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***Call to Order***

Senator Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Oral Communications:***

***Dean’s Evaluation forms (Mark Hoelscher/Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

Senator Kalter: So we'll start with that. And Mark is not going to be here, but last time he said that the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee had passed the dean's evals out of their committee and for timing reasons we thought, let's put that on maybe the August agenda. So I wanted to make sure we recorded that officially. I think it was all of the dean's evals except for the College of Ed because they're still working with the College of Ed. So, just so we know that.

***Oral Communications:***

***Upcoming discussions regarding possible Milner NTT conversions to AP (Dist. Faculty Affairs)***

The second thing on there was called Upcoming Discussions Regarding Possible Milner NTT Conversions to AP. A couple weeks ago, actually during the collection of external committee volunteers, one of the librarians said if I change from an NTT to an AP, can I stay in the Senate seats, like the external Senate seats? And I was like, well actually not because those are faculty seats by definition. So that led to Dane Ward talking to me about… What they have is a number of non-tenure tracks who never get to carry their vacation and sick leave over even though they're full-year NTTs for some strange reason that he's been trying to work out with HR. So one of the ways that they were thinking of solving that was to convert those positions from faculty NTT to AP, and this is not really ready because he's kind of still talking to Tammy Carlson about all of this. But I said to him, first of all we might want Faculty Affairs to help you review the possible implications about that. Does it have implications beyond that college? I wrote down a whole list of stuff that could be affected, including the fact that the state is concerned about our administrative numbers compared to our faculty numbers, so that's one. Is it really the best way to solve the vacation and sick leave problem or is there another way to get those to carry over? The job descriptions for faculty and staff must be sort of different. The salary implications are obviously different. Also, somebody brought this up in the interim to me that some of the non-tenure tracks in the faculty may be funded out of the AIF, so that might change things if they became APs, etc. So I just wanted to put all of that on people's radar screens just to let you know that they are contemplating that in order to try to make sure that the non-tenure tracks actually get their full benefits package in terms of vacation and sick leave, but that there are other things that might be unintended consequences of such a shift, and we might be needing to help them think some of those through.

Senator Lonbom: I guess I have two questions. Was that on an agenda I didn't see; what you just brought up?

Senator Kalter: It was. It was on the one that I sent as sort of an interim one. Yes.

Senator Lonbom: Okay. So I missed that agenda. And second, I'm hearing things that I haven't heard before so I didn't know our NTTs were looking to be converted to APs, so that's interesting.

Senator Kalter: Those discussions have apparently been happening without real conclusion right now, I guess. They're still trying to figure out whether that's the best way to go.

Provost Krejci: As a clarification, NTT positions are really in a bucket. Really very different in terms of a bucket of resources that people use to hire positions. And the positions that he's looking to convert are his bucket. They don't come out of AIF. And, in fact, at one point there was a discussion about whether IC money that is granted to the library could be used to do that, and I said no because that's instructional monies and they don't fund AP. But the positions that he talked about, he's really trying to (from what I understand) advocate for them about vacation, and the same discussion has been occurring apparently for years before I got to the Provost's office that they thought they had it solved where the NTTs could carry over and then they didn't. So this is a years' long process. Then we're looking at the job descriptions, that some of the APs and some of the NTTs have very similar job descriptions because of the nature of the library which is a little different than… So he is continuing to work on this, and I don't think anything has reached a conclusion. I think he's got a little light at the end of the tunnel about how to solve the problem, but the issue was, is that the wrong solution for the right problem or the right solution for the wrong problem. He's working on that, but it has nothing to do with AIF.

Senator Kalter: Oh, that's interesting because I'm trying to remember who brought that up to me. I don't think it was Dane.

Provost Krejci: It could have been because Milner gets a certain amount of money for instructional capacity, which is a little bit of a misnomer because instructional capacity is supposed to cover courses, but I've tried to dig down to see when was that decision made and why. That apparently occurred during the Cheryl Elzy time for a variety of reasons, I don't know what it was, but the request to say, could we use instructional capacity monies to fund people who are NTTs permanently so they could be APs and I said, that's just not anything close to the guidelines of AIF, so that was not pursued.

Senator Kalter: Over the last 15 or 20 years, the numbers of tenured/tenure track in the library have basically been cut more than in half.

Senator Lonbom: Part of what's aggravating the situation is we've lost a lot of these people that are in positions that were formerly tenure line positions that we've never been able to fill again.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. The records that I have go back to when there were 28, and somebody said there were actually at one point about 32. Now there are only 14 tenured/tenure track.

Senator Crowley: So we're at 13-14?

Senator Kalter: Yes, 13-14, but basically there are the same number of faculty but now half of them are off the tenure track. And actually it's kind of interesting because if you look at the numbers in terms of salary, there are significant differences there in terms of salary.

Senator Lonbom: There's differences, but the NTTs are not required to do research or service. Technically, that's not part of their job. They're not required to do that. Just to make it clear. We do not have the same jobs.

Senator Daddario: Just a quick clarification. So, it's NTT faculty members who are trying to solve… who are vocalizing about their problem with no vacation, and then Dean Ward's solution is this conversion to AP?

Senator Kalter: I wouldn't say it that way. I think that he's been trying to work with them to figure out the best solution. And then he mentioned working with people like Derek Story in HR and Tammy Carlson and trying to figure out all of this. And he was very grateful for me saying it might be a good idea to have a larger look at this in terms of the implications when we do mass conversions of faculty to staff. What does that mean for everybody else? But also, are there certain kinds of arrangements like sitting on external Senate committees that might be interfered with when these kinds of things happen? And then, as we talked, there were more and more things that we started batting back and forth.

