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The regular quarterly meeting of the Library Leadership Council was held at Spokane Community College, Spokane, Washington, and was convened at 9:10 a.m., October 12, 2017. Chair, Vivienne McClendon, and secretary, Cheyenne Roduin, were present.

Vivienne welcomed the council to Spokane Community College and introduced SCC Interim President Dr. Brockbank, who welcomed the councils and described the college.

Zoom Link: <https://zoom.us/j/7177265024>

**APPROVAL OF SUMMER MINUTES:** Minutes approved

**DISCUSSION OF 2017 WORKPLAN:** We will go through point by point to make sure we all agree on workplan in order to approve it.

* 1. - fine

**2.1** – Stephen asks why “access” rather than “attainment”?

MC – I think it has to do with eLearning and having access to accessibility issues and access to accessible technologies. But the objectives don’t address the word Access.

VM – should we change the word Access to Attainment?

MC – I think we should change it.

CW - yes, I agree with that. Access is misleading when the emphasis should be on attainment of student learning outcomes.

GB - I am new to this whole process, but is there any other document that describes these goals in greater detail? Perhaps it could be expanded upon/elaborated there.

KJ – if we were mirroring the guided pathways language, we would substitute completion instead of access.

SB - Logically it should be retention then completion - I am also new, could someone outline the relationship between info lit and articulation? We want to retain them so they can complete and transfer.

CF – Articulation to the 4-year institutions

MC – I am thinking of the work Howard is doing with the info lit classes out of the grey area to a required course.

EC – not all our students want to transfer…some of it might be about their work environment. Is there another way to capture the bigger importance of Info lit?

CF – there is nothing wrong with spelling out the articulation part and our ability to be part of that is important, but completion is important even if you are not transferring to another college. I think Retention, completion and articulation covers all our bases.

SB - So we can measure (maybe) transfer but not lifelong learning. I understand that tracking them after they leave is really challenging.

MC – I think it would be difficult to measure lifelong learning. However, we can talk about completion, retention, and articulation. Our office of IR has been able to get Western to communicate how well our students do that transfer to Western. I do not know if it is possible for all of us to do it, but that doesn’t tell me much about information literacy. I am trying to get us to track our Skagit students better, but each campus would need to track that individually.

SB – we reach out to the employers in our area to see how they feel about our students’ capabilities so it is theoretically possible, but tough to do on a systematic level.

VM – our workplan is supposed to show the work we are doing (forward movement).

MC – This is a high-level initiative. We are trying to demonstrate our councils work in this workplan, not necessarily individual campuses work.

VM – The workplan needs to be focused on what this council can accomplish in a given year.

CF – as an institution in a system, we can be looking at other models for tracking students in our overall system.

MH – I put forward a motion to change Access to Completion.

SB – friendly amendment to reorder words: Retention, Completion and articulation.

MH – I accept the friendly amendment to change word and word order to Retention, Completion and Articulation.

**Motion approved**

**3.1 –**

EC - In the objective, we mention Accessibility, but do not have an outcome for this. ELC and ITC have a joint subgroup on Accessibility and I am on this. I was our rep. on CATO, but that is undergoing changes in membership.

VM – any suggestions on outcomes in relation to OER and accessibility?

HF – As we look to develop any statement around accessibility, it would need to mirror Policy 188. Does this mean we are working with our vendors on accessibility and submit VPATS. That is all done. The accessibility piece seems driven by Policy 188 and the Access 360 grant that has library involvement.

AT – My teaching learning center coordinator is our accessibility person. Anything that is dealing with Accessibility could come out of the Access 360 grant and we could have this group monitor the grant and its process.

GV - I am on an Accessibility task force at Highline, looking to plan for the short-term and long term on campus

VM – do we have a motion to amend our wording under goal 3 to include wording about Access 360 as our avenue to address accessibility.

HF – I will move that we create a separate objective under the goal for Accessibility but make it in 3.2 to separate it from OER and that would allow us to attack them separately. It goes beyond SBCTC so we want to include other institutions. A lot of the training materials we are using live at UW.

EC – propose: Monitor discussions and outcomes of accessibility initiatives related to library resources and services.

GV - accessibility or accessible technology?

HF – I don’t think limiting it to technology would be good. Accessibility would be broader than technology. Some of the things we might work with might not be considered technology today.

GV - ok broader is better.

VM - we have a motion to create a 3.3 “working with other SBCTC and state groups to facilitate accessibility efforts”

MH – possible language: Working with other state groups to support and facilitate accessibility efforts.

HF – monitoring does not necessarily mean working with other groups and is too limiting and does not reflect the work that is going on at this time.

MC – I am fine with the motion but we have to develop a strategy, responsibility and outcomes. This is just the first step. Maybe someone who made the motion can help.

VM – maybe we can have it developed by the end of this meeting. Do we need any further discussion on the proposal?

MH – my only comment would be to change “working with others” to “work with others”

HF – that is good with me

VM – we are going to vote on this. New language for 3.3: “Work with other state groups to support and facilitate accessibility efforts”. In addition, we will change other verbs of working to Work.

