

Librarians' Meeting 2/23/2016

Present: Ali, Ann, Melinda, Scott, Leah, Carrie, Mari, Paul, Dave

Agenda:

1. **Dean's update**
2. **Report on LHAC activities (Carrie)**
3. **Report on search process for vacant reference position (Carrie)**
4. **Initiatives action process as it relates to job descriptions discussion**

Agenda items:

1. **Dean's updates:** Updates were sent this morning via e-mail and briefly mentioned by Scott. Please see Appendix A for updates.
2. **Report on LHAC activities (Carrie):** Carrie met with LHAC (Library / Historical / Archival Committee), a university-wide committee, to discuss a potential model to help inform liaison responsibilities / liaison program. Carrie has also spoken with Fran and Kristy to gather more insight about the liaison program.

Scott had recommended the Harwood model which has been applied at Rutgers University and has been promoted through MCLS. The Harwood model encourages individuals / institutions to "look outward" and use the information from their user populations to inform practices / decisions. At the LHAC meeting, Carrie spoke with the committee members to get their impressions on using the Harwood approach to inform library practices, and asked faculty members on this committee if they would be willing to participate as a test group for the Harwood approach. The committee members indicated willingness to participate in this endeavor.

Carrie is having a condensed training session with David Votta from MCLS on using the Harwood model to prepare for the upcoming test group meetings with LHAC faculty members. Scott explained that MCLS has had a series of conversations on using the Harwood process to encourage this "turning outward" approach that focused on asking the community what will be helpful, rather than what the organization has to offer.

More information about MCLS and the Harwood process can be found here:

<https://mcls.org/engagement/harwood/>

Melinda indicated that getting community involvement may be more challenging with some programs / colleges than with others. Ali indicated that it is essential to have liaisons involved in the Harwood process when their liaison areas are the "community" involved.

3. **Report on search process for vacant reference position (Carrie):**

Several meetings have been held with RIS to discuss positions based on 1 part time and 1 full time position to be filled. Three position descriptions have been drafted and shared within RIS, and are still very much in draft format. Additionally, these 3 positions still have not been prioritized within RIS, so they are not being shared at the Librarians' Meeting at this time. Scott had requested that draft position descriptions be completed by the end of February, and Carrie

indicated that RIS should be able to meet this deadline. Once position descriptions are finalized and approved within the library, the process will follow the university approved process to formalize the positions. Scott indicated that there is a separate process for filling a vacant position versus requesting a new position. Melinda asserted that the current vacant positions are not bound to the timeline for the *Process Framework for Job Descriptions*, and the open positions should be on an accelerated track to be filled.

4. Initiatives action process as it relates to Job Descriptions discussion (Scott):

The **Action / Initiative process Framework: Faculty Job Descriptions** draft (see Appendix B) was distributed via email by Scott on 2/17/2016 and is also posted on the J drive. Scott asked the librarians at the meeting for input. Melinda asked for #5 on the draft, how the process would be communicated to library personnel, and Scott answered with a question inquiring as to how we would like it communicated. Although no answers were offered, Melinda indicated that for many people the “what” is more important than the how (process). Regarding #3 on the document, Ali asked if the meetings between the librarians and Admin Team have been informative in regards to job descriptions. The Admin Team indicated that they had learned new information. With many librarians absent from today’s meeting, it was determined that rather than moving to approve this framework, a final version should be sent out for review and voted on during the next Librarians’ Meeting.

- Submitted by Ali Konieczny

Appendix A: Dean's Update

From: Scott Garrison
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2016 10:29 AM
To: Melinda K Isler; Frances K Rosen; Rick G Bearden; Leah M Monger; Paul D Kammerdiner; Alison M Konieczny; Dejah T Rubel; Kristy L Motz; Mari E Kermit; Ann L Breitenwischer; Stacy A Anderson; David A Scott; Gary Maixner; Carrie E Donovan
Subject: Re: updated agenda

Here are a few updates following the Deans Council meeting on 2/17.