President Dietz: I might mention another just kind of a yellow light on this as well. We're fortunate that we have a new head of the Civil Service Commission that's been really terrific to work with, but that person's predecessor was really balancing the AP and Civil Service piece, so once you start moving in the staff direction… The person that we have right now has been really terrific to work with and a lot of the issues that were there before aren't there now. But under the previous administration, you start a slippery slope into staff, and is it then AP or is it Civil Service, and then the differences between them. Those classifications. So, again, we're fortunate that's not a big issue right now, but before this new person came in it was a huge issue.

Senator Kalter: Yes. I thought you might bring that up because that was also one of the things on the radar. And also we're about to go into… I think by next fall, the Fair Labor Standards Act is being changed so that some exempt employees may actually have to record their overtime and be paid for it above a certain salary threshold that's been lowered by the Obama administration, as I remember right.

Provost Krejci: Highered.

Senator Kalter: Sorry, highered.

Provost Krejci: $50,400.

Senator Kalter: Yes. So that's going to have implications there also. And I think that faculty are not included in that.

Provost Krejci: Faculty are exempt. However, the definitions (from what we can understand) of library faculty don't fit the exemption because they don't actually teach courses. So there are some faculty that do not fit the federal guidelines and, as you know, in some libraries they have a different structure with that in terms of how they treat the librarians. But it is my understanding, and again we're learning a lot about this, that faculty are exempt if they meet certain criteria and apparently the librarians who are faculty don't meet that criteria because of what they do. But we learn more every day. And, just as a clarification, they believe that that could come as early as July 1 and then they'd have 30-60 days to put it into place. Others believe it will be closer to the election because it's election. And, just so you know, Dr. Brent Paterson has been invited to the White House on April 19th to discuss this with a variety of higher ed organizations because, for instance, University of Michigan has said that that change will cost them in the tens of millions of dollars. So it's possible that that will not go forward, but there's no indication at this point that anyone has acted to stop it. It's not legislative. It's out of rules.

Senator Kalter: I think that the other obvious thing here is the shared governance aspect of the library given what happened a couple years ago with problems with the Dean, and the people who were protected in that situation were the tenured faculty who were able to sort of advocate for the right kinds of changes. So that's obviously also a concern in terms of when we have the whittling down of faculty numbers overall, the library, and then its relationship to the community that is the campus, changes. So I think looking at the overall impact on shared governance is part of the picture here. So that one's on our radar screen. And then the last oral communication…

Provost Krejci: Just another clarification because of that. NTT in Milner are not unionized. Some people may or may not know that, whereas the rest of the faculty except for Mennonite are unionized, and then different rules apply.

***Oral Communications:***

***Report on Academic Affairs Committee discussion with Milner Library administration regarding Annex and IRMA collections and first floor construction and renovation plans (Will Daddario/Academic Affairs Committee)***

Senator Kalter: Yeah. That's right. And now I'm going to turn it over to Will. Report on Academic Affairs discussion with Milner Administration about the first floor plans, stuff that's going on there.

Provost Krejci: Can I just say because I tried to clarify which agenda because I know a few came out. I have one that came out, but is the one that we should be looking at the one you sent out before the one that Cynthia sent out?

Senator Kalter: Right. Except that the one that Cynthia sent out last has the correct proposed agenda for the meeting. In other words, that's the one where it starts out in Founders Suite, etc. So what I'm doing here is going through the oral communications that didn't get picked up on that one and then we'll eventually look at that other Senate proposed agenda, if that makes sense. Sorry for the confusion.

President Dietz: So we should be looking at the bottom half of the page?

Provost Krejci: For later. But the top half for now. Well, the other top half for now. This one's the wrong one for now.

Senator Kalter: So on the one that I had sent around, there was report on Academic Affairs Committee discussion with Milner Library Administration regarding annex and IRMA collections and the first floor construction and renovation plans. And that's from Will and the Academic Affairs Committee. And actually I will read what began all of that discussion, which is Alan Lessoff back in the middle of February had sent me some stuff about the Library and then just before leaving sent another e-mail in which he says, "While one fully understands the necessity of trimming the collection…" in other words, the stuff in the basement, "… an approach based upon circulation supplemented by miscellaneous expressions of interest from various current faculty who happen to express themselves does not address the archival mission that a university library has: Its responsibility for preserving a region's and a society's record for future uses that are unpredictable. I believe strongly that this whole process should be stopped and then re-thought so that it is based first on an articulated set of priorities related to the substance of the collection and its emphases over time. This is what an archiver's special collection library would do in this circumstance. The first question should be, what do we want the library to be strong in 50 or 100 years from now, and what do we have a responsibility to protect?" And then he says, "The task should be based on a set of principles and priorities that have been worked through beforehand. Circulation measures simply don't address the issue I am raising. They can't. The historians have an obvious duty to argue for preserving the record of our society for the future, and the humanists overall have reason to be wary of the process by which books and other materials have ended up on the basement storage vulnerable to deaccession. Libraries of course deaccession things all the time, but the prospect of large-scale withdrawals is new, and that in my mind strongly raises the matter of the archival and social responsibility of the library." And then he ends by saying, "I feel bad about being so critical since all of you are good friends and one understands the pressures you are under." So he sent that to the associate dean, the dean, and his subject librarian, essentially.

