit and support, but who should be represented in LCP is an issue; hopes in the next few weeks she will have more clarity, but needs to speak with Dean Wilkin before announcing more widely.
- d. Susan noted that it might be helpful if when a position's search process is opened, the announcement includes if the position is eligible for some of the supports, so that LCP would have better information on what they should or not communicate with the candidates – what to say in meetings with CSP has been tenuous, and it feels like there's a chance things could change if the new Dean wants to do things differently. Breakenridge noted that most likely something like this would not be changed within the new Dean's first year, especially something that had been planned and budgeted for (though those kinds of things might come up in the next budgeting cycle). Will commented that in that case, meeting with LCP could be more of a "welcome wagon," an informal chat about the Library, the campus, and the community, and the information about support becomes more of a secondary point of the meeting.
- e. Breakenridge asked for clarification that the script is documented? Susan replied that LCP created a handout and script for these meetings. Will noted that the handout does a good job explaining the supports, so the meeting ends up being a chance to learn things and make connections. Breakenridge noted that as LCP does

- not have a stake in the process, it is a great opportunity to answer candidate questions and be more sincere and honest about their experience at the Library; it might be good to have HR include in the interview packet a note for candidates to bring questions about the community/library culture for the LCP meeting.
- f. Breakenridge asked if the current time allowance is enough (30 minutes), or if a larger amount would be better? Susan noted that the half hour is enough and typically the entire time is not used – but it helps to be a bit of a buffer between the more critical meetings (e. g., candidate can be late to LCP meeting and leave early for a break without any detriment to their interview process). Susan also noted that generally just 2-4 LCP members attend, not all.
  - g. Jen noted that it might be good to remind the Search Chair to give LCP a heads-up when interview meetings with candidates are scheduled, and maybe to have the Chair “show” the candidate into the meeting, as transitions between the interview sessions can be awkward when candidates aren’t familiar with or fully understand the process. Susan concurred, and noted that even with Zoom interviews it can be a good thing to have an escort, though eventually we’ll probably return to in-person interviews, where someone always escorts the candidate between rooms/sessions. Breakenridge agreed, and noted that because of the increase in remote work, most likely there will continue to be a hybrid option for the stakeholders in the interview, even as the majority of the people involved (candidates included) are in-person for the interviews.
  - h. Thanking LCP for their time, Breakenridge noted this has been a helpful session. She will meet with Aneitre Johnson and Kim Hutcherson and “firm up” some approaches on how to deal with LCP meeting in the CSP interviews: is it welcoming and informational or should it be a stakeholder meeting (with defined parameters), and if welcoming there should a limit on the time slot (no more than 30 minutes), also discuss documentation for the search process, such as the language that needs to be included with the documentation for the committee chairs, etc. and what options and rules are available for an informational session.
4. Upcoming LCP Election
- a. The LCP election will occur in July (back on the usual cycle) and will be for 4 seats.
  - b. Heather, Jen, and Susan volunteered to run the election (same team as last year).
  - c. Susan asked who would set up future meetings, as it has previously been the Chair but the chair is outgoing this year. Will suggested that the Bylaws could have a hierarchy of whose responsibility it should be (e. g., “the Chair should set the meetings, if Chair is not available then the Secretary, if the Secretary is not available... etc.”), and Megan agreed.
5. Quarterly Meeting with Dean Wilkin
- a. Next meeting is June 16<sup>th</sup>.
  - b. There is an agenda, but if there is anything else members would like to discuss, please add to it.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10PM.