**Motion Approved**

MC – We are working a couple things on that are not in this document like the new assessment grant and the transitioning into the new consortium. That is 3.2 so forget that one. We are going to spend time on the assessment this year, so would be good to have in here.

VM – the assessment one is not in here. By the end of this meeting, we should be able to fit it into something that is already here or add a new goal. Are we okay delaying a final vote on workplan until we discuss the assessment piece? OK.

**LOEL Report (Candice Watkins)** **(*slightly out of order with agenda)*** – The LOEL grant is complete but the summer meeting requested a formal report. That would need to come from Quill. I can talk about the final stages around assessment. The last year of the grant focused on the work between faculty and the librarians. They kept journals on their workings together and Quill wants to assess trends from those journals. Quill and Amy Hoffer collected journal entries and reports and did a literature review then developed a comprehensive report and they are presenting it at Open Ed this week. Once she has released the report, we will post it to the LOEL website and we will email it to everyone. I think it was a great success in shedding light on the librarian’s impact in OER. It is eye opening to see how we can incorporate OER into the daily workflow of a librarian’s job.

**WORK PLAN UPDATES AND REPORTS:**

* **Library Services Platform (Wade Guidry):** *Report on wiki*I believe you have a link to my report on the agenda. First news is stale now, but we are now officially done with implementation. Cohort 3 switched to support in early August. Next point is about the website for WACTCLC. The website will be where Shelly and I will post documents on projects that we are working on in addition to all the Zoom recordings for the leads calls. We posted all the institutional contacts and online catalogs. As we develop projects and post meeting minutes, they will all go on the website. Anything that we need to follow up can be done through SalesForce. Shelly and I did a post-implementation survey to make sure we have correct contact info and to ask about institutional priorities for this year. One thing that came up in the Executive meeting was about possibly shared access to electronic resources and generalized interest in who is doing what with electronic resources in ALMA by Institution. In addition, you can activate OERs in Alma too. There is a new ALMA UI available and the hard deadline to switch to new UI is January 2018. ELUNA 2018 is in Spokane. There is another Community College system in Virginia that is converting to ALMA/PRIMO.
	+ **Billing (Tim Fuhrman):** All the libraries have paid or have check in the mail.We just paid $214K for Cohort 3, our balance is over $500K. Next year I am hoping to have everybody’s bills and we will bill you once for everything. We are working on closing out ORCA and need the final bill and who gets what for refunds.

JB – When do we get our individual bills for Primo?

TF – you should have already got it.

CR – Will we need to keep paying for support people every year?

TF – yes.

* **CLAMS (Linda Keys):** I need time for a discussion in addition to a report. I shared a couple documents with you today and first one is an outline. This is my second term as president of CLAMS and want to thank you all for the guidance and support you have given CLAMs over the years. CLAMS thinks this is a key moment for us to evolve. Not a complete dissolution of CLAMS but that our vision and roles as librarians need to evolve. Need to re-envision our role as library leaders. Librarians are the perfect bridge for our students to ACRL. Our members have so much to offer that we need to expand the purview of who we talk to and what our jobs are. We would like to have a larger role in the library discussions around state with WLA and promote our membership by becoming part of ACRL as well. We think it will affect retention, success and transfer. We have amazing membership. The other reality check is that, as much as CLAMS connections are important, there is a small part of the membership that changes places and takes turns in leadership positions. We have leadership fatigue and we are not getting other members to step up and take leader roles. It is a reality of increased job responsibilities with a decrease in resources. So what we did in spring 2017 conference, we invited president of ACRL-WA and WLA. What we want to recommend to our membership is that they get WLA and ACRL memberships. The WLA membership is cost prohibitive. This is going to be a huge economic impact to pay those fees. An $80-100 membership annually is something we would need to budget for. We would like to consider an institutional membership. WLA has individual and organizational memberships that looks like it is based on total operating expenses of a library. I think we can get more of our members to move with us to WLA – we want to join the academic division and have a CLAMS sub-group so we can keep our budget and maintain communication, cohesion, and vision. I think we will lose people if we ask them to pay for individual memberships. I am proposing the facts that we have discovered and ask for our consideration.

MC – I have already paid the institutional membership to WLA at Skagit. I feel strongly the larger group with help with cross-pollination and I would like to see our librarians do more presenting. To get our librarians to attend, there needs to be programs they are interested in. I would like to see the academic division increase. I am very much in favor of this. I would like everybody to be on board with this too. Skagit cost $285 for the year for our librarians.

CW - Hi Linda! Does the $100 for CLAMS membership go towards the WLA membership?Or is it separate?

LK – the CLAMS membership fee would go away and would go towards WLA. We would dissolve and become part of WLA. Yakima Valley has an institutional membership too.

GB - Similar to Mindy's thoughts--inst. memberships reinforce the library's/inst.'s commitment to their employees, and streamline costs in addition to all the other benefits that Mindy has mentioned.

LK – looking at the organization benefits for WLA – includes up to eight trustees.

MC – I called them and talked about how to get all my librarians on this and they said to list the librarians as trustees.

Lynn K – I am in favor of working with WLA. I had a conversation with Cindy Aiden and maybe there is a way to affiliate with WLA.

LK – Our conversation was based around the model we see in Oregon and there ACRL is part of WLA. That would be our ultimate goal.