Senator Daddario: So we took information like that and from a couple other faculty members and asked the question of Dean Ward and the two associate deans of the library for some clarification. And, just for additional context, it was my understanding that there is a set of money that's available now that's not coming from the state, obviously, and that that money can be used to renovate the basement portion of Milner, but with that renovation comes the question of what do we do with all the books that are down there. And what seems to be happening is that a group of people in the Library including maybe the Library Committee but maybe not (I'm still not clear about this), have for a year been making a series of decisions that they have not reported back to the Senate about removing these books, completely then circumventing the shared governance aspect of the relations between the subcommittee and the rest of the university. And then in addition to that problem, when asked for some sort of explanation of the methodology by which the collection was being culled, they had no answer. Not only did they have no answer, but they really seemed confused by the question. I've been thinking about this because this was extremely upsetting to me, this meeting, and I don't want to be dramatic about it but it is a huge problem. There's just two really big blind spots here – one dealing with shared governance; one dealing with a lack of clarity about what the archival mission is of the university or at least an inability to express that openly – and so now we're sort of at an impasse, which is a twofold problem. One is that there are deadlines in place by which certain books… There's a big spreadsheet out there. Faculty are supposed to be responding to this spreadsheet that has tens of thousands more of titles in it. That will not happen. Given the end of the year crush, no one's really going to give any feedback. In the absence of feedback, subject librarians are going to make decisions about which books to keep and which books to get rid of. Some of those books are earmarked for recycling. Some will go into the landfill. Some will be sold. Some will be then other places. There are deadlines for when this is supposed to happen. Even though there are deadlines that have not yet come up for this, the wheels have actually already started turning about getting rid of these things. I asked for a document that would tell us where they are planning on sending things, and they pretended to not understand what I was asking, so I don't think that they wanted to give that information over. It was a really upsetting conversation and so we said we would bring it back here to Exec to talk about what the next steps are, but I really agree with Senator Lessoff about wanting to stop this because ultimately what it comes down to, to me, is a budgetary concern in the moment driving a decision that can have an impact for hundreds of years in the future. And as a historiographer myself, these are exactly the moments that we study, which are moments when huge bodies of knowledge no longer are accessible because of decisions made by individuals that weren't taking into consideration long duration thinking and planning. So that's where we are at the moment. But they're all on the committee so they can speak otherwise if I've mischaracterized it. And so is Kathleen.

Senator Lonbom: Yeah. The one thing I'll say that Dane, Dean Ward probably didn't make clear is what that funding is. It's a COPs grant (certification of participation) that's bond funding. When you said it's some other kind of funding it's not…

Senator Daddario: With the Board of Trustees ?

Senator Lonbom: Yeah, they're waiting. It's been on the agenda. It keeps getting pushed off for obvious reasons, but priority-wise, as I understand it, on the Board of Trustees. And evidently it's on their agenda again in May, perhaps, so it's waiting approval. And it's money… if not funding, if not spent it goes away and Dean Ward is…

Senator Johnson: I think they said it needed to be spent by December 2016.

Senator Daddario: 2018.

Senator Lonbom: Yeah, so just so everyone knows what that funding is, it's a bond funding as I understand it.

Senator Crowley: What's the magic date? December?

Senator Daddario: 2018.

Senator Crowley: December?

Senator Daddario: Yes.

President Dietz: It doesn't have to be spent by then. It has to be committed.

Senator Johnson: He said that it needed to be spent, but he may have not… That kind of changes things, too.

President Dietz: I don't think so. You're right. It's on the agenda for May. Let me say a couple things about that. We saved some money on some other projects and devoted the savings to the decking, basically, out in front of the Milner Plaza that's been a problem for a long time. And they've tried to Band-Aid the thing and it hasn't worked and it still leaks and so forth. So we finally recommitted this. I don't think the Board will have problems with passing that. We certainly don't want to lose those dollars, and that's exactly what will happen if they don't approve that in May. I don't know a lot about the rest of this, but I'm hoping that I can get the Board at that point to approve the proposal, which is really about the decking and all that kind of stuff. That all can't happen by December is why I'm pretty certain it doesn't have to be spent, but it has to be…

Provost Krejci: December '18 I think.

Senator Daddario: Yeah, 2018.

President Dietz: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Okay, yeah. And I think that's realistic. There haven't been plans developed for that, but that will solve a long-term issue and hopefully make the bottom part of that facility available for whatever goes down there, so I don't want us to throw the baby out with the bath water here. I'm not saying that the issue that you're bringing up is not an important issue. I just want to keep my eye on the construction piece of this.

Senator Ellerton: Yeah. I agree with everything that Will said. There's a gold mine of books in the basement. There was a gold mine of books in the archives in Williams when it was there, and a lot of those disappeared. They never came back. We had access at one point with a special group of students to go in and look at them, and until you can browse through what's somewhere, you don't know what's there. Just looking at a list, you can't tell. And I've experienced the frustration of finding that there is one copy of a book somewhere in Illinois that I have to ask for an interlibrary loan. It's outside the I-Share ones. I can have it for a very limited time, and that is the destiny. If they say, we'll only keep one copy of whatever in one place in Illinois, it actually is going backwards in accessibility, which is a real shame when we have such a resource there that, as Alan Lessoff says, has unpredictable use. That just because someone hasn't accessed it for a while doesn't mean it's not going to be. So, given all the space restrictions I can understand why they're concerned, but the storage that was used as library storage in Williams is still there, empty. There is somewhere that the books could go while the basement is being renovated. And there's a cost associated with that, but I reckon if you said we can save the books if we get volunteers to take them over, I reckon you'd get volunteers.

Senator Daddario: That was another issue. I was asking about what work had been done to find a location to store these books, and it seemed as though no work had been to find a location to store these books.

Senator Johnson: You said they would have to get a rental unit off campus to store the books, basically.

Provost Krejci: I think, and it might be; Kathleen, you've been working in the library on this for a while so you probably have more information on this, and I've just been briefed a little bit on this, but I think it's probably helpful, if Exec wants, to have the dean of the library come to talk about the specifics. I have just a little briefing and I think it's probably more complex than some of the things we've been talking about. I think this has been an ongoing conversation, from what I can understand, for years and years about there's not the space. We're not going to have the space for all the volumes of books and the perception was that it would cost several hundred thousand dollars to move the books temporarily. I don't know what that data is, but that is what they have been told. I think what they tried to do, what I understand, is over a year ago they announced this. They held forums for people to come and talk about it in terms of trying to support a shared governance, put it out to faculty, from my understanding, and they had several forums last April to talk about this and they said about 20 people came. And they had input and they believed they were moving forward with input because they had sent out e-mails, they had held forums, they had tried to look at this, and they have quite a bit of criteria. I think if you've seen some of the criteria, about 40% of the books had never been checked out, etc. I'm not the expert here, but this is obviously an emotional and a serious thing, so I think it would be helpful if we're going to talk about it, maybe to have the dean of the library come to have a discussion because they're the ones who are the expert. And, Kathleen, you've kind of lived through some of this, correct?

