University Library Committee Minutes
October 11, 2017

Present: Thomas Burr, Oz Dincer, Duleep Delpechitre, Melissa Johnson, Chad Kahl, Kathy Webster, Shari Zeck

Absent: S.J. Chang, Carolyn Hunt, Alan Lessoff, Dallas Long, Ed Reitz

Meeting was called to order at 3:20pm.

Burr welcomed members to the start of a new academic year.   Delpechitre introduced himself.

Minutes approved from last meeting with Thomas Burr's edit noted in bold.

Burr noted Long was correct in pointing out that the Blue Book stated that the Student Government Association is supposed to find undergraduate representatives per the Blue Book. Amy Hurd put out call for interested grad students—no response to this point. Burr will be talking with the Vice-President of the Student Government Association about getting a long-term solution to getting undergraduate student representation, which has been difficult in the past.

Milner updates

Zeck said bids are out for removal of the canopy and are due by October 24. Bid for rest of plaza work will be done separately. Zeck noted challenges with initial plaza bid. The only bid received did not meet requirements.   The bid's estimated cost for the project was also well over the amount the university had estimated for the project. If the rejected bid's estimate was meaningful, then the university had under-estimated the costs of the plaza and first floor rehabilitation.

Kahl shared numbers on review of items in IRMA:

Start of project count of storage basement monographs – 293,929
- Monographs reviewed and retained – 158,574 (54%)
    - Temporarily stored onsite (floors 4 & 5) – 123,980
    - Temporarily stored off-site – 34,594
- Monographs withdrawn – 135,355 (46%)
    - Given to Government Documents as <u>potential</u> state or federal documents – 8,475
    - Sent to UIUC as part of CARLI's *Last Copy Project* – 10,744
    - Recycled – 115,866

Start of project count of storage basement periodicals – 147,880
- Periodicals reviewed and retained – 93,492 (63%)
- Periodicals withdrawn – 54,388 (37%)

Start of project count of storage basement non-book materials (including VHS & LPs) – 21,283
- Non-book materials reviewed and retained – 18,716 (88%)

- Non-book materials withdrawn – 2,567 (12%)

Zeck noted she had just sent a charge to the tenured and tenure track (T/TT) faculty caucus to prepare a white paper on the status of tenure. She noted Milner had nearly twice as many T/TT faculty twenty years ago. The charge asked for examination of tenure at other institutions in state and comparator institutions at R2 level. She asked for recommendations for future of T/TT positions. Dan Holland will convene the faculty and coordinate the work of the group.

Johnson felt that giving the charge to the T/TT faculty is much better than presenting the study to them.

Dincer asked if there was sufficient campus administrative support. Zeck noted the administration supports Milner, and it does not appear the decline in TT numbers was planned. There are more tenure lines at ISU is now more than ever, so why has the number cut in half at Milner in the past twenty years? Zeck noted that Milner used to be more involved in General Education teaching. Recently, the Provost Office has been asking tenure track requests to be connected to enrollment needs—Milner is unable to do so easily because it does not have majors, but can make other needs based arguments for positions.

Burr noted chart that showed the absolute number of tenure track lines is actually increasing nationwide, but the number of adjunct positions is growing faster than that. The telling thing to Zeck is that campus has its highest number of T/TT faculty ever but Milner is not reflecting that.

Johnson asked if more non-tenure tracks (NTT) were hired, because they can be paid less. Zeck noted that Academic Impact Fund funds TT lines, whereas most NTT money comes from local accounts (save for those funded through Instructional Capacity) so Milner actually saves money with more T/TT faculty than NTT faculty. Zeck described how Academic Impact Fund was developed and works. It was supposed to be a temporary solution, but the Senate voted to continue it about 15 years ago. If a faculty member doesn't get tenure or dies, the unit gets immediate permission to search for an exact same position, typically within the next hiring cycle, but otherwise all TT money is connected to AIF, and cannot be spent at the local unit's discretion.

Webster asked about the structure of Milner, especially in terms of personnel. There are fifteen T/TT, sixteen NTT, six A/Ps and the rest of civil service staff, out of roughly 85. Zeck also noted that not all subject librarians are T/TT.

Even though NTTs are not guaranteed contracts, Milner is much different from rest of campus. Millner NTTs are not hired to work a semester at a time. They are not part of the NTT union. Milner's NTT are not teaching. Librarianship is equivalent to teaching for T/TT. Some benefits roll over.

