Library Council
Wednesday, April 22, 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 4/8/26 Library Council Meeting

Library Council approved the 4/8/26 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:

- The last meeting of the 2025-26 Academic Senate would be held on April 22.
- At the May 6 meeting, the 2026-27 Academic Senate will meet for the first time, consisting of returning senators and those newly elected for next year.
- There were two remaining action items for consideration by the current senate, and 15 university policies that had been approved, including some which had not been updated in many years.
- Amendments to the constitution were also approved but awaited Board of Trustees' approval. The most noteworthy change is the merger of the civil service and administrative professional councils into a single staff council.
- 30 curricular items have also been approved. Thanks to Lindsey Skaggs for her work with the Textbook Affordability Committee.
- Updates to Policy 1.7, University Use of Electronic Equipment for Surveillance Purposes, was still under consideration; as is the policy on disestablishment, which needed to align with the collective bargaining agreement.

Bonnell also expressed appreciation for her Milner colleagues who she consulted with after some recent events. They helped her forge a constructive path forward. She believes in her responsibilities as chair and as Milner's representative on the Academic Senate. If she remains as chair, she would like to perhaps have office hours or find a way to better reach those in Milner in her capacity as their senate representative.

Chair Skaggs noted that Bonnell had done an excellent job as the Academic Senate Chair and was a great representative for Milner. She hoped Bonnell would be re-elected as chair.

V. Discussion Items

A. Library Council Bylaws, Caucus Representation

Chair Skaggs explained that Library Council (LC) was returning to discussions from previous meetings about potential changes to LC bylaws and caucus representation in the library. For the bylaws to be updated, they would need to be voted on by the library and then go to Academic Senate for approval. She believed there had been instances before where such changes were enacted at the library level while they awaited final senate approval, due to the time involved in that process, but was not completely certain if that was permitted.

Chair Skaggs noted that at a previous LC meeting, there had been some discussion about potentially changing the configuration of the civil service (CS) caucus to encourage better participation and representation. Currently, there are over 40 individuals in that caucus, so it was nearly impossible for them to meet. There are individuals in that classification whose job duties may be more aligned with non-tenure track faculty (NTT) positions. Is there interest in perhaps changing the composition of the CS caucus so there is more alignment between roles in the caucuses.

Jayna Leipart Guttilla stated that the CS council members had touched based on this and attempted to determine what an appropriate way might be to channel this information out. She noted they were bogged down by the possibilities of ways to split the council and how to succinctly communicate those to members. She believed that with regards to the program coordinator classification, which encompassed the CS librarians, separating by exempt vs non-exempt CS positions may solve the issue. She would like more feedback from the CS caucus in general, however, before voting on any split.

Chris Worland noted that the NTT caucus did not discuss the specific splitting of the CS caucus but had discussed related issues. They were interested in talking with the program coordinators and/or those in exempt CS positions where the Master of Library Science (MLS) degree was required, as they were interested in what their evaluation process looked like. They may have similar job functions; however, Human Resources (HR) treated CS and NTT classifications very differently, so it did not make sense in that respect to combine them for caucus purposes. NTTs also felt it may be inappropriate for them to weigh in on how the CS caucus should be split. Some of these mirrored discussions previously had when Library Faculty Council dissolved and became Library Council. It was a struggle to make information sharing beneficial, as there were also CS who had MLS degrees that weren't required for their positions, and others in library school, who could benefit from being a part of conversations about those functions.

Leipart Guttilla explained there was a lack of communication between CS since they did not meet and disseminate information like the other caucuses. That was the crux of the issue for her. There should be a framework for open and equitable communication in all classifications, to be inclusive.

Colby Cilento agreed with Worland. She did not necessarily support CS in program coordinator and/or MLS required positions caucusing with NTTs because at an HR level, those positions were treated differently and would have different concerns. She did not know if there was broad support from CS employees for splitting the caucus but noted that tenured and tenure-track faculty (TT) and NTTs had a support system and sounding board through the caucuses that CS did not. It was difficult because of the size and position variety in the CS caucus; there were a lot of diverse perspectives and positions in a way that was not an issue in the TT and NTT caucuses where all the positions were functionally the same. She did not know what the solution was to this problem, if there was a feasible one. She would want feedback from the library before making any changes to the caucuses or representation models.

Ellie Harman stated she did not believe the CS caucus had even met in the two years she had been back at Milner; whereby, Logan Janicki noted it may have met once in that time period.