Lynn K – question and concern is the number of eight for WLA. For Seattle Central we would exceed those eight trustees so it is a challenge and a bit restrictive. CLAMS is so inclusive to ALL librarians.

LK – We might want to help supplement those extra memberships from the CLAMS budget.

SB - I would like to suggest CLAMS could do less with more. As part of Goal 3, we could develop standardized conferencing technology so that the problems we’ve had today do not recur and CLAMS could meet virtually as well. If organizing meetings wasn’t such a BIG DEAL you would find more folks willing to lead and meet.

LK – that is a good point because we do not have travel money.

LPH – I think one of the reasons that group was powerful is because we had the ability to meet and hear each other and share. Virtual conferencing is good, but we still need to meet face to face.

LK – I agree. Virtually you don’t get those conversations when you are online or virtual. Our goal is to always have our spring conference and potentially invite other people to participate.

CW - I came from Oregon and have a lot of experience with OLA, ACRL, and ILAGO (Clams equivalent). All work closely and are mainly a part of OLA. This has had tremendous benefits!

MC – Does anyone know if WLA is having a spring conference? In addition, I remember the debate 20 years ago at ACRL when they had that crisis to decide to set up their own state group. I wonder since WLA has restructured, if that conversation could be revisited and ACRL could be more involved in WLA. Also, is there any way to change the pricing structure to include more librarians and larger institutions could have more people.

LK – We have approached WLA and ACRL about reconsidering that affiliation.

MC – I remember before there was the LLC, the directors and deans were actively involved in CLAMS and when we left, the environment changed quite a bit. We are failing our librarians if we aren’t providing opportunities for growth

GV - Highline College has been an organizational member for a long time. I think this is a great idea.

CW - Totally agree with Stephen - we need some best practices for online/hybrid meetings. This will help everyone feel more involved despite distance and alleviate the pressure from Vivienne.

SB - Librarians should be leaders in the use of DE technology, creating online training and meeting opportunities for our members

LK – Instead of using the time here, should we continue this via email?

AT – Library staff working together – we also have WACTCLC and this group will encompass everyone working together.

CW - It would also encourage more involvement WLA is scheduled into the future for fall conferences, except when they do joint conferences with OLA

TF – We are working to update our tech. for online meetings. Report coming later in the meeting.

CW – I think the direction CLAMS is heading is the right way to go. I see how ACRL – OR provides tremendous benefits by making Community college librarianship part of the larger discussions. Not just financial benefits, but people are going to want to get involved and benefits in leadership rotation.

SB - For what it is worth, I think CLAMS should evolve and not disband. There are practical things we should work on together as well as higher-level professional topics to discuss (which could certainly happen in other organizations).

LK – The last 2 sessions at our spring conference were helpful. One was about privilege and one was about mindfulness and they were both great. I would like to thank everybody and would like to continue this discussion. We would like to have a vote sooner than later.

CF – what I am hearing is you are asking us to make the first step for institutional membership to WLA.

LK – We want your guidance as well, in addition to institutional memberships.

VM – would someone from this group like to volunteer to be a point person with CLAMS?

MC – I would suggest Ahniwa Ferrari might be the best person as a chair of ACRL-WA.

LK – I will follow up with Ahniwa Ferrari and Candice Watkins.

* **SBCTC Report- accessibility, eLearning, and opportunities collaboration (Mark Jenkins):** I want to run through the topics on our charts in eLearning. There are so many opportunities for collaboration between ELC and LLC. I have talking points from CATO (SBCTC group): we truncated this group into a smaller group with specific goals. One goal is system level – Access 360 where we will do a gap analysis or maturity modeling chart. There will be a keynote speaker on each day to share with group and there will be panels and discussions for best practice framework around accessibility. Whatcom is helping us develop a cloud-based system-wide application for accessibility. We are also looking to develop a set of trained testers to use in the system and looking at 3rd-party for testing for accessibility. Captioning is rolling out and people are not using it to the full extent. We might be giving away money as an incentive to use it. In OER, the state auditor asked if we wanted a performance audit on our OER initiative work and I think we may take them up on that. Boyoung doing survey of student organizations surrounding affordability of resources to help develop the affordability code that will accompany courses. Boyoung also finishing up the OER Toolkit and will share it out. For a future discussion, the state board does these epic procurements for technologies and we are thinking of pursuing a middle ground between state board and WATECH will help define the categories of technology and take more of a policy stance that includes LLC, ELC, and ITC. We need to continue to have these group conversations to move forward on initiatives and possible core technologies. A Core Technology is one that the whole system has a single solution that is paid for and supported by SBCTC. Part of the framework for the technology strategic planning work will revamp this definition.

VM – There is a lot of work to do here and eLearning is feeling like a separate entity and that is not a good way to utilize this group.

* **eLearning Council (Aryana Bates):** *Report on wiki.* There was a discussion around FERPA and cross-listing courses in Canvas and how we are handling those regulations. Several workgroups were updated. Council priorities for this year can be found here: [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1od5A7ynXVO7voV\_WoKB650Je0TZ0Ycrxt1XSK1Hu2pY/edit#](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1od5A7ynXVO7voV_WoKB650Je0TZ0Ycrxt1XSK1Hu2pY/edit) Discussion about how Ally is being used. Discussion about college experiences with DOE program reviews.