1. A committee that includes Dean Steve Durst and faculty members Amy Dorey and Ken Kuk is currently considering how best to apply the ~\$18M MPSERS reimbursement to provide scholarships. The committee will give its recommendations to the Ferris Foundation in April.
2. Faculty wishing to give notice of retirement should abide by the current FFA Agreement Section 17.5. Provost Blake stated that the university and FFA are working on clarifying language around notice of retirement.
3. Dean Larry Schult mentioned a recent meeting between faculty, staff and administrators from CET, Library and Media Production regarding potential partnerships for offering and supporting 3D printing for students. Demand for CET's 3D printing lab in Swan has grown much faster than faculty members Bill Koepf and Luke Hedman had expected.
4. Carrie, Lyle, Melinda and I met with Mike McKay and representatives from most building partner units yesterday, and we will be working together on making sure everyone who works in FLITE has up to date safety and security training. We asked the building partners to identify a person who could meet on a regular basis with our Building Emergency Coordinators, Josie, Lingfei and Lyle. We also discussed establishing one or more voluntary building-wide teams trained in First Aid and CPR/AED.

As always, please let me know if you have questions about these or other items.

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: Action/Initiative process framework: Faculty Job Descriptions

Action/Initiative process framework: **Faculty Job Descriptions**

DRAFT 2/17/16

1. What are we trying to do? Philosophy/principles

The provost and FFA have agreed that we should have up to date job descriptions for our library faculty positions. We also need up to date job descriptions for staff and student positions. Having these would help us define workload, determine how functions and tasks could be distributed between librarians, staff and student employees, fill vacant positions, and plan for how to invest in professional development for library personnel most effectively. Strategic plan action step 4.2 calls for us to “review and update all job descriptions, including vacant positions,” and action step 4.3 calls for us to “investigate how some positions should change.”

2. What has our past practice been?

Clerical/Technical and administrative positions have had job descriptions; most faculty librarians have not. Some job descriptions are ten or more years old, and do not necessarily reflect the library’s current and near-future needs (e.g. as articulated in the library’s strategic plan, and our current conversations with faculty).

3. Edit/create new approach, with timeline and time-limited input

In fall 2014, each faculty librarian submitted a list of current duties to the Admin Team. In January 2016, the Admin Team began meeting with each librarian to discuss a series of questions about the current and potential future state of positions and roles in the library, including professional development and personnel utilization. Once these meetings are finished in February, the Admin Team will summarize the meetings, look for themes, and discuss findings with the major functional teams and all librarians in March. We should use what we learn from this series of conversations, and the initiatives and action steps in our strategic plan to build job descriptions for vacant positions, and review and update job descriptions for current faculty librarians.

With multiple concurrent projects happening that may also influence job descriptions (e.g. Work Teams Task Force and liaison program review), we will start with individual job descriptions based on duties and responsibilities related to CAS and RIS team functions, and incorporate other pieces as we develop them. For consistency, we should use a common format.

We should start by writing job descriptions for current/coming vacancies based on work we need done, and capacity and gaps we have, and seek approval to fill vacancies. Next, we should move to positions whose work overlaps with, is most closely connected to, or is influenced by the vacant ones in terms of function. We should then move to the remaining

positions, and have each assistant dean work with each faculty librarian to create a mutually agreeable job description that can be discussed and reviewed/updated annually. This idea comes from a fall 2015 draft of the faculty workload policy.

We should establish current job descriptions for all librarian positions by no later than the end of July, 2016. We should also work to establish current job descriptions for other positions as soon as possible. The dean, assistant deans, and each faculty librarian will be responsible for establishing and maintaining agreement regarding each job description, and will review them annually.

4. Approve process – who/how?

Meetings with individual librarians began in January 2016 and will be completed by the end of February. We will discuss this process framework at the February librarians meeting, and will meet on March 16 to discuss findings and themes from the individual meetings. Our goal could be to reach agreement on a final version of this process by the end of March.

5. File documentation and communicate about action/initiative as appropriate

Once we have agreement, we could communicate the process to everyone in the library in writing and CAS and RIS team meetings.

6. Review on regular, established cycle

We should establish annual meetings between the assistant deans and librarians in each major functional team, to determine whether job descriptions remain up to date and support progress toward other strategic plan actions (or if adjustments are needed). We should also use regular readings and discussions, retreats, and/or other methods to discuss developments in the library field and at Ferris, and how we should respond, including via job descriptions.

For staff and student positions, some reclassification may be warranted. If positions are recommended for upgrade, funds will need to be identified.