Chair Skaggs addressed the representation on LC from each caucus classification. TT was overrepresented in terms of numbers, with three representatives representing 18 faculty members. She asked how we ensured equitable representation for the caucuses.

Dean Carrie Forbes asked why LC representation was structured by the caucuses/classifications as opposed to units and job functions.

Chair Skaggs explained that she believes Milner's council was the only one of the college councils on campus with CS representation. The library has a vastly different classification mix than other colleges. It was previously a faculty council and expanded because more than half of the employees in the library were CS. She confirmed with Jennifer Sharkey that the switch happened in the mid-2010s or so.

Worland believed it was 2014 or 2015 that the council shifted. The library is different from other colleges due to the range of position classifications, and there was a statement made about them needing to be more inclusive. Other colleges have very minimal CS staff. There has been a clear feeling that TT representatives were expected to take the lead on LC, due to their required service and leadership activities, and that helped shape their representation numbers. The model isn't perfect, but that was what was felt would allow for discussion among the different groups with their different needs. The driving force at the start of those discussions was that TT faculty would speak about Department Faculty Status Committee (DFSC) and College Faculty Status Committee (CFSC) issues, which NTTs were left out of, so the question became whether those discussions needed to be had at council.

Worland explained that at the time, CS also expressed a desire to have a space that was not influenced or overrun by those with faculty status, so their concerns could also be heard. However, it has always been challenging due to the size and position diversity of CS. There also used to be more employees in the administrative professional (AP) classification, which were converted to CS. Another concern is that at a CS caucus meeting, CS supervisors would also be in attendance with other CS employees, some felt they could not speak freely because of that. Having appropriate opportunities and support for CS has been a constant challenge since the inception of council.

Logan Janicki noted that there were incentives for TT faculty to chair and lead LC. He explained another reason it was difficult for CS caucus to function in a similar way was that there was no incentive for a CS employee to be caucus convener or provide leadership and communication services for caucus meetings. He noted his own reluctance to start them because it would end up with him having to continuously lead that effort.

Dean Forbes wondered if the university might allow for a stipend for that work as it was above and beyond what was required. She noted it would be strange since it was written in the job description for some, but some would be compensated separately.

Worland explained that a previous Library Council ran meetings and solicited feedback to find solutions to issues with LC, and one thing suggested was some recognition or compensation for the work it took to serve beyond normal job duties. It could be tricky for CS employees covered by a union to receive that. Financial recognition is something that would be appreciated.

Dean Forbes noted there was no CS equivalent to the workload policy that covered faculty.

Chad Buckley shared that he spot-checked the council composition for the other colleges. The College of Education and the Wonsook Kim College of Fine Arts each had one CS representative on their councils. They had different unit/departmental representations as well, but all were faculty. He explained that previously there had also been a Library Operations Council, with unit representation, but former Dean Dallas Long disbanded it after it became essentially just a place for units to report.

Chair Skaggs shared a background document from the previous council's answer-seeking that Worland had mentioned. She noted she had served on that council as well. She explained it contained feedback from the discussions with employees, and one of the questions posted was what could incentive greater participation. She read one comment as follows: "*There is no reward for civil service serving on the council. It does not aid in earning promotions nor assist in qualifying for higher-ranked or librarian positions.*"

Chair Skaggs noted other comments about workload concerns for council members. There was also a question of what would happen if everyone in a caucus removed their names from consideration for LC on the ballot, which had been a potential concern at one point. There was a comment suggesting splitting the CS caucus into one which contained hourly employees and one which did not, noting that commenter did not feel comfortable openly discussing their concerns as an hourly CS employee with the other CS members, some of whom used to be APs. There was also a suggestion for a combined faculty caucus with TT and NTTs, a middle management caucus, and then a CS caucus.

Chair Skaggs read another comment about the caucus model being performative inclusion and not being an accurate reflection of the library's demographics. She noted that generally, the LC chair was TT because TT faculty received credit in their annual evaluation papers for that service, and as such, it did not feel fair to ask anyone in another classification to do it.

Janicki noted the importance of addressing the concerns of those in CS caucus who felt they could not speak in a meeting where their supervisors would also be present.

Dean Forbes asked if a split by exempt vs non-exempt would help that. She asked if the split had to be neat by categories such as those or could different individuals be grouped together to different caucuses to try and address the supervisor issue.