MH – DOE is looking for regular and substantive interactions between student and instructors in online classes to make a difference between distance and correspondence courses.

AB – Some of what they were looking for is what kind of training is offered to faculty for online teaching. Looking for standards of coding and attendance tracking.

VM – at the State Authorization Network meeting, modality is not an excuse to not interact with students. In addition, Mark pays for SAN, but there is still a lot of work around SARA. I think eLearning should help to find out if we are in compliance with the state requirements for SARA and SAN.

SB - It sounds like the DOE requirements are in writing - are they anywhere we can read them/share them. <https://ifap.ed.gov/programrevguide/attachments/2017ProgramReviewGuide.pdf>

**Lunch – Orlando’s, Student Run Food Service**

**Breakout Groups concurrent with lunch and updates:**

**ELEARNING GROUP:**

MJ – A rich discussion. My role was to frame educational technology issues in smaller groups. On the table is current definition of eLearning and Educational Technology and what kinds of policies need to be built to support them. It would be good to be in a position to not react to an IC workplan but to be proactive instead and make joint recommendations on the future of eLearning in our system.

AB – We talked about what our next steps should be. One is framing eLearning as instruction and the other is beginning to work more intimately with eLearning Council by forming a working group of members of ELC and LLC. We will track stuff like compliance, shared strategies for instructional technologies, shared interests like technology, figure ways to encourage IC to support shared techs, start working towards a single report or 2 similar reports that are framed similarly to show our vision of what eLearning should be doing. We may need to initiate a conversation with Mary Garguile. We need to form a vision instead of just reporting out. Try to frame the discourse that instructional design is taught to all instructors; regardless of subject or modality, (captioning might be our hook). Bringing instructional design and information literacy and OER as touchpoint that we build our vision around. Talked about the resistance that instructional designers get from faculty as a way of exploring it to be able to work around it or dissolve it. Elevating the work of instructional designers to help other faculty understand instructional design – one example is showcasing more work completed by faculty. Compliance with standards of engagement for student and faculty check-in. Talked about statistics and how do we make sure we are in on the decisions with IR and deans to track data and use it. Talked about how to better collaborate with Instructional deans to battle waitlists and offering online/hybrid courses to reduce waitlists. How are we assessing whether there are similar types of assessment across modalities.

 **ASSESSMENT IN ACTION STEERING COMMITTEE GROUP:**

Larger discussion tomorrow.

**TEASER OF WACTCLC DISCUSSION AND MEETING:**

CF –A sneak peek on the consortium meeting – WACTCLC update. I pulled up the website that Wade showed. Membership of Exec Committee on website. Tim and Wade spoke about Alma earlier but we will all speak together in the future. Alma launched and trying to figure out what the structure is between LLC and WACTCLC. Consortium is meeting tomorrow from 12-2 and we will discuss the things we have already done: help LLC secure Dumas Bay for the AiA meeting,

AT – Could the consortium consider replacing the sound system that LLC uses? This helped us discuss what our role and structure is with LLC. I think LLC will be able to handle that financially.

CF – We do not know what the structure is going to be going forward between LLC and WACTCLC. Possibly looking at other models of consortium to help us decide what the focus of this consortium will be moving forward and ways it might be different then LLC. The consortium does not share the same membership model as LLC and could be divided up in different ways for projects.

HF - Great job of pulling that together. Because we are focusing on structure, the meeting tomorrow should be very important. During this planning phase, this is a great time to have your voice heard.

MC – in terms of where the consortium is going, is the work on the 21st Century project informing the WACTCLC decisions and directions? Is there anything that we can work with the state board to help achieve those goals from that document?

CF – Yes, we have only met one of the goals on that document so far. I think if we are putting things in order, we were making sure we completed and managed the ALMA project first. Next, we are looking at other projects.

AF - If we do shared electronic resources (or consortial buying) that seems like a great in for SBCTC helping us find money.

MC – part of what initiated our request to get money from the legislature years ago is because the 4-years got a line item from state and we wanted it too.

**DISCUSSION ABOUT NEW LLC SOUND SYSTEM:**

AT – However many years ago when we bought the mixer, the technology was good at the time, but it is a bit outdated now for our needs. We thought it was going to be expensive, but my media tech says we can get daisy chain microphones and the software we are using has better sound tools built in. He thinks we can come up with something for a few hundred dollars.

VM – it occurred to me that I have not looked at zoom to see if it can be accessed from cell phone. Zoom has a lot of capacity that we can use for our meetings. We have a little time to figure it out since our next meeting will be fully online for winter.

AT – I will include the idea of breakout sessions and see if there are solutions where you can be in a noisy environment.

CW - I think having best practices for hybrid meetings - this could help, not just about technology!

AT – That is something that we do better than other groups, having a moderator and having people managing the group and formalizing it into a best practices would be great.

**OER GROUP:**

CW – I wanted to say that when I got here I walked into the LOEL project. Although we have had OER in our workplan, the focus has been on LOEL and LLC has been relying on LOEL to push OER ahead. That reliance has reduced the participation in the group. Therefore, we might be experiencing a vacuum and we need to reinvigorate our vision for that.