Senator Lonbom: Yeah. Nerida brought up an interesting point. When I started at ISU, it was on the tail end of when Williams was closing down. This is the fourth large collection assessment, I realized, in I'm going to say a 10-12 year period because in Williams Hall, which was the formerly Milner Library, when they shut that down there was a big project there and then there was something called New Directions when floor one closed and became a storage area.

Senator Ellerton: As far as I know, it's completely empty.

Senator Kalter: The first floor?

Senator Lonbom: You're talking about Williams Hall. But then there was a second one where they closed the basement and then there was the third one under Dr. Wastawy and now this is sort of the fourth iteration. And this isn't unusual, what's happening. This is happening in libraries everywhere. But I think what Dr. Lessoff and Will are pointing to (and Nerida), advocating, is the kinds of researchers that you are, I love that idea of are we really looking down the road and what measures are we going to take. And there's such variance between disciplines. This is a really nuanced discussion and there's nothing easy about it. And I've been on the fringes of it. I'm a subject librarian, a liaison myself, but it seems like the key people haven't been in the… I know they had forums. It was really busy, it was last April, a really busy time of year, 25 faculty out of 700.

Senator Ellerton: I certainly went, and it was a smallish number. There may have been 30 there, the one I went to.

Provost Krejci: They had them on March 31, April 6, and April 13 open forums to review the process and they said total number of non-Milner attendees was approximately 20-30 for all three forums.

Senator Kalter: I believe I went to either all three of those or two of the three. What I'm concerned about, and I don't want to give the impression that the Senate hasn't been in the loop at all. In fact, they let me into the basement just to tour around what we call the Annex books, which are the ones that Sohair Wastawy sent down without any consultation whatsoever, and then also to look at the other collections. It was rather overwhelming because there were tens, hundreds of thousands, really, of books.

Senator Johnson: 145,000

Senator Kalter: Yeah. So when you go down there and you start thinking I can give some guidelines as to what should be kept and what should not, then you start looking through the books and that's a very difficult question to answer with even an afternoon's worth of scanning of the actual physical stacks. But the other thing that concerned me is that both Tony Crubaugh and I, him speaking for the entire History Department and me trying to represent basically just the faculty at large in the humanities and social sciences (especially for those books that Sohair sent down there, when she really just didn't consult with anybody), that hit the largest users of physical collections, in philosophy, political science, history, English, anthropology, etc. And to talk about circulation numbers with those as criteria for getting rid or not getting rid of books is a false measure because with my students not being able to go into the library and actually touch those books and scan through them and pick them off the shelves, which is I think… You know, people laugh at us for doing that, but that is one of the major ways in which people discover new knowledge in the humanities and some of the social sciences and the arts is what we call serendipitous discovery.

Senator Daddario: I actually teach that as a method.

Senator Kalter: So maybe a week or two ago I was informed, I think it was at the budget meetings, that those books, against our shared governance input, had started to be put in with the rest of the books, which said to me, is all of this input being listened to? So if we are having forums and if we're gathering stuff from spreadsheets, is any of that actually being listened to? I know I have gone through probably seven or eight or nine or ten spreadsheets and half of them are over 10,000 volumes. It takes hours, and I have a course release. I'm not teaching my full load. So I tried to sort of ask the associate dean, is this really realistic to give these out to the faculty who are, in April in particular, so much more busy than I am with being able to have a course release and not have your time interrupted in that way? And there didn't seem to be much understanding of that. So it's not that the Senate hasn't been consulted at all, it's the question of whether consultation with us or the other faculty or what have you is actually being taken in and heard and listened to. And then, the budget question of what can we afford and what can't we afford and have we looked for options?

Provost Krejci: I think they've looked for options, but I can't quote them, and I think certainly they're open to problem-solving. I don't know if everyone's seen this list, but it was a very, I thought, specific list: Retain items that have been frequently requested, retain items charged in ten years, retain seminal works, retain works that are… And this is not my specialty, but I thought that they had tried to create with the subject specialists in the library a whole list of criteria that they would use to review these and send all that information out to the faculty. But I agree, even if you had every faculty look at every spreadsheet and every book, there would be different things that different people would want. I think what they were trying to also do is say that anything requested could be retrieved from University of Illinois Library or another library within 48 hours.

Senator Kalter: Except let me just interrupt there. I'm not sure that they're understanding that when my students are doing a research project, if the book is not right there right then, they often will just not get it. And that includes being down in the basement, right? They often will say, it's too much to wait. And so we're living in this weird on-demand world with physical resources. And I know like all of U of I is closed stack; you actually have to order the books; but here we've had this practice and so even for faculty ordering the book from afar - you were shaking your head; you were going like this, Nerida—is difficult, but for students that is what is causing the drop in circulation. We just saw a slide at the budget meeting that said that the national drop in circulation is 35%, but ours here at ISU is 70%. That has got to be connected to the fact that we took the books out of the open stacks and put them in a flooded basement, right? So, in order to protect the intellectual mission of the university, it's so important to re-open that floor. That's what the work on the plaza is about,

President Dietz: Right

Senator Kalter: To make it so that that's a dry space to store books instead of a wet, hazardous one where nobody can walk. So that is being set against this sort of longer term imperative that we get the books back in touchable range of students who will not and do not stand for even an hour's wait to get a book upstairs. It's not part of their…

