

LCP (formerly L-CAP) Quarterly Meeting with Dean Wilkin  
June 16, 2022, at 9:00AM via Zoom

**LCP Members Present:** Susan Braxton (chair), John Laskowski, Hoa Luong, Heather Murphy, Megan N Pearson, Tracy Tolliver, Jen-chien Yu, Eric Kurt (*ex officio*), Will Schlaack (*ex officio*)

**Absent:** none

**Minutes:** Megan N Pearson

*NB: The 2022 Q1 meeting was cancelled due to scheduling issues and few agenda items.*

Meeting called to order at 9:02AM.

1. New LCP Member: Introduced Eric Kurt, new CAP District 9 representative and LCP *ex officio* member.
2. Updated Charge and Campus Criteria for Civil Service Professional (CSP) Employees
  - a. Announced the updated charge to be live on the Committee website. The only major difference in the charge is that LCP has expanded our constituency to both APs and CSPs (with a footnote that CSP is currently defined based on reclassified AP positions, but that as Campus announces a definition of CSP the Committee's definition of CSP might change).
  - b. In our June Meeting, guest attendee Susan Breakenridge mentioned that there should be some guidelines from Campus (IHR) on the CSP definition coming soon that she would need to discuss with Dean Wilkin. As that discussion unfolds, LCP wants to be included to advocate for our CSP constituents – probably not in the earliest stages, but before the final decision is announced.
  - c. Dean Wilkin agreed with including LCP in the discussion after he and Library HR meet to gain clarity from IHR's guidance, noting that most likely the Library will need to have some nomenclature/designation of its own that will differ from IHR's definition of CSP – the Library may not have the same goal/needs for the CSPs as Campus does, and we need to support these distinct professionals within the Library.
3. Annual Performance Evaluation changes and implications for APs, CSPs, and Library governance
  - a. To give a bit of background: in 2014, guidelines for the AP Performance Evaluation were written and approved by the Administrative Council (AC); these guidelines were in use until 2020, and there was an Optional Worksheet for AP to use to provide information for their supervisor that included a list of the criteria APs were evaluation on, which was linked on the Library HR's [Resources for Academic Professionals](#) website. In 2021, the new online evaluation system was launched with a different set of criteria (those for Civil Service employees), which seems to have been a mistake – the CS criteria do not include AP-specific areas such as Investigation Time. This discrepancy was noticed by a member of

LCP and reported to the BHRSC by email in April 2022, whose response was to remove the Worksheet from the HR website without any discussion or transparency. Removing the file was understandable as it is inconsistent with the current evaluation system, but it doesn't address the fact that there was governance involved in putting forth the original 2014 criteria document; LCP would like to be involved in improving the evaluation process, starting with reinstating the 2014 criteria in evaluations for AP and including them for CSP employees, working in partnership with HR.

- b. Dean Wilkin agreed that this is a concern and should be rectified, and appreciated that LCP is tying the evaluation process to governance, as broad feedback is important in the Library as well as transparency. The performance evaluations are managed by HR but not HR processes, so changes should happen with transparency and input from supervisors and the representative bodies. LCP should invite Susan Breakenridge for another conversation and explain this history of the evaluation criteria and discuss reinstating the 2014 as well as improving the evaluation in general.
4. Meetings with candidates/discrepancy between response to LCP Memo and what HR thinks we should share with candidates
    - a. LCP met with Susan Breakenridge at our June meeting regarding LCP meeting with candidates for AP and CSP positions in the hiring process, which was sparked by Breakenridge joining a CSP candidate meeting unannounced and unexpected earlier this year. LCP explained the history of our meetings with candidates and its value as a recruitment tactic to meet with non-stakeholder employees in a similar classification; Breakenridge agreed with the value of these meetings for building relationships from the beginning, creating connections with actual people in the library. LCP's concern is that we were under the impression that our created script that discusses the development supports available to CSP was approved by HR, but there seems to be some concern from Breakenridge that this is not information that should be promised. Some of her concern may stem from the lack of official campus definition for CSP, but it may be a general question of what supports CSP are eligible for – and to LCP, if these candidates are **categorically** ineligible for these supports, it might not make sense for LCP to meet with the candidates or even represent them.
    - b. Tracy Tolliver noted that the recent interviews have been for IT positions that were reclassified from AP to CSP, so she, as Director of Library IT, has made sure that those positions will be eligible for these professional development funds (as these funds are a recruiting tool). It might be possible that there is not a paper trail about the reclassification of these positions and the explicit guarantee of the promise for funding and Breakenridge, being newer to the Library, doesn't have that full understanding of that background.
    - c. Dean Wilkin noted that it does sound like a general confusion, and that it is important for CSP to have professional development funding. Recommends that LCP keep the conversation with Breakenridge going, and hopefully with new