VM – How can we move OER forward or what is mentioned in the workplan? I feel like we have it listed but at the moment, we are not doing anything.

KJ – Alternative education resources and what role does the library play. If the goals are reducing cost for students, what role does the library play in that?

VM – Right now, we do not have a chair for this group and Mark Jenkins mentioned that he has got a lot of student interest in this topic and Boyoung feels like her work really matters.

MH – In regards to the workplan, I am responsible for student outcomes and we haven’t really done anything on that either. I am not clear on what the expectations are in leading this goal? Do we meet in between our bigger meetings? I need help setting the expectations.

CW - I think it would be wise to look at the final LOEL assessment report that Quill publishes and draw our direction from this. Quill is presenting it at Open Ed and by next week, I should be able to share it with the group.

AB – I agree with Melinda about expectation on taking point on an initiative. I was under the assumption I am a facilitator and not responsible for getting all the work done myself.

VM – Each subgroup can decide its own scope and what its leadership does. It might be building awareness or connecting with other groups. I asked people who are presenting reports to also let us know how we are involved in their work/report. So maybe we are waiting for Quills report to move forward on OER.

CW - Again, perhaps we are talking about best practices for work group leads. The results of LOEL point to determining how to better incorporate OER into existing librarian workflow without being overwhelming.

AT – On facilitation, I think the discussion we had today was light-years ahead based on your facilitating.

TF – Even the ELC OER group is more about supporting the work Boyoung is doing.

VM – I suggest we table OER until we get a report from Quill to see how we want to move forward.

**Christie Flynn side discussions:** Pierce has drafted a letter to send to APA about advertisements on the Diagnostic Statistical Manual (DSM) database site.

Another point – a student posted a violent and threatening message on QuestionPoint from the Pierce IP address range. Nono looked at it and noticed it was a cut and paste job. The security office got involved too. It is probably a good time to have those conversations with our staffs about privacy and safety.

SB - Our students have to login to the network, so we could probably figure out who was online at the time someone sent an abusive/violent message.

CF – Our students do not log in until they have to print.

**STANDING REPORTS:**

* **Treasurer’s Report (Andrew Tudor):** *Report on wiki.* New membership statements can be paid by credit card now. After this meeting, we will probably have a balance of about $5,000.

TS – How much is the average of expenses for meetings?

AT – the range is from $500-$1,100

VM – our campus is considering charging us for using our own space because events are a self-support unit and they need money.

* **Library Council (Lynn Kanne):** Met in Walla Walla yesterday. Jeff will be here tomorrow to give a state library update. We had a visit to the prison library in Walla Walla to see what kind of services SOME inmates get while incarcerated. I asked about the support that students get and found they are minimally staffed with one paraprofessional at each site and one librarian for the whole state prison system. Washington state library is lobbying for a new library building. It seems that the state library has good support from secretary of state and that Cindy is a great advocate for what our libraries need and making the state library very visible. New state law librarian started and the law library is working on outreach and will provide service to anyone in Washington. They have someone named Mary Campbell as an intern with the state library to work on staff development. Jeff will talk about LSTA tomorrow.
* **Instruction Commission (Mindy Coslor):** In summer, I attended IC but they were so busy with agenda items that I did not get to vocally report out and handed in a written report.

VM – I would like us to be reflective on what we are committed to and what we can actually accomplish.

LK – I agree. It is also about the nature of what we apply ourselves to and what we commit our own time to. If we can be strategic about the types of things we put our power behind, I look forward to that discussion.

* **Adult ED/CBS/AEAC (Mindy Coslor):** *Report on wiki.* This is a group representing various state agencies and is actively managed by the AEAC office in the state board. They are interested on advocating for Info Lit. We discussed the challenges of mostly part-time faculty, discussed IDEA grants. We worked on a workplan with new goals (See report).
* **IT Commission (Andrew Tudor):** Conversations about PCI compliance and CTCLink. PCI is about credit card transactions and where data is stored on networks. There is scrutiny if we are in compliance. CTCLink’s new manager attended and she was bringing the work in progress to the commission. Waves are gone and now more about individual college readiness and then you are put in a queue. There will be a new version of PeopleSoft coming out and we are trying to figure out how to get colleges converted before the CTCLink happens. New timeline pushes project out to 2020 and presidents are not happy. Do you want me to take the conversation to ITC that we are having about teaching and learning between ELC and LLC?

VM – eLearning is meeting next week so maybe we see what comes out of that. Mark said we could have a smaller task force that might handle communication out on issues.

**DAILY WRAP UP AND TOUR**

**MOTIONS PASSED:**

Melinda Harbaugh put forward a motion to change Access to Completion in section 2.1 of Workplan.

Stephen Badalamente put forward a friendly amendment to reorder words: Retention, Completion and articulation.

Melinda Harbaugh accepted the friendly amendment to change word and word order to Retention, Completion and Articulation.

**Motion approved**

Melinda Harbaugh and Howard Fuller suggested new language for 3.3 to read: “Work with other state groups to support and facilitate accessibility efforts”. Additionally, we will change other verbs of working to Work.

