

Library Council

Wednesday, March 11, 2026

9:00 AM, 311G and Zoom

Library Council Present: Chad Buckley, Colby Cilento, Ellie Harman, Logan Janicki, Jayna Leipart Guttilla, Jennifer Sharkey, Lindsey Skaggs, Chris Worland

Agenda

I. Call to Order

Chair Lindsey Skaggs called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.

Chair Skaggs noted that Dean Carrie Forbes was not in attendance as she was at the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Board's strategic planning retreat in Chicago.

II. Approval of Minutes from 2/11/26 Library Council Meeting

Library Council approved the 2/11/26 meeting minutes.

III. Public Comments

Chair Skaggs noted that no members of the public registered to speak.

IV. Information Items

Chair Skaggs noted there were no information items on the agenda, but she wanted to mention that the dean evaluation survey had been sent out yesterday and asked library faculty and staff to fill it out at their convenience. It is open for four weeks to encourage participation, closing on April 3. After that date, the Library Council (LC) officers will meet to put together a report that goes to the provost's office by the end of April. She explained that she had not heard from the provost's office and reached out to them to initiate the process. They had indicated that the process could be started without them, so she wanted to note that for the future.

V. Discussion Items

A. Updates to Library Council Bylaws, Election Procedures

Chair Skaggs displayed the current LC bylaws. She noted she had made some markup to the document, primarily removing some words and copyediting. She referred to the eligibility section, noting it read that eligible student employees would have needed to work at Milner for at least two consecutive semesters. She noted there was already difficulty filling the student representative position, which was currently vacant, and asked if that provision was necessary. She would not want to discourage interested students from serving because they did not meet those criteria.

Logan Janicki noted that two consecutive semesters was a year, which was a long time for a student to have worked in a position.

Colby Cilento suggested perhaps one semester instead of two, so that the student at least had some basis of familiarity with the library but did not have to wait a year to serve.

Jayna Leipart Guttilla asked how the student representatives for LC were selected. She asked if there was an election or a formal procedure; noting that lack of one could be why more students aren't aware or interested in serving.

Chair Skaggs explained the procedure had been to ask student supervisors if they knew of student employees interested in serving. She noted that other university committees she served on also had trouble getting students involved in serving, so it was likely a common issue across campus. She noted it may be worth changing the election procedures for student representatives on LC.

Chad Buckley noted that notifying students when the meetings were held, at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesdays, also helped reduce the pool.

Ellie Harman explained that the community team had recently created a student worker pool email, which is helpful because students can be contacted directly rather than through their supervisors.

Chair Skaggs stated that as far as election procedures, which were discussed at the last meeting regarding vote count totals and majorities, were housed in the election procedures document and not the bylaws themselves.

Chair Skaggs explained that former LC Chair Angela Bonnell put together a document for incoming LC chairs to explain their duties, which she found very helpful. Officer duties are also specified in the bylaws. Regarding the chairperson section, she suggested striking "attends administrative meetings of the library department heads", noting that was not something she had been doing.

Buckley, who previously served as Chair, explained he believed that was referring originally to Library Operations Council but then Former Dean Long had that group stop meeting.

Chair Skaggs noted there was not presently a unified department heads meeting held.

Sue Franzen, Associate Dean for Public Services and Organizational Development, stated that the heads of the Public Services departments met once a month.

Chris Worland, Cilento, and Skaggs voiced support for striking that duty from those listed under the chairperson.

Chair Skaggs referred to the duties of the secretary, noting that it specified minutes to be available to library personnel within a week, but she thought the Open Meetings Act (OMA) provided more time.

Cilento stated that, per OMA, you had 30 days to create and approve minutes after a meeting, and they were to be posted online within 10 days after approval. Minutes also had to stay up for a minimum of 60 days after posting. She thought it would be fine if they needed to be available in the Teams folder for library personnel earlier.

Worland confirmed with Cilento that the minutes had to be posted online and were presently on the library website.

Skaggs clarified that agendas were posted online as well and had to be available 48 hours prior to the meeting.

