<u>**Librarians' Meeting Minutes: December 15, 2015**</u>

Present: Scott, Melinda, Dejah, Ann, Leah, Ali, Paul, Fran, David, Gary, Rick, Mari, Stacy

Agenda:
1) Deans updates
2) Update on Music Listening Station
3) Continuation of discussion about policies/processes

Agenda Items
1. **Dean's updates - Scott:**

See attached e-mail (**Appendix A**). In addition to the attached e-mail, Scott indicated that Provost Blake feels that he'll be ready to have a discussion with library personnel on the proposed Literacy Center in February. It was suggested that this discussion include all FLITE employees since everybody will be impacted.

2. Update on Music Listening Station – Melinda:

Melinda and Mari have determined the equipment that they believe should be incorporated into a music listening station and have gotten price quotes from vendors. The approximate price for the recommended equipment is $1800.00, as well as additional funds to cover the cost of a computer. Melinda read a list of recommended equipment and provided the written list below following the Librarians' Meeting:

<u>**Equipment for Single Music Listening Station:**</u>
2 sets headphones (quarter inch jack)
Headphone splitter (quarter inch jack)
1 stereo
1 record player
Supply of needles; cleaners and equipment
Tape deck
CD/DVD player
VCR
Personal TV
Computer for listening to online sound files
Earphone covers*
Adaptors*
Desk/table for items

Ideally the library space housing the music listening station will have adequate space to add additional equipment/ listening stations in the future, if indicated. The headphone splitter will allow for 2 people to listen simultaneously, and adaptors will be readily available so patrons will be able to use their own headsets. A discussion of hygiene clarified that disposable earphone covers will be available for hygienic purposes.

3) Continuation of Discussion about Policies/Processes - Scott

At the November Librarians' Meeting Scott had introduced the draft document *Policy/procedure process framework* and indicated that he would set up a different meeting to look at the framework or process. The most recent iteration of the document is found in **Appendix B** and is also available on the J drive.

Scott indicated that the framework should help us have process conversations, create more understanding and buy-in for various initiatives, and help us to understand where we are and how to get where we want to be.

Melinda offered a recent example where a process should have been followed. Previously there was a formal process via FLAC for approval of policies and a feedback period on policies to allow for FLITE employee input. Recently the *Personal Conduct Code* was sent to Melinda to be uploaded without an approving body or approval date on this document.

A brief conversation ensued about what are the next steps for FLAC, particularly given that FLAC was disbanded long ago with the commitment to review membership or find an alternative solution to allow for a group to carry on a similar role to FLAC: "The FLITE Advisory Council provides guidance, advice, and recommendations to the Dean of the Library concerning general library policies, issues, and future planning" (FLITE Advisory Council Charter: http://fir.ferris.edu:8080/xmlui/handle/2323/1743).

Stacy indicated that while the *Policy/procedure process framework* looks OK for policies, it is not really getting at the process. Melinda, Stacy, and Fran made a distinction between a policy or procedure versus a process. Even with this distinction, Scott indicated that it will be helpful for us to write down what we are doing and why it is important.

Ann indicated that before proceeding with initiatives there needs to be a process which includes a definite timeline and fuller involvement of library employees. Stacy added that the timeline should include a specific timeframe for action so that the process isn't drug out too long or over talked.

Rick indicated that we need to focus on the *How* not the *What* for library initiatives. Processes should be looked at from the *How* perspective so people aren't left out of the process and initiatives are not seen as a foregone conclusion or fait accompli without adequate input.

Melinda and Paul emphasized that there needs to be responsibility or accountability for ensuring that process occurs as written. For example, there is supposed to be membership rotation on various committees – who is responsible for ensuring that this happens?

Scott indicated that although this document may not work for everything, he would like to try it for a couple of initiatives to see how it works. He would like to put a comment period on the *Policy/procedure process framework* document and then see how it works during early spring.

Ann indicated that this document should aid us with prioritization and that we need to ensure that our priorities align with the University's priorities and core values.

Stacy indicated that if all groups/teams are following a similar process, it may help to illuminate priorities and help with planning for the year, and will also aid with communication.

Paul summarized that this is really about a cultural shift that focuses on follow-through and accountability.

Round table:

Scott indicated that he has shared 2nd floor furniture plans with the Provost, including the "best" and "better" options. The Provost did not give an indication of what our budget will be or our funding, so Scott will check back in early 2016 for follow-up.

Ali asked that everybody keep the Atwell family in mind as the holiday season and one-year anniversary of Dr. Atwell's passing approaches.

- Submitted by Ali Konieczny

Appendix A: Deans Update

From: Scott Garrison
To: FLT Librarians
Subject: brief Dean"s updates since the last Librarians meeting **Date:**   Thursday,
December 10, 2015 6:37:13 PM

Colleagues,

Here are a few update items in advance of our 12/15 Librarians meeting. As always, please let me know if you have any questions.

1. Please let me know if you plan to request financial support for any conferences or other events taking place before June 30, 2016, by no later than January 31. I have received a request to help sponsor the MI-ALA conference in May, and need to know about any other requests that may come in order to determine how much we can provide to whichever conferences we're able to support.

2. As we work on the action steps to achieve strategic plan initiatives 4 and 5, Carrie, Leah and I plan to have a series of conversations with each of you, and in groups. We want to hear your thoughts about your current professional role(s) and how to build a job description that balances what the library and university need most now and in the future, the current and potential future work that most energizes and inspires you, and any professional development opportunities that will position you and our library to continue forward. As part of this process, we will include regular discussions and readings from the literature regarding the role of librarians in higher education and how current trends could play out at our institution. We look forward to engaging with you in these discussions and welcome your input into how we move forward together.

3. The latest version of the policy and procedure process framework is now at J:\Workgroup\FLITE\Dean docs\PolicyProcedureProcess-December 2015.docx . Please come prepared to discuss it at next Tuesday's Librarians meeting.

Scott

Scott Garrison
Dean
Ferris Library for Information, Technology and Education
Ferris State University
1010 Campus Drive, 410A Big
Rapids, MI 49307 voice: (231)
591-3728 fax: (231) 591-3724

Appendix B:

Policy/procedure process framework
DRAFT December 2015

- What are we trying to do? Philosophy/principles
    - Problem to be solved – library, university or both
        - What
        - Why
        - How

- What has our past practice been?
    - Have we had one?
        - Does/did it work?
            - Yes – did we continue? Why/not?
            - No – how why/not?

- Edit/create new policy/procedure, with input
    - Success criteria? How will we know it works/needs review?
    - Use tools
        - Internal discussion and input, with comment periods
        - Literature
        - Other library examples
        - User data and input
            - Ask them
            - Observe them
            - Use data about what they do, how
        - "Versioning" – how far can we get in version 1, 2, etc.?
    - Identify and gather needed resources
        - Input from elsewhere on campus?
        - Money?
        - Other?
    - Regular review cycle

- Approve – who/how?
    - If funding or other external support is required - Dean
    - If CBA-mandated, union members recommend ->Dean->Provost
    - If neither, need mechanism (vote, new leadership group, etc.)

- File and communicate new policy/procedure as appropriate
    - Internally
    - Across campus as needed

- Review on regular, established cycle
    - Use a policy manual approach so we can make it manageable and routine