**Motion Approved**
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Zoom Link: <https://zoom.us/j/7177265024>

The second day of the regular quarterly meeting of the Library Leadership Council was convened at 9:05 a.m., October 13, 2017, by the chair, Vivienne McClendon.

VM – This morning we worked on draft language in the workplan regarding accessibility. I appreciate the help.

**State Library Update (Jeff Martin):** *Report on wiki* Thank you for inviting me to Spokane. I was at the Library Council of Washington meeting where we discussed the 2018 Workplan and introduced 3 new projects for the 2017 workplan with current funds. Actionable research in the library and also talked about the Newsbank project and the third item is the virtual reality research project in conjunction with UW iSchool and Oculus. Good news, hopefully, is that the house of reps approved the current bill with current levels of funding for libraries. Senate also provided funding for IMLS and it needs to move forward to a vote. The Strategic Plan has been put together and Cindy Aiden handled strategic planning. We developed goals, including engagement with elected officials and the public and the other one is concerning state and federal documents. Some other goals will be covered with state funding and others with LSTA funds. We are hoping that HS21+ will be going online in December and there is partnership opportunities for public and school libraries. Other goals of 5-year plan include continuing to digitize materials. Washington digital newspapers continue and we have an online portal that makes everything available. We are moving forward with a linked data project pilot that involves WSL and select collections and some other libraries that would participate. What linked data will allow libraries catalog to be more readily searched via a Google Search – should make libraries more visible. We posted the mental health initiative videos on our website. The other opportunity is NewsBank – Cindy had a relationship with a person who brokered a deal that we pay $100,000 in a pilot year for libraries across the state to access content including Washington newspaper and American newspaper collections. The state library is paying that out of LSTA the first year and we will look for shared pay models in the future. We hope to have this up and running by January 2018 and will let you all know when that is ready. After that first year, we can decide if we want to continue and work out pay models.

LPH – Does newsbank include Seattle Times?

JM – Yes, it should.

HF – Do you know how much of the current state already subscribes?

JM- We are just in the preliminary stages of finding out.

AT – you mentioned HS21+ is online, who would deliver that?

JM – each local college would participate in delivering that content and the state board will have a curriculum but it won’t be mandated so the local colleges can adapt it to their needs.

MG – Linda Keys helped build out that project and used OER and is available online.

**AiA Grant Discussion- Campus Priorities and Assessment Topics Discussion - Preparing for the Pre-Retreat Deans Event:**

**Action Research in the Library (Mary Ann Goodwin):** *Powerpoint on wiki.*We have some great activities scheduled. I think it is important to set the stage when we send our statement of work and request to state library. These outcomes are to give our faculty librarians exposure to the research process to use in their daily teaching lives and also to give them the incentive to create research projects of their own. My philosophy for this type of work comes from Everett Rodgers. If you lower the barriers to entry, you make it easier to try out something new (research in this case). The stage we want is to get librarians to try.

Project (LSTA funding): we have $80,060 to spend. We are starting with the Assessment in Action workshop over 2 days to allow for time to brainstorm the research projects. I want people to leave with a draft of their grant proposal/research project. The add-on is the mini-research grant project that takes the rest of the year. We have money for about 24 proposals at around $1,500 per project. What I would like to do is lower barriers by producing some templates to put their findings on and help them build from. These projects could be in many forms: PPT, Posters, Paper, etc. Year 2 is to create an environment for presenting research findings/projects. Year 2 is tentatively funded through WSL LSTA for $70,600. Year two activities could be a second round of mini-grants, the 1st symposium for reporting out and a 2nd symposium for second round grant reports.

LK – Question about the symposium, do you see this as a stand-alone event or something that we might look at for WLA or ATL that would have a wider audience?

MG – I will be recruiting for people to take it out further and bigger.

MC – in the AiA reading, they were expecting librarians to lead teams and have 14 months to produce a project. Have you talked with our presenters about our timeline and if there is any issue with a shorter timeframe?

MG – no, it’s a good question.

CF – the facilitators perceive this as something different than what was before in the AiA. They know this one day is just one day and their suggestion is to do this day and the work and in your year two bring us back to see if it can be leveled up.

MC – Do we mean that anyone who attended the workshop could apply for the 2nd year instead of first year?

MG – Or they don’t need to attend and just have interest or training in assessment. Detail: Dumas Bay center December 7-8, 2017. Money built into grant to cover housing for those that need to stay. Next steps: email ready to go out and would like to send it out so we can arrange for our staffs to attend (Includes a googleform). We have single rooms and doubles. We can have 98 people in the room and 80 people that can sleep over. We are hoping each college could send teams of 3 or more. So who wants to help?

