

Library Council

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

9:00 AM, 311G and Zoom

Library Council Present: Chad Buckley, Colby Cilento, Carrie Forbes, 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.

II. Approval of Minutes from 3/11/26 Library Council Meeting

Library Council approved the 3/11/26 meeting minutes.

III. Public Comments

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

IV. Information Items

A. Academic Senate Update (Bonnell)

Angela Bonnell, Academic Senate Chair, provided the following updates from Academic Senate:

- Bonnell hoped to share that updates to [policy 9.2., Appropriate Use of Information Technology Resources and Systems](#) had been approved, but there is still an area of issue being debated. It will be an information item at that evening's Senate meeting.
- A new policy, 4.1.22, Recording in Instructional Settings, is also being worked on. Thanks to Dean Forbes, Associate Dean Sue Franzen, and Jennifer Sharkey for meeting with representatives from the Senate to suggest changes relevant to Milner Library.
- The Senate approved language to reflect the merger of the Civil Service and Administrative Professional Councils into a Staff Council. This will hopefully be approved by the Board of Trustees in May and become effective in July.
- On February 20, ISU's Academic Senate hosted a conference with the other public university senates. Notes are available online at: https://cius.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/67814360_2026%2002%2020%20CIUS%20notes%20ab.pdf.
- Academic Senate meets on March 25 and then has two remaining meetings with current membership. There will be a May meeting with the new and returning senate members.
- Thanks to those that contributed to the joint food drive between the Senate and Student Government Association (SGA). This is the third year supporting the School Street Food Pantry.

V. Discussion Items

A. Prioritizing Positions for Hiring in FY26

Dean Carrie Forbes explained that the Academic Impact Fund (AIF), which had served as the centralized tenure-track or tenured faculty (TT) positions funding line originating from the provost's office, would be going away starting in FY 27 due to the new budget model. This funding would now be a part of the colleges, and they would retain the line and the funding for TT positions that were vacated, which means the colleges could decide if they wanted to continue those lines or convert them. She explained that the provost's office still wants to approve TT lines broadly because they look at the level of TT lines across the university. There are some financial implications for the university with TT lines as they are more expensive than other positions, except for administrators, due to their collective bargaining raises, tenure and promotion, and a higher pay scale. The library will have some control over these positions but would still need to submit what TT positions they were wanting to hire and note how they were funded.

Dean Forbes noted this was a good time to look at positions across the library, because there was personnel variance due to vacancies, which created some opportunities to look at lines across classifications. She read a list of currently vacant positions that had been brought up to her for consideration, noting they were not listed in any order:

- Head of Special Collections
- Digital Scholarship Coordinator
- Design and Discovery Librarian
- Outreach Librarian
- Student Success Librarian
- Digital Archivist

Dean Forbes shared some other requests she had received, for new or additional positions, also not in any order:

- Additional subject liaison librarian
- Additional Digitization Center position
- Additional patron services position, possibly part-time night/weekend floater
- Part-time administrative support help

Dean Forbes noted this would also be discussed on the TT caucus agenda to get their feedback about tenure-line positions. She explained that the library would not be able to hire all of these positions. She discussed them with Business Manager Tracy Berner, and they felt they could potentially hire two or three librarian positions and then maybe two staff positions as well, but it would be dependent on what classifications were hired because that changed the salary lines. Approximately four or five positions could potentially be prioritized.

Chris Worland noted Dean Forbes said two or three librarian positions and asked if she meant TT or non-tenure track faculty (NTT) positions; whereby, Colby Cilento noted there are also civil service (CS) classification librarians.

Dean Forbes explained it depended on the position. She noted that the Head of Special Collections, for example, would come in at a higher salary line as a department head. She believed they could afford two TT lines, but it would impact their ability to hire staff positions as well. She noted that the provost may only wish for one TT to be hired due to the evaluation of TT lines across campus. Dean Forbes has had several discussions about whether positions in outreach, discovery, or digital archives could be NTT or CS potentially.

Jayna Leipart Guttilla addressed succession planning. She asked if upcoming retirements in FY 27 would be factored in.

Dean Forbes noted that if someone retired from a position, it would be kept in that area but could potentially be changed or tweaked with feedback from that department. If there was a question of creating a different position after a retirement vacates one, that discussion could be had.

Jennifer Sharkey asked if there had been any discussion about combining special collections and archives and perhaps having one department head for those areas.

Dean Forbes noted there had been a few preliminary discussions. The Digital Scholarship Coordinator is a position where there have been evolving conversations on whether it should be CS or NTT or turned into something else entirely if there are other priorities. There may be some options for possible interim positions or cases where current library employees may have interest in some of these positions discussed as well. She presumed that positions would have to be posted, and a search would have to be conducted even in those cases.

Chair Skaggs noted that NTTs can have their positions rewritten if they remain in the same classification.