Zeck noted that WIU lost roughly two-thirds of their NTTs. Even though Milner treats them as continuous, they are not officially. As NTTs leave, they are re-evaluated and are likely going to be A/P or civil service. Milner is able to ask for T/TT for the exact same type of positions as those in NTT and A/P classifications.

Johnson asked if T/TT chose to get rid of that status, what classification would they become.

Delpechitre asked about the effect on recruiting. Zeck said it could have effect. She wants that reviewed as part of the process.

Dincer asked if there is difference in qualifications among similar job positions with their classifications. Kahl noted that a second masters is required for T/TT. Oz asked if NTT or A/P has second masters. Some do. Dincer noted it is odd that A/P, NTT, and T/TT positions and qualifications are not clearly distinguishable.

Research is required of T/TT, but not nearly at level of rest of campus.

Kahl noted the Masters in Library and Information Science is terminal degree, per the American Librarian Association.

Zeck is hopeful that something will be written to make tenure being more meaningful with marching orders going forward. It will help making future cases for T/TT position hires.

ULC could provide helpful feedback on final document.

Burr asked if all faculty received it. Zeck responded yes, it was sent to all faculty, but NTTs don't have role in this. Zeck said it's not the business of the other classifications on what T/TT should mean.

In the end, Milner needs a sustainable plan for positions—what really is difference between other classifications?

Zeck noted challenges lacking a coherent strategy of how to be a 21st century library goes beyond the Master Plan' review of space, services, technology, etc. It comes down to planning Milner's personnel models and hires.

Johnson noted this lack of coherence was clear last year when the collection review documents were shared and demonstrated a lack of coordination and clarity.

Dincer asked Zeck about the length of her contract relative to the timeline of this inquiry. She hopes T/TT faculty will be in a position to tell eventual dean candidates what they think their model is rather than ask what the candidates think it should be.

Webster said if T/TT continues to decline, Milner could be the ugly step child compared to the other colleges. Milner is size of some departments/schools. Milner could have challenges with future recruiting. Might it effect Milner's status on campus?

Faculty interview project

Oz asked about his military science assignment.

At last ULC meeting, Zeck had suggested Burr send out documents for members to review. Burr shared *Faculty Interview Project* and *Interview assignments* draft documents prior to meeting (attached to minutes).

Burr noted he received an email from Chang. He had a concern about going out and interviewing people outside of his college. Chang noted the Blue Book said that the committee members represent their colleges. Burr thought good reasons to go outside college: if we interview outside departments, then 1)

we won't fill in blanks with unspoken language by not being able to assume everything, 2) interviewees will also have to be more explicit than when talking to a colleague who knows what they know, and 3) "getting out of our own heads" will make us better members of the committee.

Burr asked for feedback.

Webster already interview five people at an all-CAST meeting, including some outside her department. She went to everyone and asked their questions and wrote down their responses. No one had strong objections to library so that conversation didn't take long. What can the library do better? Responses varied.

Burr said this was a pilot, in effect.

Webster shared her questions and responses:

Does Milner meet needs in terms of scholarship? CJS faculty member appreciated .pdf delivery and KNR faculty member gave comment given to them by students about difficulty accessing *Medline* due to separate login.

Does Milner meet needs in terms of teaching? All faculty members were okay.

Does Milner meet needs for technology? Faculty members noted EndNote support is good, liked Milner's tutorials; and were pleased with Makerspace discussion.

How do they prefer to interact with library? Agriculture faculty member preferred online.

Are they satisfied with quality of subject librarians? Faculty members all responded they were. Military Science faculty was very pleased with maps options.

In general, no one had strong issues with library.

What services would you like to see? One faculty member said soft serve ice cream and there was agreement from others; coffee (other than Einstein's offerings); white noise (quietness is creepy to students); newer faculty really liked the New Faculty Orientation, but it happens when they are getting inundated. Subject librarians should follow up later.

Burr asked if the Committee should go ahead and use this model. Johnson said a more formal process may not be necessary; perhaps talking with people, as Webster had done, would be helpful with offer to follow up with coffee/meeting.

[Zeck received an email message about Master Planning during the meeting. During the week of November 13, there will be a variety of focus groups. She suggested that ULC members help drum out participation in faculty feedback session.]

Burr set aside methodological considerations and proposed adopting Webster's model with some additional considerations. He suggested not limiting to three conversations. He said he is going to stop by during people's office hours. Johnson asked if this should happen in their college. Burr didn't think necessarily so.

Burr asked if everyone was okay with doing this. There could be more than three since they are relatively short.

Johnson asked about doing this over the phone.

Burr thinks it is better to do contacts outside department (in addition to department). Dincer liked Webster's model. Delpechitre will talk to Chang.