Cilento suggested adding language to reflect that the minutes would be posted publicly in accordance with OMA, rather than specifying the different time lengths.

Chair Skaggs directed LC to the provision for closed sessions section, knowing this had changed under OMA; whereby, Cilento clarified that meetings could only be closed to the public for specific reasons, such as for employment related actions, and that most of the elucidated reasons in OMA would not apply to LC.

Chair Skaggs noted that LC used to close for things like creating search committees but could not now and would have to have potentially uncomfortable discussions on the record, making that function of LC more obsolete.

Cilento suggested applying similar language that meetings would only be moved to a closed session via vote in accordance with OMA. She noted that while that was not as specific, it would also help not to have to change the bylaws if any changes were made to OMA in the future.

Chair Skaggs directed LC to the calendar section. She noted that it needed updating and that some of the timelines mentioned may have changed. For example, it read that the dean's evaluation was due to the provost office by March 1, which was not the case. It also indicated the process should start in November; whereby, Cilento noted that was odd because the evaluation was for a calendar year, so the evaluation period would not even be over before they started.

Chair Skaggs noted it also mentioned a call for library committees. She explained that a recent chair and co-chair had led a process of reviewing bylaws to determine if LC was accomplishing what it was supposed to be. She noted that with OMA, there was now limited participation from online attendees, unlike in previous years. In the past, LC had served as a discussion forum for the library, and now, due to the OMA compliance, that has changed and left her wondering about the role of LC. She believes those that serve are engaged in service not for their CVs but for accomplishing something for the library. Sometimes it's challenging to understand where shared governance fits into the organization.

Chair Skaggs noted this subject came up in the tenured and tenure-track faculty (TT) caucus last week. Faculty administrators attend TT caucus generally but there was a discussion of faculty status vs faculty rank and if they should caucus while they hold rank, because they technically aren't TT, and whether that undermined shared governance since non-tenure track faculty (NTT) and civil service (CS) don't get that same face time with them. There are things that are discussed in TT caucus which may only pertain to that group, but it might also keep some things from being brought up to the shared governance structure that might have been otherwise.

Chair Skaggs stated that public comment can be uncomfortable, particularly with the sign-up and attendance process via OMA, but that is a forum to bring things for discussion. The question is then what should be discussed in shared governance and what can be accomplished.

Worland noted the calendar section of the bylaws. He explained that work had been done a couple years prior to streamline the number of committees, because there used to be many of them, and it was the purview of LC to seat all of them. Now, there are many teams and working groups, and other functional groups replacing the heavy committee structure. It makes sense to change or strike this section with regards to timelines for calling for volunteers and announcing membership for the committees.

Buckley agreed there was no need to specify dates for committee volunteers given the low number of committees that reported to LC presently.

Worland noted the election procedures were spelled out in the election document, so it made sense for any calendar notices regarding that to live there as well. He also noted the timing for the dean's evaluation being incorrect.

Chair Skaggs suggested it would be smart to start the evaluation earlier in the year, since it encompassed the previous calendar year. It would be hard not to include things from the current year if we were several months into it during the survey; whereby, Cilento suggested perhaps starting it in January.

Chair Skaggs suggested that the calendar article could be removed from the bylaws; whereby, Worland and Cilento agreed. Worland and Cilento noted that information can be found in other documentation for council. Cilento also noted that the bylaws were time consuming to update, since they had to be approved by Academic Senate, so it might be best to not have those events, the schedule for some of which were not even controlled by the library, appear listed by dates.

Chair Skaggs noted that the bylaws were last approved by Academic Senate in November 2023, after revisions by the library in January 2022 and May 2023. It can take some time to get through the Academic Senate. Bylaw changes would be approved via a ballot sent to the whole library and then sent to Academic Senate if approved. Some of the responsibilities and duties specified would be a larger conversation.