Senator Heylin: If I may give a little bit of a student's perspective, just as a history/social sciences education major I've had to write many research papers even in classes with Dr. Lessoff. I might be an exception, but I do love interlibrary loan and I do request a lot of books from there for my research papers, but at the same time I know there's been a lot of talk about having faculty access to books and making sure that they have what they need to do their research, but I think it can't be underplayed the demand for space that students have in the library. Especially when I was a freshman and sophomore living in the dorms, I did all my homework, all my papers, all my research in the library and there were times where I didn't have space in the library, especially during finals week. I wouldn't even try and go to the library and I had to just do it in a noisy dorm room because there wasn't that space. So I know a lot of the focus of this conversation has been on the faculty and the research, but I do think that the students' need for space within the library - and even though it may be some people that wrote the letter to the Academic Affairs Committee think that it's just Facebooking and social media that's going on in there - there is good intellectual work that students are doing in the library. And I think that even if we redo the first floor, there is more space for students to have those books and look at those books that I do all the time. So I just don't want the students' needs for the space in the library to be underplayed throughout the discussion.

Senator Johnson: I think in order to have more work space, somehow they're going to need to get rid of some of the books. I realize that there's a lot of books down there, but I'm sure right now they're just all stored, and I think they need room for tables and work desks and things.

Senator Daddario: Yeah, and again my point is present a methodology by which you've decided which books go. That's the issue that we've missed. Because giving out a spreadsheet and then hoping that the subject librarian can do it is not a methodology. It's an expedient.

Provost Krejci: But I think the dilemma that you bring up is just that there's more conversation that needs to happen here. And I would say that I think it was, I'm going to guess but I have an optimistic view, that it was done in good faith with trying to create a list of criteria, trying to communicate, trying to hold open forums, not trying to do anything that would be an undermine. I believe that. It may not have resulted in the best outcomes, if you perceive that, but I think having more conversations about this because their methodology of here's the criteria and here's what the subject specialist will look at in order to do this could probably be improved or there could be other discussion. But I do think, from what I can understand, they put a tremendous amount of work into trying to do the best for faculty, especially given what happened last time there was movement. I think there was an attempt to inform, open, get feedback, create a list, etc. But it sounds like there's more conversation that needs to take place.

President Dietz: A couple of observations. We're all colored by our past experiences and there hasn't been some good experiences, I'm aware of that. I wasn't here during that timeframe, so from what I gather there's some history there that we don't want to repeat. So I get that. I never thought that I would be saying anything that would be good about our procurement process.

Provost Krejci: Me, neither.

President Dietz: But here's my one attempt, I guess, and that is our eye on the prize is to fix that problem, fix that deck so there's more usable space. So that's my first priority. Because procurement is so complex and it takes forever to get anything through, I think we've got time for more discussion about this process, though.

Provost Krejci: That's a reach.

President Dietz: That's as positive as I'll ever be about the procurement process.

Senator Kalter: That may be a really good positive thing, because I don't know what Will is going to say, but I think it's partly about closing the feedback loop. So once decisions have been made, they said we're going to then let the campus know which books we're going to get rid of, and I think that was what was shocking about the meeting on Wednesday for you guys, right? That you were finding out that some of the books had actually already gone to the landfill, I think is what you said.

Senator Daddario: Well, they're planned.

Senator Kalter: Or have been planned to.

Senator Lonbom: Will was asking for any spreadsheets once decisions have been made. Where will the books… Are they going to U of I or are they going to World Books?

Senator Daddario: They had specific places. It sounded like they already started the process.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Let's hope it's not the case that they have already gone to landfills or what have you. If we have time to close the feedback loop, that would be helpful because I think part of what's going on is an attempt, like you were saying, to recover from that history (that terrible non-shared governance history) and do shared governance but running up against a time crunch. And human resources - I'm guessing there's actually one person in the basement of the library who's doing a lot of the moving of stuff based on my discussions with people - not all of the moving but sort of some of the decisions. So if the perception of rush isn't necessary, it would be nice not to happen. So one of the perceptions also is that we can't do anything during the summer because that was how the last fiasco happened was it was all done during the summer when nobody was here. But if we can have communication back and forth to reassure faculty and students… because I think one of the problems is that faculty interests and student interests have been pitted artificially against one another. I don't think anybody disagrees that students need space. If you look at the English Studies Commons in Stevenson that we opened up, students are in there looking for quiet study space. They would be there 24/7 if they could be. So everybody agrees. And students need the books, too, right? It's not like faculty need the books and students need the space. We both need both. So if that procurement, the delay, can sort of help us get reassurance that there has been methodology - yes there has been care and in fact you're going to get a second look at what is being de-accessioned, that would be helpful. But I think part of it also is that it's very hard when you work with books all day, every day, all the time, in the library sense to understand the faculty member or the grad student who's going through one of these large spreadsheets and your eyes are rolling into your head because it's taking you so long and you're looking at it in certain ways. So I don't know, Will, what else?

Senator Daddario: I think it's a really important issue because it's pointing out two completely different points of view about how to navigate a core need of the university, an administrative point of view and a faculty point of view. This is typically the impasse that you hear about, the difference in language between administrators and faculty, and here it is in action. So if it can be used as a learning experience to figure out a shared language that really works for both sides so that we're both seeing these. I think that's the best way of proceeding. Time certainly will do that. I will add, though, that the purpose of the meeting, we talked for 40 minutes about all the details. So having him come here is definitely a good idea, but that was the purpose of that meeting on Wednesday was to hear in detail what was this all about. So we had done one round of that.

Provost Krejci: Given the complexity of it, I'm just saying it sounds like, and what I heard, and again I heard the summary just as an update so I'm probably missing some of this, but I do think that given the complexity and the importance of it, it's probably worth some more conversation.