information from Campus the Library and LCP can make further definitions and clarifications.

5. CSP eligibility for Research and Publication Committee (RPC)
  - a. At the AP/CSP Forum in March, the representative for RPC stated that CSPs are not eligible for RPC funding; however, LCP was under the impression that RPC funding for CSP was part of the “Memorandum on Addressing Need to Update Library Policies and Procedures RE Civil Service Professionals” (Memo). LCP believes it was a misunderstanding by the RPC rep, but wanted to verify.
  - b. Dean Wilkin noted that RPC funds are not provided through governance but through administrative oversight in the interest of supporting professionals in the Library. LCP should talk with RPC about the Memo and if needed seek clarification with Susan Breakenridge.
  
6. CSP eligibility for the Library Innovation and Seed Funding
  - a. CSP eligibility for the Library Innovation and Seed Funding (LISF) was not addressed by the memo. In the email announcement in May, Mara Thacker followed-up with a clarification that CSP are eligible for the LISF. However, should LCP add an Addendum to the Memo about the LISF?
  - b. Dean Wilkin agreed that LCP should submit an Addendum to the Memo. The Executive Committee (EC) gave the definitive answer in May that CSP were eligible for LISF, but it is good to have official documentation.
  
7. Copyright and guidance for non-faculty staff
  - a. LCP met with Sara Benson to discuss copyright specifications for APs. The big takeaway is that under “Work Made for Hire,” APs don’t own the copyright for their work, the U of I Board of Trustees does (however, Faculty have been granted an exemption under the University Statutes). LCP believes there should be more transparent guidance for APs in navigating this, as well as guidance on how to reach out to the Office of Technology Management in order for APs to receive the copyright ownership for their own work, and are discussing with Benson a presentation to the Library in the early fall.
  - b. Dean Wilkin acknowledged that this situation is a little baffling, as it seems as though in regard to publications it should not matter which classification of employee is for the copyright to be owned by the author. There might be some things the Library can do to support APs, but in the long term it sounds like something that would need to be adjusted in the Statutes. LCP should continue the conversation with Benson, and if there is something Dean Wilkin can do to help with discussing policy in the Library and then advancing our concerns to a campus and university level, he is happy to help.
  
8. CAP Updates (Will and Eric)
  - a. Will noted that CAP is figuring out its next objectives after leadership transition, with the Library’s work on CSP classification and support providing a good

example in these conversations. There is work on a Wellbeing committee, right now more of a clearing house on resources available in a “post-COVID” era of wellbeing. CAP is having some issues with fulfillment of the AP Development Fund (APDF) requests, so it is good that the Library works to support its employees.

- b. Eric noted he is working hard on gathering as much information as possible in his new roles and helping out where he can on both CAP and LCP, possibly taking over some of the subcommittees and projects Jake Metz worked on.

9. Miscellaneous

- a. Dean Wilkin noted, in conjunction with several agenda items, that while the Library is interested in Campus clearly defining the employee groups because it can be beneficial in the end, we as the Library need to keep our own interests in mind and make our own decisions, in order to attract and retain the best employees and ensure that they advance in the profession.
- b. John Laskowski noted that, as the LCP Chair when LCP composed and submitted the Memo, he very much appreciated Dean Wilkin’s support and how consistent he has been in that support, and members of LCP agreed.
- c. Dean Wilkin thanked Laskowski and LCP, and reminded everyone to keep doing their great work and as much as possible get everything in official documentation.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00AM.