* We need help with a registration team. Samantha is doing the fiscal agent part
	+ (GERIE VENTURA, SAMANTHA HINES, JEANNE LEADER).
* We need someone to help put the room together at Dumas Bay with the specifics that the AiA people require.
	+ (GERIE VENTURA, MARY ANN GOODWIN, CHEYENNE RODUIN)
* We need a team to put together the mini-grant process. We would like them to have some commons research questions to choose from while allowing for unique ideas too.
	+ (AMY KELLY, ARYANA BATES, VIVIENNE MCCLENDON, LYNN KANNE, MARY ANN GOODWIN, CANDICE WATKINS)
* Need help with the research symposium next fall (venue or combined with another meeting)
	+ LYNNE KANNE (lead), LESLIE POTTER-HENDERSON, MINDY COLSOR).
* Need help with workshop day 2 organizing (developing agendas or arrange for presentations).
	+ (CHRISTIE FLYNN (lead), KENNEDY JAMES, JENNIFER PATTERSON, LESLIE POTTER-HENDERSON)

SB - three = librarian, non-librarian faculty and IR ?

MG – I am not going to dictate who a college wants to send.

CF – that is what I was thinking about for day 2 where we get some key IR people to join us who really understands libraries.

MG – one of my librarians has created data dashboards and she would be a good person for day two.

LK – Thinking about teams, I am wondering about multi-college teams for smaller libraries or the numbers would be too small from a certain college. We need to make sure the mini-grant makes that possible.

MG – I think people will self-organize.

JL – What are the workshop hours – please include them on the registration form.

MG – they are on the registration form. All day on Thursday and maybe 8-2 on Friday.

JB – in order to include local people, you need to have an activity in the evening.

CF – I think an activity will come out that night in reframing the questions.

SB - Is this training suitable for libraries that do not have library courses?

MG – yes, Stephen. They should be able to do some testing if their programs and instruction are working. The other thing we are facing is Program Reviews and how we know our programs are adding value to the institution and support academic success. This is all about being able to show the value of our programs.

MC – based on what is in the AiA, they had several outcomes already concerning student success and student learning.

MG – the new revised standards for libraries mentions that student learning in libraries are hard to determine but it does not absolve librarians from determining how effective their teaching is.

TS – It sounds like this could be applied to research consultation or even reference work within the library, not necessarily in a class format.

MG – I would encourage librarians to look for small, manageable projects.

MC – I think Deb’s vision was about making the case to college presidents about the value of libraries.

SB - Our administration decided to move up our college wide info lit learning outcome in the assessment cycle such that we have to design, implement and report by the end of the academic year.

MG – can I submit the budget request to Jeff for year 2 of the grant.

MC – I move that we accept the proposal as proposed by MaryAnn, including the budget for the second year, to submit to Jeff Martin at the State Library.

JM – I wanted to say for year 2 we are presently over what we received last year so we need to see how everything shakes out to see what congress gives us for 2018. We might need to make some adjustments to year 2 so we don’t get our expectations too high.

SB – I will certainly take this to our administration and suggest it is a more reasonable timeline for our work and I would appreciate any feedback from people.

MG – Setting the stage is handing off to Christie Flynn, We asked you to send in your institutional priorities that might help us build off those to align our work.

CF – Some research showed that libraries didn’t have the full support of the institution and IR departments to be able to do this work. Deb was wondering if we could take some time to make sure that all the library directors/deans are in support of this and the work being done. Also so that we can frame the question so that research questions really get at our interests of completion, retention, etc. We need to show and measure that we are impacting student learning and success. What I think our goal is “engage libraries and library faculty in action based research that enables us to measure our impact on key institutional themes.” Our question: “What is the most effective contribution we can make to the Learning System?” “Are students changed as a result of our interaction with them in the context of these institutional priorities?” I looked at all the comments about institutional directions and themes, and we were a little bit all over the map but I did the best to pull out similar themes so we can get deans to buy in. Could we look at these 4 themes:

 **Retention**

 **Classroom Success**

 **Engagement**

 **Equity**

Could we look through these lenses:

 **Credit courses**

 **Integrated instruction**

 **Reference Interactions**

 **Strategic Partnerships (writing Center, tutoring, etc.)**

CF **–** So these issues might help our presenters on day-one to show that all our participants all fall into these general buckets and what questions would arise from these.

SB - Do the ENG 101s all have librarian led instruction at Pierce?

CF – No

AK - I like these themes/lens ideas. They reflect SPSCC's major concerns, and yet leave a lot of scope for research.

JL - Christie - would you send your PPT to us or post on the LLC page? Thanks!

LK – Seattle Central, our librarians will be very excited about this work.

SP – how many colleges have credit bearing library courses?

CF – Pierce added a 3-credit college success class and now there is a strong push to add more 2-credit classes to help fill credit options. Courses that were not heavily used by institutions are starting to get more play.

JB – I want to share a study on Impact of Information literacy on Student Success. Their 4 research questions fit in with this. They will be looking into more specific types of classes in the next year.

GV - I like that we'll all be gathered together to help find a research focus for each campus

EC - We are meeting with our new IR person in a few weeks, and this will help us plan.

AT – There is also a strong theoretical foundation around retention theory through a community college lens – findings included that the engagement happened in the classroom instead of through the extra surrounding sources or resources.

CF – monetarily, these mini-grants need to be of value to get the librarians to do the work. But it will also depend on how these teams look.

JP – it seems like the $1500 per person instead of per project will need to be figured out.

MC – to clarify about the research question, are we saying we have these 4 areas to focus on but we aren’t telling them what to say in their research question? The team can have different questions, but to fall under one of these 4 themes.