Senator Daddario: Absolutely. That was the original request was to slow down.

Provost Krejci: And I think they thought, for whatever reason, and I'm only hearing from them so I don't mean to speak for them, that the perception of announcing it and having open forums for discussion, there was an assumption that some of that had occurred already. I think, and Kathleen help me, it's the subject librarians who are really going through this. The spreadsheets are just to kind of also let everyone know if they want to do a search and find or they want to look, but it was really the subject librarians I think that were instrumental in trying to create this criteria if I understand this right.

Senator Lonbom: Yes. You're right. It’s very broad.

Provost Krejci: And I think there was an assumption that they were communicating with the faculty and looking to say how could we do this in a way that meets everyone's needs, but I think there's more conversation that needs to occur, then. Because it’s not obviously… Right? Is that what… The subject librarians were in on it, correct or not?

Senator Lonbom: Yes, yes. But that criteria is really broad. The criteria I would use would be far different than a science librarian, you know, looking at the art or theater collection, the humanities and history. There's a lot more obviously that we're going to save. But I should say the one thing that I will cling to from that meeting, Dean Ward said no quota, right? Everyone heard him say that. So I don't feel pressured, other than this time because we do keep getting deadlines pushed at us. Other than that, I don't feel a pressure to throw books out of my collection.

Senator Johnson: He said to be conservative, too, about it.

Senator Kalter: The other thing at the facilities meeting maybe a week and a half ago… You were there, right?

Senator Powers: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: They indicated that some of the work can be done in pieces so that you can repair a part by moving books to one side or what have you. It's probably a little bit more expensive to do it that way, but it may be less expensive than taking all of the books, moving them out, and pulling them back in, renting the space off campus. So perhaps creative thinking about how the construction project itself works might ameliorate a lot of the worry about this because that sounded good to me. If you can do half of the basement or even a quarter of the basement at a time and somehow consolidate the books in some way, that might reassure people that there is no quota, essentially.

Senator Crowley: Wrap the books, you can imagine, when it's all being done you could sort of do it bit by bit. Another consideration, when you talk about conversations need to be had, I'm wondering where will those conversations take place. We have a library committee, and my sense is that libraries are such dynamic places where change is happening internationally that I'm not sure that we have a vehicle that really takes time to have all of those complicated conversations. Maybe it's not our library committee, because they're doing more today what matters for next month, and they're doing more day to day. And then Senator Lessoff's committee is - Faculty Affairs, is it? - do we have the infrastructure to have the conversations is really my question.

Senator Johnson: I know there's a long range housing committee, so maybe something similar to that for the library.

Senator Lonbom: Paula, I think that's a really great observation. I think that's actually really interesting, especially the changing nature of the library. I actually don't know if we have that. And this, in fact, may point out the really big gap that's missing because I think in that meeting… I'm going to quote you, Will, when we left. Will felt like I had gotten thrown under the bus by my administrators. I think they were sort of pushing it all off on liaison librarians and there's a natural sort of… We're the ones who work with our faculty and students in our departments, but that said, Will was pointing out if you look to the bibliography of his most recent publication, you wouldn't know what discipline Will was writing for because the world we live in, there's a lot of different resources. So I think you bring up a really interesting point about how it's one thing to have forums and for administration to send out e-mails, say these lists are coming, but it does point to maybe a really big gap and something we need to somehow remedy.

Senator Crowley: Tomorrow isn't there a guest on campus at 10 a.m. at Old Main? What's the discussion tomorrow?

Senator Lonbom: Joan Lippincott.

Provost Krejci: Joan Lippincott. I think it's something about librarians of the future or something.

Senator Kalter: Moving Forward Together: Libraries And Librarians.

Senator Crowley: You know, it's a bigger thing. And for the last I think 20 years I've been hearing it. I've been hearing digital age, physical space for collaboration, which I'm hearing advocacy for, and libraries are changing. I don't know what infrastructure we have to address those kinds of things. And the mushrooming of resources as well. You know?

Senator Lonbom: Absolutely.

Senator Kalter: I think that… Two things. Students prefer print in general

Senator Daddario: According to studies…

Senator Kalter: According to studies, according to anecdotal information, etc. So tactile resources are important. But I think one of the things that is happening here, and you're pointing out and we're sort of discovering, is that the administration of libraries in general and here also do not have a model for how to do this kind of shared governance because they have never had to do it before. They've never had to sort of deaccession in these major ways because the state isn't doing its capital funding that would actually build us a better library or what have you or renovate Williams, which of course is not going to become a library again in that plan. But perhaps part of this is to… It's sort of like we need a memorandum of understanding with the library administration because unlike any other college, it's the only college where everybody, every other college has a major stake in the outcome. I'm not going to go over to the College of Applied Science and Technology or Nursing or what have you and say I want a piece of your shared governance, right? It's sort of like, do your own thing. Do whatever you want. But for libraries, we all care. And yet we don't even have on our own part the time to spend doing it, which is why only 25 people showed up at the forum, right? Because they're not really sure what they're looking for until it's not there and they start complaining about the library resources. So, perhaps your idea and then also working a little bit with Dane and Dallas and Chad and the liaison librarians to try to figure out, okay, these processes are not quite there yet. How can we use this as a moment to assess what's going well and what's not going well? Because I think it was going pretty well up until a certain point and then kind of hit an "oh no" point. Like this is going too fast. The feedback loop is not coming back. It's hard to tell whether you're listening to our input or not listening to it. Larry, you were going to say something.

