University Libraries Management Team
January 21, 2014

Present: Reynolds, Hayworth, Moeller, Austin, Fong, Hollis, Knievel, Montgomery, Maness

In These Minutes:
- Working Group discussion
- Spring All Libraries Meeting
- Program Review Update
- Entry Level (LTI) positions
- Updates

1. Working Group (WG) discussion – evaluation and membership
   a. WG Coordinators reported back to MT: see proposal here: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1pzb78WDB-QSKvJd5mTsIrxcO_5kWgpZby-dyEqEQtEM/edit for more information about evaluating working group members and WG recommendations.
      i. MT supports the Working Group Coordinators’ proposal for a procedure for evaluating staff and faculty working group members for the upcoming evaluation cycle:
         Staff:
         • Written into PPP (performance plan) for staff as an individual line of the PPP
         • Written into PDQ/Position Description for permanent members
         • Percentages adjusted for coordinators
         • Possible Language: “Participates in and represents the library and department in the XXX Working Group.”
         • Supervisor can contact WG Coordinator with specific questions or to request a few sentences about an individual’s participation.

         Faculty:
         • Self-reported to supervisors.
         • First-level evaluators can consult WG coordinator with specific questions based on the self-reported feedback.
         • Coordinators can go to non-participating members’ supervisor with a specific question that the faculty member has listed in their self-statement if necessary.

      ii. WG coordinators proposed that WG coordinator positions be written into professional plans/PPPs.

      iii. MT and WG coordinators will revisit this issue in a few months after the evaluation period for 2013 has passed.

   b. WG structure/Group Characteristics, etc. by Working Group (a brief summary follows, see link above for more information)
      i. Collections and Access Working Group (CAWG) has no recommendations.
      ii. Long-term Recommendation for Scholarly Communications Working Group (SCWG): Create a department responsible for scholarly communication,
research data, and digital initiatives. This would be the optimal structure to allow work in these areas, which are widely regarded as essential to research libraries, to grow in terms of visibility, productivity, and impact. A working group chaired by the department director and made up of interested members from other departments could also be created in order to communicate and coordinate scholarly communication work across the library.

iii. Instruction Working Group (IWG) Recommendation: In order to maximize the reach and impact of the University Libraries’ teaching and learning programs, we recommend a department structure. Teaching and learning are not ancillary components of the Libraries’ mission and therefore warrant a demonstrated commitment.

iv. Virtual Presence Working Group (VPWG) & User Experience Working Group (UXWG) Recommendation: VPWG should remain largely similar to how it is now in the short term, including co-chairs who are members of the working group. Its main function should shift more towards discussion of and library-wide input on virtual presence, and the creation plans, standardization, and other big picture issues. It would stay the voting body for major web changes and/or decisions. Its role in the nitty-gritty of design and testing would be removed/lessened, providing needed relief to the workload of working group members. The head of LIT would be the management team liaison and would attend all meetings, it will be necessary to reevaluate after new head of LIT is hired whether they should be a permanent co-chair of the group. Change voting procedures so that each department gets one vote regardless of the number of VPWG members from the department.

The Digital user experience librarian would become a permanent chair of UXWG, and this responsibility would be written into the job. There may also be a need for a staff member under this position to help coordinate logistics, recruitment, incentives inventories, materials, and scheduling. UXWG would continue to be interest/knowledge driven and project based, as aligned with the virtual presence strategy established by VPWG. Their role would be to augment the testing capability of the LIT’s Web Services Team and the Digital User Experience librarian and to provide opportunity for more employees to participate in the design and testing process.

v. Service Points Working Group (SPWG) Recommendation: Remains largely similar to how it’s running now. The general task of standardizing daily operations of the service desks is proving successful and should continue. Possible changes include:

- All service desk managers would remain as permanent members. This would include ESC, BUS, EMP, MUS, Norlin Circulation, Norlin Research Desk, and the Commons. This would be written in to job description.
- Rotating members could include representatives from LIT, ARC/SPC, ILL, Building Management and Metadata Services.
- Should be more involved, when necessary, in outreach and promotions to insure projects/marketing are being done at all locations.
- Should be more involved, when necessary, in virtual presence and user experience projects and issues, since we are on the frontline of services.
• Our charge needs to be completely updated to reflect the current group. This included removing responsibility for social media projects. Also, duration of membership should be changed. The chair is currently set for four years. This seems too long of a commitment. Three should be the max.
• Evaluation process would include submitting reviews about each member to the chair or MT liaison.

2. Spring All Libraries Meeting
   a. The Spring All Libraries Meeting will be on Tuesday, February 11th from 9AM-11AM in CBIS. Please plan to attend.

3. Program Review Update
   a. Please review the email from Debbie Hollis (sent to all faculty & staff on 1/22/14) regarding next steps of Program Review.
   b. MT members will meet with our Program Review internal evaluators (Catherine Labio and Michael Breed) at 2:30 on Wednesday, January 22.
   c. External Reviewers (Deborah Carver, Dean University of Oregon Libraries and Carol Diedrichs, Dean Ohio State University Libraries) will visit the Libraries on March 10-11. Please leave your schedule as open as possible on those dates.

4. Entry Level (LTI) positions – open discussion
   a. MT had a discussion about the lack of LTI positions in Libraries as a whole. MT would like all supervisors/managers/department directors to look critically at qualifications and needs of the Libraries for each open classified staff/library tech position and consider whether or not the position can be filled by an LTI or state service trainee. The idea behind considering LTI/state service trainees is to make sure the Libraries has the potential to provide positions with upward mobility for library techs.

5. Updates

   In preparation for the creation of a new website, VPWG is cataloging the current website to determine which pages are internal and which are external. They are also considering how to develop a sustainable intranet solution.

   MT requests that VPWG develop a proposal for an intranet architecture solution and a training plan for rolling out that solution. MT also requests that a subgroup of VPWG be created to complete this task include input from all departments.

Upcoming meetings

   February 4 – Revisit the Renaissance plan; Digital Public Library of America participation; revisit the charge of IDG; intranet

   February 18, 2014 – Digital Humanities Task Force Report, Review IR/Luna Policy, new library faculty orientation checklist
Management team minutes are available online:  http://ucblibraries.colorado.edu/adminservices/management/index.htm
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