Leipart Guttilla noted that the CS caucus, which was the largest in the library, did not meet. There was no vocal representation or participation for that caucus. There are four CS representatives on LC, but the issue with CS caucus is the wide disparity of different position types. It's difficult to wrangle them not just scheduling wise, but also different position types and classifications have different values and expected outcomes. If there were representation for the different position types, and that was prescribed, it might help, but otherwise, she did not see the purpose of what CS did at LC as functional to what they do outside.

Chair Skaggs explained that the makeup of council was changed when the administrative professional (AP) classification went away - other than for associate deans. She recalled discussion of whether those classified as CS program coordinators should caucus with NTTs because functionally their roles were more similar, but with the different statuses there were unique challenges. She asked if it would make more sense to split that way or split the CS caucus so that it was grouped more along roles. She understood that sometimes when CS caucus did meet there were different values and it wasn't a unified front like it may be in other caucuses.

Cilento explained that there were 40 to 45 CS employees but at the few meetings that had been held during her tenure, maybe 10 to 12 people attended those. It's difficult for that classification with different roles and different hours to have better attendance.

Harman noted that she believed the CS caucus meetings mostly died with covid-19. The meetings also are often not relevant for everyone, noting different priorities and that some CS were in the union while others were not.

Buckley stated there also needed to be a broader discussion about how to facilitate feedback and input with OMA.

Worland noted that while he may advocate for something like a LC listening tour, there may be issues with that with OMA.

Cilento explained that a quorum of LC could not be present if they were discussing anything that would come before LC for a decision or vote in the future. She noted feedback could be solicited asynchronously, but they may need to be creative about other ways to get more input. OMA is designed with transparency for citizens of local governments or agencies in mind, whereas LC primarily serves internal library personnel.

Worland stated that there has constantly been a struggle with how to functionally and practically help engage and support CS personnel.

Janicki noted a prior conversation about trying to get regular CS caucus meetings going on. He asked if that would violate OMA; whereby, Cilento noted that there likely wouldn't be a quorum of LC in any caucus meetings.

Worland suggested setting the agenda and indicating which parts were being taken forward to groups as appropriate; some things would be going to LC, but some would not.

Leipart Guttilla noted that NTT and TT caucuses met frequently and reported unified feedback. For CS, there is not a collective unit that can say what the CS caucus' temperature is; there is no formal process.

Cilento stated it was easier for those smaller caucuses to meet, but also for those alike classifications in those caucuses to agree on priorities and positions.

Leipart Guttilla explained that was why a split of the CS caucus might be important.

Chair Skaggs noted that the FY24 council had attempted to clarify and identify LC's role and how it could be most effective via meetings and identified action items and potential deliverables, but some of that had fizzled out to a degree. She didn't want to waste time by having the same conversation every couple of years and then not acting. It can be frustrating when LC meets twice a month, and there are things that need to be discussed in an open forum, but it feels vulnerable to have that on the record. This is the structure to say what's on our minds and bring about changes in the library.

Leipart Guttilla referenced Chair Skaggs's comments earlier about TT caucus discussing admin faculty rank vs status. She asked if being a manager was a factor in those discussions.

Chair Skaggs explained that they were discussing status and rank because technically admins are APs, not TTs, and caucus is empowered to have conversations that they close and say faculty only, whether you are someone's admin coordinator or not. In the shared governance structure, the purpose of TT caucus is more support than anything else.

Worland agreed that NTT caucus continues to use that space as a place to support each other and air grievances.

Leipart Guttilla noted that does not occur for CS. It's an equity issue that that classification doesn't have that support and sounding board that others do. She advocated for considering a split of the CS caucus.

Worland asked if it would make sense to split it between exempt and non-exempt positions.

Franzen noted that many in the program coordinator classification currently used to be AP, so they were split there previously.

Chair Skaggs noted it was approaching the meeting's scheduled end time. There were several other items on the next LC agenda, so this discussion may not be continued until the meeting following that one.

VI. Celebratory Items

There were no celebratory items.

VII. Announcements/Other

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Skaggs at 10:01 a.m.

Submitted by C. Cilento
17 March 2026