President Dietz: I was just going to say that this might inform a longer conversation, but one of the things that's not very exciting about this COPs money being moved over to Milner. In addition to that deck being replaced or fixed, there will also be renovations of a number of restrooms in the library, so that's going to be a part of this COPs thing too. That kind of begs the question that to me and I have been talking a little bit about this in cabinet that we have a master plan for facilities. There is never any money connected to the master plan. It just kind of is there. And we've gone back a number of times with the legislature, and so what are your highest priorities, and we've been back with our list of highest priorities and the library has been there for a long period of time. I'm getting ready to begin a conversation about that list with the idea that I don't think in any of our lives' times that the state is going to come up with 80 plus million dollars for a new library. So, with that as a more realistic approach, then what can we do that are smaller pieces that address what a new library might look like in terms of more learning space, protection of the collection. There's lots of issues around that, but what are some smaller chunks that we might be able to bite off and actually accomplish something other than continuing going back every year? And you all know the predicament the state's in right now. We've had the Fine Arts project approved and it's all planned and shovel ready, as they say. Lord knows when we're going to get any money for that. So it's kind of a good time to have conversations like this about some of these bigger projects that have been on the list with a more realistic approach and say, well it's nice to be on the list but what can we actually do that might be phased? And I was delighted that Janet and Greg Alt worked on this and Dane and others worked on this idea about moving some COPs money around. We saved some money on other projects. So it's about three and a half million dollars. It's not 80, but it's something and it fixes a problem. You know, kind of start your conversation about that whole master plan list but specifically with the library. These kind of conversations may identify some of these smaller chunks and how do we do that and try to accomplish that.

Senator Kalter: That's a great idea.

Senator Crowley: It sounds like a mission for the long range. A long-range planning kind of infrastructural committee that might actually say, what are people doing to address the dynamic changes and then in our context what do we need to be doing? It sounds like two levels.

Senator Kalter: Nerida, why don't you say some more. We're coming up on 5:00 so we probably should…

Senator Ellerton: One possibility would be a task force that is formed, but it would need to be defined what it is looking at. Because the aim would not be to undermine what has been done but rather take the larger view, following that down. But the other one is the imperative that we're saying is we hope that decisions won't be made that we will regret later, that we can't undo. That's really the essence.

Senator Kalter: After, frankly, investing lots of money in our library collection. Those books weren't free.

Senator Ellerton: It was a good collection and I hope still is. I can give examples specifically. I won't take the time, but where it's a book that's never been checked out and yet we borrowed it from the basement because we found the library had it, and it was reference works for the Bodleian Library in Oxford, in England, that was absolutely invaluable. I never expected to find it here. And that, in turn, has led to the finding I mentioned a while back, that there it is in that book.

Senator Kalter: Perfect example.

Senator Ellerton: You know, things like that. That's just one small example. But I really think some sort of task force but with a very clearly defined aim of taking that bigger picture and keeping that conversation going.

Provost Krejci: And I think libraries are changing across the country in many, many, many ways and it's a very different world as we visit libraries across the country. And I think the task force would help say, what do librarians and libraries look like in five years and what do we want?

Senator Ellerton: What is our vision for it?

Provost Krejci: What do we want in terms of not just letting it happen to us.

Senator Crowley: And not just 5 years but 10, 20, 30. Where are we going?

*Pause as the President and Provost leave for the Black Cultural Dinner*

Senator Crowley: Enjoy the dinner.

Provost Krejci: I think it's going to be a great speaker.

***Distributed Communications:***

***Intellectual Property Policy with friendly amendments from Senate chair (Dan Rich/Faculty Affairs Committee)***

Senator Kalter: He is a great speaker. Giancarlo Esposito, right? Killed like 400 people in the Revolution, right? Ruthless. Totally ruthless. So I think the next stuff is pretty straightforward. I sent around this morning the updated, updated Intellectual Property Policy. If nobody has any objections to any of that stuff I think we're ready for an action item on that.

Senator Daddario: I had four questions.

Senator Kalter: Four questions. Okay.

Senator Daddario: I'm sorry. In Baur's comment AR7 which is on page 4, a sentence was taken out. You said, "Are we sure we want to eliminate the sentence?" He put the sentence back in.

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Daddario: Yeah. It says students must be given a chance. Who's the agent who's giving them the chance?

Senator Kalter: The instructor of the course.

Senator Daddario: I think that it makes sense that it would be the instructor of the course, but given that this is a concern that is a larger university-wide issue including intellectual property, one can imagine a situation in which a director or a chair of a school puts some sort of mandate out that says, in all your courses, given the IP agreement, it has to be given and therefore it's not really the individual instructors. It's a law. So is it left up to the individual instructors? And I think it would be, but it just would help to specify it.

Senator Kalter: Actually I think what the policy is trying to say is that it's not left up to the individual instructors because the students have to have a choice, and so then we should say instructors must give students a choice. I think that's another one of those passive to active voice changes that we can make.

Senator Daddario: Yup. Which is an important one. Also related to that, 5.1.

Senator Kalter: Disclosure process?

Senator Daddario: Yeah, "The ownership shall be promptly reported in writing." Whose responsibility is it to do the reporting in writing?

Senator Kalter: I tried to get them to change that one from passive to active, and for some reason they didn't take the change, but we can ask that again because I have wording for that where… I'm not sure why they rejected it. It may be one of those legal things.

Senator Daddario: Presumably it's the inventor who has to.

Senator Kalter: Right. The creator.

Senator Daddario: Right. But it's not specified. So it's just one of those things. It's like, someone was supposed to do it, but we never did.

Senator Kalter: I agree. I totally agree with you about one. There must be some reason why they said no to that.

Senator Daddario: Also, sorry, SK comment 11. This was the external university grant. The phrase external university grant is confusing because university is still the primary adjective, so it sounds like it's outside the university. The university still has something to do with it. And I think then would it be something like pursuant to a grant issued by an agency other than the university or something like that? That's the point they're trying to make, right? That it's a third party not related to the university and that's why. So, again, the subject not just the object of the sentence.