Worland asked how formal the divide would need to be. If it was spelled out in the bylaws, maybe it could just be that supervisory CS had their own caucus group.

Chair Skaggs noted that if representation was specified as four CS employees, then perhaps the internal election document could provide more specifics.

Worland suggested that perhaps CS could also craft their own document to run their caucus meetings. He noted that he did not want to be dismissive of the issue and put the onus back on CS to solve amongst themselves. It should be formalized enough so that every time there were new representatives they did not have to figure this out again.

Chair Skaggs noted there were other suggestions for different models in that feedback document. These suggestions included a non-caucus model which placed every employee in the same ballot or a hybrid caucus model where there was one seat designated for each caucus but then the remainder of the seats went to at-large representatives voted across classifications.

Dean Forbes noted that was an interesting idea; whereby Chair Skaggs shared that the commenter thought there would potentially be more interest in serving if there were at-large positions. Presently, the model is predicated on interfacing with your representatives but as chair, she received comments from across classifications.

Janicki liked that idea. It would take pressure off CS employees to serve, especially with a large and unwieldly caucus, removing the need to add extra meetings and organize them would be helpful and allow those on LC to represent those that they interact with regularly, who may or may not be of their classification.

Leipart Guttilla believed it would still not solve the issues for those in program coordinator positions or the issue of having supervisors caucusing with their employees. Those lines still need to be drawn. She wouldn't feel like she had equivalent representation if it was at-large.

Worland noted a concern would be the general idea of consensus. If you heard from the same five individuals, you could feel good about representing their ideas, but the issue of how we provide a venue for greater engagement would remain. TT and NTT caucuses have an embedded method of meeting and a tradition of communication. How do we build that for CS? He also likes the at-large idea, but it doesn't solve all the issues for CS.

Dean Forbes noted the power differential; whereby, Worland noted the need for opportunities for cross-departmental interaction.

Leipart Guttilla suggested divisions may be most appropriate to have program coordinator and director positions in one caucus because those positions were most aligned. We need to reach out to the library at-large for feedback before voting on any changes.

Harman noted it would be nice to reach a conclusion about this instead of this being a recurring biannual discussion.

Chair Skaggs stated that the TT caucus was more procedural whereas the NTT caucus was more supportive. She noted that having that standing caucus meeting allows for an opportunity for dialogue that might not occur otherwise. There needs to be an equitable meeting structure for CS. She will solicit feedback from the library, but provide ideas and context, so it is not as open-ended of a discussion as it has been in the past. This way, we can identify commonalities in how individuals are leaning in terms of potential changes.

Chair Skaggs addressed the bylaws. Some small changes have been discussed at a previous meeting. This included allowing a student representative to serve after being a student employee for one semester, rather than two. There is now a student employee listserv that can be used to recruit a student representative for next year. There were also draft changes made to the closed meetings provisions due to the Open Meetings Act. Other changes included adjustments to the calendar.

B. Election Procedures

Chair Skaggs noted there was no time to discuss changes to election procedures, so this would have to be continued for a future meeting. She asked Worland about running the elections for next year's council.

Worland shared that those elections would generally occur in May. He would touch base to see which TT elections were being run internally as well; whereby, Chair Skaggs stated that DFSC and CFSC elections were being handled, only LC needed to be run.

Chair Skaggs noted that elections will be run over the summer. The new LC will take office at the first meeting after August 16, according to the bylaws.

VI. Celebratory Items

Conference presentation

Janicki announced that he presented at the Reaching Forward South Conference for the Illinois Library Association regarding tools and resources for trading card games in libraries. The room was pretty full, and he received a lot of interesting niche questions. He enjoyed the experience.

Welcome

Andy Wesolek, Associate Dean for Information Assets, thanked everyone for being so kind and welcoming to him as he was onboarding. He enjoyed getting to know Milner.

VII. Announcements/Other

Dean's evaluation

Chair Skaggs announced that she, Worland, and Cilento, as the LC officers, had met to prepare the report of the dean's evaluation which would be sent to the provost. She thanked all those who participated in the survey that was sent out.

June meetings

Buckley mentioned that Milner usually had a moratorium on meetings in June. He asked if Dean Forbes was considering keeping that tradition.

Skaggs noted that LC was required to meet once a month, per the bylaws; whereby, Cilento noted they had generally chosen one of the June meetings to cancel.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Skaggs at 9:57 a.m.

Submitted by C. Cilento
27 April 2026