Sharkey explained that current policies and state law require open positions to be posted; however, that would not preclude internal candidates from applying. She noted they can also determine how long a position is posted for, so there is some flexibility if they want to have a more targeted search. She did not believe that anyone could be promoted to another position without posting and a search being conducted.

Dean Forbes explained that her current position would be to prioritize hiring for the Head of Special Collections (and possibly archives), as well as for the discovery and outreach positions. Those could be filled, and they could still decide what they want to do with the digital scholarship position. She referred to the administrative support position mentioned earlier. She explained that they may not need full-time help there, so the position could be part-time or perhaps combined with another. It would be to help with things like support for search committees and other administrative tasks. She mentioned that patron services also could use a night and weekend floater position, but that may be appropriate to combine with a daytime weekday admin help position.

Worland referenced past conversations regarding NTT roles, noting that at one point it had been indicated that no new NTTs would be hired. Now that that position has changed, there needs to be clarification about what makes a librarian TT, NTT, or CS. There is quite a lot of overlap in the Venn diagram of librarians, especially between NTTs and CS librarians. NTT and CS librarians may want to have a discussion in the future about what is required or not and how those decisions are made.

Dean Forbes noted the history and was not sure how to fix the current problem.

Cilento noted that it seemed to have depended on when you got hired what the pay and classification expectation was at that time and noted it was not consistent across those positions.

Dean Forbes suggested it may be easier to not hire CS librarians and instead hire librarians into the NTT or TT lines.

Leipart Guttilla asked how that would address the current issues; whereby Dean Forbes noted that it would not.

Sharkey asked what the implications would be in providing CS librarians with the ability to become NTTs or TTs.

Dean Forbes stated that she did not see a big distinction between NTT and CS librarians in their job descriptions. TTs were different because they had research, scholarship, and service expectations.

Leipart Guttilla noted that potentially converting to an NTT would cause her some worry, because CS is a little more cushioned in that NTTs have annual contracts that must be renewed.

Dean Forbes explained that NTTs elsewhere on campus are considered more adjunct positions, which is not true of CS positions. She noted that she broached the subject of NTT lines with extended contracts with Human Resources (HR). She asked if those NTTs outside of the library, that were part of a union and subject to their collective bargaining agreement, had extended contracts.

Chair Skaggs replied that their contracts were still annual, but those in the union had provisions in the agreement which granted them longevity raises and other things of that nature.

Dean Forbes noted the issue was about how much they cared about faculty status for librarians, which NTTs and TTs had.

Sharkey expressed concern about the perception across campus, and particularly with HR and the provost's office, when we have librarians at different position levels. It makes it harder to argue that librarians deserve and need faculty status. There are benefits to being faculty, including having access to certain campus level committees and engagement opportunities that CS may not have. She noted that there are longstanding NTTs elsewhere on campus, so those contracts are generally being renewed.

Dean Forbes would be in favor of moving NTTs to multi-year contracts. If that was possible, she would be more in favor of moving more librarians into that classification for the purposes of obtaining faculty status.

Chair Skaggs noted that this had come up before, and it had been pointed out that the library had a tradition of always renewing NTT contracts, which is true, but there is still a psychological burden to having your contract renewed annually. You know you are in the most tenuous position if there are budgetary issues. It has been a huge driver for some of those in the NTT line to move to TT positions, including herself.

Dean Forbes mentioned professional development opportunities that faculty have that CS do not. She considered not hiring CS positions with a librarian title in the future. There are many CS employees that hold terminal librarian degrees, but a distinction could be made.

Leipart Guttilla stated there were six CS librarians, classified as program coordinators or program directors, but in positions which required the degree.

Dean Forbes suggested that the distinction could be made for positions requiring the degree.

Sharkey explained that April Anderson-Zorn, the University Archivist, had previously been in an AP position but had another offer, so the dean at the time made the argument to convert her position to TT to keep her.

Dean Forbes noted she did not love the idea of individuals needing to apply for their own positions again if the position was converted to TT; whereby, Worland noted it has happened several times.

Dean Forbes expressed that there may also be CS and NTT librarians who are not interested in changing classifications.

Worland suggested looking at pay ranges before doing new hiring. He also advised that the IDEA Committee had discussed the possibility of an Accessibility and Access Librarian and looked at other institutions' job postings for similar roles. He also noted that a Student Success Librarian would align with the strategic plan goals well, which was discussed at NTT caucus.

Logan Janicki noted that the e-resources team also saw value in an accessibility position, which had come up in their discussions of late.

Leipart Guttilla suggested potentially rolling accessibility into the Discovery Librarian's role. There could be CS or specialist lines that did accessibility work as well; it corresponds with the work of collection development and acquisitions. She noted she had been thinking about such a role given the upcoming retirements in her department.

Sharkey suggested that perhaps the part-time administrative support role could also do accessibility work to create a full-time position; but noted that accessibility work could also easily be a full-time effort.

Chair Skaggs shared that she and Karmine Beecroft were hiring two part-time extra help positions through the summer to help with accessibility in the institutional repository and contentDM platforms.