Senator Ellerton: It means from an external agency. That would be easy enough to clarify.

Senator Kalter: Let's ask them about that one a little more in case there's some need to word it in a particular way, but you can see that my attempt was to clarify that this is only for externals, not internals. To further clarify that if you get a URG or something, that that's not considered so substantial that you just gave away your copyright or what have you.

Senator Ellerton: It could be grant to the university from an external agency, literally spell it out. But it's to the university.

Senator Kalter: And what was your fourth?

Senator Daddario: It was just your comment in Susan Kalter comment 9. I like what you wrote, but it says 3.11. I think it's supposed to be 3.21.

Senator Kalter: Yes, I think that's a copying error. Like a cut and paste error.

Senator Daddario: So if they were to adopt it, I just didn't want them to put in a different number.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, I think that one's taken care of. Do you all agree that we're ready to move forward to action with this pending their answers to what Will's asking?

Senator Daddario: Especially what Mark was saying about it needs to be up and ready and it's a big improvement from the last time and it'll be revisited.

Senator Kalter: I'm thrilled that we negotiated a 5% decrease in the university's share and a 5% increase in the creator's share. That's amazing. That's awesome. All right. Great. So that'll go on the agenda.

***Institutional Priorities Report updated with committee revisions (Senator Marx/Planning and Finance Committee)***

Senator Kalter: We've got Institution Priorities Report and Senator Marx sent around his new stuff that we talked about.
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***Adjournment***

Senator Kalter: And I'm going to skip over Dallas' thing for a minute so we can go to the proposed agenda. So in this case we should be looking at the latest agenda that says Founders Suite and do I have a motion to approve that agenda, first of all?

Motion: By Senator Daddario, seconded by Senator Crowley, to approve the agenda for April 20.

Senator Kalter: And Jackie, you have some stuff to add.

Senator Johnson: The two policies that we did not get to at our last meeting. The withdrawal policy and I think it was economic interests.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. So let's put those in after the Institutional Priorities Report because, again, they're not as important. Hopefully this will go relatively fast. Cynthia, last time we had the withdrawal policy and the economic interests disclosure policy on the action but we never went to action on them. Anything else about that one? The proposed agenda?

Ms. James: I have a quick question about the Faculty Caucus agenda. I know we're not really looking at that right now, but it does say please print your ballot and I think that the ballot will come with the material.

Senator Kalter: Okay.

Ms. James: So I don't think we need that.

Senator Kalter: Are you talking about the ombudsperson?

Ms. James: The very last one. Since we're doing it in exec session, won't the ballot come with the material?

Senator Kalter: Oh, right. Yeah. Because we don't want to publicize that over e-mail. You're right. So we can get rid of that "please print your ballot." I actually just checked with Sam a couple hours ago to make sure we would have the candidate list, and he said yes I can get that to you by the 20th. Okay, going back to the other one. Any other changes? All right.

The agenda was approved unanimously as amended.

***04.02.16.01 From Dallas Long, Associate Dean Milner Library: Sabbatical Leave Policy***

Senator Kalter: Awesome. And for the thing from Dallas Long, you can read that. Basically he's asking that we think about, how did he put it, sabbaticals in the summer for library faculty because they're on 12-month contracts basically.

Senator Lonbom: The current sabbatical policy is made for a 9-month. It doesn't take into account that we're 12-month employees.

Senator Kalter: Yes, and it makes a ton of sense to have a sabbatical in the summer for librarians. And then my e-mail was adding two things to once again, and I'm not going to give up on this, revisit the junior sabbatical. President Bowman was sort of against it, but I don't know why that has to remain necessarily the policy. We'll just talk about it again with Dr. Dietz. And then also, can people who have for some reason delayed a sabbatical, get back on an every seven-year schedule kind of thing? So we'll distribute that out to Faculty Affairs Committee. Anything else? We had a nice long discussion about the library.

Senator Ellerton: I was just going to ask. Do you think there will be a Senate Exec meeting in two weeks' time?

Senator Kalter: Probably, because we're still waiting for the Presidential Commentary thing from Mark's committee to go to the Board, and we've got task lists too.

Senator Lonbom: There's also the VP commentaries, but I'm hoping to compile them and print them and as soon as I figure out how to do that with Qualtrics and leave them here so people can look at them. I know it's different than the Presidential Commentary.

Senator Kalter: In the sense that we don't write a report on it. We just sort of look at the raw data.

Ms. James: Should we acknowledge our guest?

Senator Kalter: Yes. Sorry, Kyle. When I came in, I had a whole conversation with Kyle and everybody else so I forgot. Introducing our new student body president, Kyle Walsh. Do you want to say anything?

Student Body President Elect Walsh: Other than I just look forward to serving with you all and thanks for having me.

Senator Ellerton: I don't feel like he's new at all, though.

Senator Kalter: No, not at all. In fact, didn't you help write one of the senses of the senate resolution? How'd you like your first exec meeting?

Student Body President Elect Walsh: It was fun.

Senator Crowley: What are you studying, Kyle?

Student Body President Elect Walsh: Political Science and Legal Studies. It’s a newer program.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. It's nice to know that people are taking that program.

Student Body President Elect Walsh: Yeah. There is a decent amount of us. A lot of political science classes kind of overlap with the legal studies courses, so it's very easy to do a double major.

Senator Kalter: Welcome.

Student Body President Elect Walsh: Thank you very much.

Senator Kalter: We look forward to you and your, what is it called, the cabinet? Are you guys the cabinet?

Student Body President Elect Walsh: Executive Committee.

Senator Kalter: Executive Committee, yes. The secretaries are the cabinet. I'm still trying to figure all that out. Awesome. All right. It looks like we can adjourn, then. Except the faculty should stay here for just a couple minutes to talk about some stuff.

***Adjournment***