

Library, Media, and Information Services Committee

Meeting Notes for 9/11/2018

Present: Committee members: Jane Carlin, Jeremy Cucco, Kate Cohn, Andrew Gomez, Ann Gleason, Sue Hannaford (minute taker), Lori Ricigliano, Adam Smith, and Lisa Wood. Visitor: Alison Tracy Hale.

Alison Tracy Hale, the LMIS liaison from the Faculty Senate, convened the meeting at 4:03 pm. Sue Hannaford volunteered to be committee chair for the fall semester, with the understanding that the committee would select a new chair for the spring semester. Hannaford proposed that the LMIS committee rotate minute taking duties among the faculty members.

The committee selected Tuesdays at 4 pm as the permanent meeting time for the fall semester. Unfortunately, while accommodating all the faculty and staff schedules, this time will not permit ASUPS representative Gabi Marrese to serve. Kate Cohn volunteered to reach out to Gabi and ASUPS and see if it was possible to find another student representative for the fall semester.

Alison Tracy Hale distributed the charges to LMIS from the faculty senate (inserted below):

The standing charges to LMIS are as follows:

1. To develop general policies, procedures and plans in collaboration with the Library Director and the Chief Technology Officer.
2. To provide recommendations and advice to all parts of the University community on the role of the library, media and information systems in support of the academic program.
3. To review periodically the mission and objectives of the library and information systems and to recommend such changes as are needed.
4. To review periodically the collection development plan for the library to ensure that a balanced collection is maintained for effective support of the academic program.

The Faculty Senate's additional charges to the committee for 2018-19 are as follows:

5. **Circulate the draft of "Best Practices for Managing Sensitive Documents" to the Professional Standards Committee; the Institutional Review Board; Counseling, Health, and Wellness Services; the Center for Writing, Learning, and Teaching; Data Standards; Student Accessibility and Accommodation; Registrar's Office; Student Conduct; Title IX; and Human Resources for feedback in the expectation that in AY 2019-2020 the committee will finalize the document for approval and campus use.**
6. **Clarify and publicize to faculty and academic staff the general policies and processes related to making changes in library and information systems as applies to the academic program.**

A lively discussion ensued, focused on the two additional charges. Tracy Hale explained that the 6th charge, arises from concerns the Senate has heard about shifts (like using Canvas, rearranging the library space) which impact faculty. Therefore the senate is turning to LMIS to clarify for which campus decisions and at what point there is faculty input. Tracy Hale explained that determining which decisions are really made without faculty input is one part of the charge.

Lisa Wood said that the issue strikes her as a very big question and suggested that it should come to the whole faculty, rather than being delegated to LMIS which is not a very powerful committee. Tracy Hale said that the senate sees the charge as more of a fact finding mission, noting that the senate doesn't expect LMIS to provide faculty input on all such decisions or to decide which decisions should involve faculty input. Jeremy Cucco agreed that it is beyond faculty to provide feedback on all decisions since many may be driven by other factors such as regulatory and fiscal changes. He said that he suspects that each individual decision is prompted by other factors. Jane Carlin suggested that one approach that we could use is to look at decisions that fall into the normal scope of LMIS, such as library, media and technology spaces. She stated that one of the more complex issues will be the space planning issue.

Wood stated that the recent decision about realigning library and technology services space was of particular interest to the faculty. She said that the library and the holdings of the library are deeply grounded in the institution, so when holdings disappear it can feel like your foundation as a teacher/scholar has been washed away. Jane Carlin noted that she has had several conversations with the Provost and that the library has been asked to prepare a strategic plan. She suggested that looking ahead to LMIS's work this year, it would be useful to see if the library and LMIS could work together to harness the energy and move ahead.

Jeremy Cucco expressed concern that if LMIS revisits specific decisions, the discussion may devolve into a lot of finger pointing. Alison Tracy Hale said the senate is not trying to belabor the decisions that are made. However, if the faculty are truly in charge of the curriculum and decisions are made that have a major and sometimes negative effect on the curriculum, then the LMIS committee with faculty and representatives from the academic dean's office, library and technology services is the place to work them out. She added that such discussion may be particularly relevant at this time when we are looking at the strategic plan.

Andrew Gomez mused that the decision-making process will look different depending on what decisions we revisit. Kate Cohn suggested that going through an exercise of several case studies could get us to the point where we could determine what are the parameters used when things went well. She suggested that such case studies include not only "the library incident" since the university has seen a myriad of different changes that have happened and then to identify places for improvement. Jeremy Cucco suggested that looking at upcoming decisions, rather than looking at some of the decisions in the past would be more profitable. He stated that one goal should be to improve the communication flow so that more faculty have the answer, understand the answer, and know what were the factors that were being weighed in the decision-making process.

Jane Carlin said that she thought the process through which the library reorganized the archives and the special collections space might provide a positive case study. She noted that this process took a long time, focus groups, a proposal, etc. and eventually got funding.

Hannaford then turned the discussion to the 5th senate charge, regarding circulating the best practices for managing sensitive documents draft. Hannaford argued that when last year's LMIS sent the working draft to the senate at the end of the year, the hope was that the senate itself would take a lead role in distributing it. Lisa Wood said she thinks the issue of managing sensitive information is incredibly important and that everyone on campus should go through the process of examining their computers and email habits to determine their risk. Wood added that she wanted to see some things implemented pretty quickly – stressing that faculty have a lot of sensitive documents. Tracy Hale noted that the senate agrees that the document is important which is one reason for asking LMIS, as the group that has been wrestling with this issue, to work to strengthen it by distributing the draft and asking for input. She pointed out that the charge specifically states that the senate is seeking action of this task so a final draft can be distributed to the campus in AY 2019-2020. Kate Cohn stated that she thought we might be able to get fairly quick answers from some of entities listed in the charge. Wood agreed saying that we could, for example, ask how sensitive documents are being handled Faculty Advancement Committee and Professional Standards Committee. She said that she would like to see LMIS focus on the faculty before we go to other agencies on campus such as CHAWS and Human Resources. Adam Smith said that as a new member of the committee, he needed to read it and the associated minutes before making a recommendation about how to proceed. Hannaford promised to share the document prior to the next LMIS meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:58 pm.