Chad Buckley noted there was a lot of discussion about accessibility and testing of resources. He hoped when vendors were complying, it would be easier, but there are patrons with other accessibility needs too. He referenced the Student Success Librarian position and noted there was a new Associate Vice President (AVP) for Undergraduate Education who he assumed would be largely in charge of student success at the university level.

Sharkey stated the university hasn't completely decided how it wants to approach student success, and so right now the colleges and departments are addressing it on their own. It is not centralized like they had hoped to do. Several departments have student success initiatives, programs, and Associate Dean positions where that is part of the focus. The person in the new AVP role will be

primarily working with general education and the effectiveness of academic programming, so they will have a lot on their plate besides student success.

Buckley explained that five to seven years ago, there had been a search for an AVP of Student Success, but the search failed. Candidates realized there was no centralized funding or support for it.

Sharkey noted there had been an interim person in that role as well, but it ended unfortunately.

Dean Forbes noted this was not an urgent discussion, but there were many vacant positions. Those being considered for TT classification will need to be sent to the provost's office in May, so there is some time, but the decisions for TT will have an impact on the availability of funds for other classifications. She stated there would be time for feedback on what positions were important to move forward with. She suggested creating pathways to get individuals to where they wanted to be, if funding allowed, but noted it may take years to develop.

Chair Skaggs stated that of the named positions, the Head of Special Collections was required to be TT because it oversees a TT position. The rest may have more flexibility. Discussion on this will continue, so please reach out to any LC representative to add to the conversation.

B. Fundraising Priorities for Milner for the University's Comprehensive Campaign

Dean Carrie Forbes explained that the university would be launching a comprehensive fundraising campaign, likely beginning in 2027 but eventually having a more formal launch. She has been asked to turn in the library's fundraising ideas and priorities by April 3. These are to be large broad goals, not smaller initiatives. During the last campaign, five or so years ago, the library was raising money for their endowed funds which serve collections, archives, and special collections. She proposes that we think bigger. She noted the library was still on the list for a potential eventual renovation costing about \$60 million, if that funding became available, but suggested pitching the renovation of some spaces for fundraising goals. Increasing the collections' endowment was also on the list.

Dean Forbes shared that one idea she had received so far was to reclaim the downstairs space on the lower level, currently being utilized by theater and dance. Archives are not in a great location currently, so one idea was to bring them back and perhaps join them with special collections in that space with a joint reading room and/or classroom for their higher use collections. She noted that archives could not bring all their materials with them but could bring some. A Student Success Center was the original idea for that space.

Sharkey felt that plan needed to be reconsidered. She never saw the rendition for the layout, but the approach had been to build more offices and put more people down there. She was not convinced that it was the best place for student success. She believed somewhere on the main floor was more appropriate.

Dean Forbes noted she was leaning that way as well. She read about the plan for the Student Success Center and noted it was a large space downstairs. She stated that endowed positions are also often a fundraising goal, but the position would need to be specified. She has seen where the dean position was endowed or the archivist, because of the community/regional connection. That could potentially be on the list as well. They could also consider advocating technology, such

as for the digital scholarship area, but would need to figure out what to do with that position first. This is not a formal process, but ideas will be submitted to the foundation, and they can follow up with the priorities they think are a good idea for fundraising.

Leipart Guttilla explained that the technical services area on floor five was worn and in need of updating. She suggested something to make the cubicles and offices more private.

Dean Forbes noted she was not sure if that staff-only space would make a fundraising priority but suggested that a donor could choose to donate and name it. If archives and special collections did move together, that would open some space on the sixth floor to make other moves.

Leipart Guttilla noted some safety concerns in the technical services space with how cubicles were adjacent to doors and stairwells.

Dean Forbes did have some internal spaces she would be interested in renovating in addition to that, such as the staff lounge and the large staging and storage area on the first floor.

Chair Skaggs also suggested classroom 164D; whereby Sharkey noted that space had not been updated in more than 25 years, save the instruction station that Paul Unsbee worked to upgrade.

Dean Forbes had classrooms on her list. She noted that the sixth-floor classrooms were open air and not conducive to all kinds of teaching. She would also love to have an event space but was not sure where to put it. These are things that could potentially be renovated by donors who could have the spaces named after them.

Sharkey also mentioned classroom 213C. It needed some technological upgrades and more could be done with that space. The current technology was not supported by the university anymore.

Dean Forbes asked anyone with ideas to please share them with her, and she will put together a list for the foundation.

VI. Celebratory Items

There were no celebratory items.

VII. Announcements/Other

Gamma Phi Circus

Chair Skaggs stated that the Community Team had put together an outing to the circus on April 18. Sue Franzen explained there is a link and promo code available to purchase tickets in the group seating.

Paper Making

Janicki and Ellie Harman noted that the Community Team was holding a paper flower making activity that day at 2:00 p.m. in the staff lounge.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Skaggs at 9:56 a.m.

Submitted by C. Cilento
1 April 2026