At end of conversation, committee members should make sure to mention the faculty open session for Master Plan.

Next ULC meeting is 11/8. Members will report what they've heard at that meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45pm.

Faculty Interview Project
(DRAFT)
October 11, 2017

I.   Purpose: We will do our own interviews, faculty member to faculty member, in order to provide information to subject/departmental librarians that they might not be able to learn themselves. This is a *one-time* project to provide a foundation for subject librarians to learn more about their own departments.

II.   Sampling method: how do we choose people to interview?
   a.   Each committee members interviews three people (still willing?)
   b.   We are trying to reach every *department*, not every faculty member (i.e., we are sampling, not doing a census). We ourselves count as members of our departments, and could answer these questions ourselves.
   c.   We interview outside of our own departments. What is the rationale?
         i.   If we know less about that discipline, we will listen more and be more open-minded (we have to be).
        ii.   In turn, explaining to a beginner will require the interviewee to be more explicit, and to explain in a way that all librarians (including administration) can understand.
       iii.   It will get us out of our own heads, which will improve our advice to library administration.

III.   Questions for departmental faculty that we agreed on in our last meeting:
   a.   What is your discipline/subfield?
   b.   What are your teaching and research needs?
   c.   How well is the library meeting your needs in terms of your scholarship? Your teaching? Your space needs? Your technology needs?
   d.   How do you interact and communicate with the library? Are you satisfied with the quality of your interaction and communication with the library?
   e.   What library issues have you heard about from your colleagues? From students?
   f.   What would you like to see the library do (that it does not do now)?

By faculty member

<u>Different</u>

Thomas Burr	Soc./Anthro (CAS)	Math, Physics, Accounting
S. J. Chang	Finance (Business)	Comm, Music
Duleep Delpechitre	Marketing (Business)	Chem, Lang/Lit, Agri
Oguzhan (Oz) Dincer	Economics (CAS)	Social Work, Military, Sp. Ed.
Carolyn Hunt	T&L (Ed)	Philosophy, K&R, Theatre
Melissa Johnson	Art (Fine Arts)	Biology, Geo/Geo, Tech
Alan Lessoff	History (CAS)	Comm Sci, Psych, Crim
Ed Reitz	Nursing (Nursing)	FCS, IT, EAF
Kathy Webster	Health (CAST)	Pol.&Govt., English, Mgt

<u>Similar</u>

Thomas Burr	Soc./Anthro (CAS)	Geo/Geo, Social W, Crim
S. J. Chang	Finance (Business)	Mgt, Accounting
Duleep Delpechitre	Marketing (Business)	Comm, FCS, Military
Oguzhan (Oz) Dincer	Economics (CAS)	Mathematics, Physics, IT
Carolyn Hunt	T&L (Ed)	EAF, Special Ed., Psych,
Melissa Johnson	Art (Fine Arts)	Music, Theatre, Lang/Lit
Alan Lessoff	History (CAS)	English, Philos, Pol&Govt
Ed Reitz	Nursing (Nursing)	Chem, K&R, Tech
Kathy Webster	Health (CAST)	Biology, Comm Sci, Agri

(see next page)

By Department

Department/School	ULC member (different)	ULC member (similar)
CAS		
- Biology	Johnson	Webster
- Chemistry	Delchepitre	Reitz
- Communication	Chang	Delchepitre
- Communication Sci.	Lessoff	Webster
- Economics	√	√
- English	Webster	Lessoff
- Geology/Geography	Johnson	Burr
- History	√	√
- Languages/Literatures	Delchepitre	Johnson
- Mathematics	Burr	Dincer
- Philosophy	Hunt	Lessoff
- Physics	Burr	Dincer
- Politics & Govt.	Webster	Lessoff
- Psychology	Lessoff	Hunt
- Soc./Anthro	√	√
- Social Work	Dincer	Burr
CAST		
- Agriculture	Delchepitre	Webster
- Criminal Justice	Lessoff	Burr
- FCS	Reitz	Delchepitre
- Health	√	√
- IT	Reitz	Dincer
- K&R	Hunt	Reitz
- Military	Dincer	Delchepitre
- Technology	Johnson	Reitz
ine Arts		
- Music	Chang	Johnson
- Theatre & Dance	Hunt	Johnson
- Art	√	√
Business		
- Accounting	Burr	Chang
- Finance	√	√
- Marketing	√	√
- Management	Webster	Chang
Ed		
- EAF	Reitz	Hunt
- T&L	√	√
- Special Ed	Dincer	Hunt
Nursing	√	√