CF – I think so. Develop your question that shows what your contribution is to the institution and tell about our impact.

LK – Building in some flexibility to how the mini-grants are structured is helpful.

VM – I’m a little concerned about the timeline and making sure we are where we need to be before we leave. My librarians have their timeline already figured out through end of year, but I am concerned. Are we prepared to move forward?

CF – Mary Ann is ready to send the email. Is it okay if the team leads are also the steering committees for this grant? Moving forward, if we want to stay on task, the group leads might need to be the steering committee.

VM – I don’t have a lead for each group. But I think you are right that these leads are the steering committee.

CF – I don’t know how Mary Ann intended with the administering the proposals and funding or is it first come, first served?

LK – we need clarity about what people are signing up for and what the criteria are if we need to evaluate proposals if we get more than we can handle. Need parameters about the expectation of engagement.

AB – Does the work with the mini-grant team need to be done by the workshop?

CF – the money is already set aside for the mini-grants. We haven’t said who gets the money and how they get it.

MC – there needs to be a simple form to report out for a first deliverable. But we still have unanswered questions about criteria for evaluating the proposals.

CF – Candice isn’t online but she has really good experience dealing with people and grant reporting and criteria.

MC – it would be great to have an IR person to help us through this process.

VM – I think I have an IR person to bring.

TS – I asked MaryAnn if everybody who attends is expected to come up with a proposal and she said no, the grant proposal comes after the training.

MC – Those who don’t submit proposals immediately might submit in spring.

VM – when will the deadline be for grant proposal criteria be done outlining.

JB – Maybe we remove the wording Per-Librarian from the money awards.

HF – when the grant was developed it was designed as per librarian.

VM – we could just say $1500 per project.

CF – all I think of is I come from a larger library in the state and I know there might be smaller libraries who participate. There might be some partnering between institutions.

AB – Maybe the mini-grant team can make the decision about this part of who and how funding is dispersed.

VM – we talked about being creative.

JP – solution for getting the email out would be to leave the dollar amount for now.

**REMAINING WORKPLAN UPDATES**

* **Student Outcomes (Melinda Harbaugh):** Currently updating the workplan document. Vivienne asked me to create a document where we can put all our updates and it is on the wiki. For student outcomes, I haven’t done a lot of work on this. I am taking your advice to schedule a meeting at the end of fall for the members. Some things are done – a draft survey for 2.2 Guided Pathways – Erica drafted the survey and we will discuss that and send out to collect data. 2.1 about info lit and student success, we will be discussing this at fall meeting.25 responses were gathered and we will discuss them. Erica created a shared folder with documents. Our big strategy with 2.1 (student outcomes and connections) will be the Assessment in Action workshop.
* **New Wiki (Erica Coe):** Kennedy asked me to take over. I like the WACTCLC webpage and we are going to look at that model. Hopefully at winter meeting we will have a draft for people to look at. Right now it is Melinda, Kennedy and Erica working on this.

MC – As long as you brought up the wiki, I realized a number of our new members are not on there and I am going to add them.

* **Library Courses (Howard Fuller):** There will be a single library course off the grey list. It will be a course that is required to have theory and history in it. It is back into the ATC larger committee (out of subcommittee) and is being vetted. But there is support for it. It has to get approval then move to IC for approval and then it has to go to ICRC who has to make the change. It is a multi-year process and I am happy to keep pushing it through.
* **CATO – Committee for Accessible Technology Oversight (Erica Coe):** Cato doesn’t exist anymore so no new update. They are looking at the membership structure but it didn’t have the effect they wanted and they are restructuring it more around technology coordinators on each campus. So maybe we can take that committee off our list.
* **Baccalaureate Leadership (Mindy Coslor):** I will find out when BLC is meeting and connect with them. I went through my dissertation and synthesized my findings on the library impact on BAS programs *Report on wiki.* I took the transcripts and coded them for different themes. Vivienne and I are reporting on the BAS conference in November and we are gathering information by college and by theme.

VM - About a year ago I was subbing for Erica on BAS council. Once we get all the input we will link it all up by theme. If you don’t want your campus associated with information, please let us know and we will hide the name of your college.

MC – one thing I could do is go back and do some comparisons on how much we are spending per student in the libraries in relation to how much university libraries are spending per student.

VM – We believe there should be some stronger leadership at the state level on how these programs are being approved and funded.

MC – Upper level materials are much deeper and we plan our collections around most of our populations. I think we need to go through state board or IC and ask for their guidance.

AT – another problem is how vendors designate us as 2-year or 4-year colleges. I had to explain to the rep that there is a fine line between the two types of colleges.

HF – what is interesting about applied BA, many schools around the country offer applied BA degrees, but in Washington they seem to separate the two and vendors probably don’t see them as different.

VM – Vendors want to know numbers of students and it is hard to get that info from IR.

MC – VPs don’t seem to understand how critical this is. Our BAS have very little FTE compared to our other programs in lower divisions so it is hard to give solid numbers of who will be using these databases.

VM – put your thoughts or experiences on the document we are forming so we can read through all the documents and come up with a presentation. We hope to inform people who are working in the BAS programs about the library issues.

EC - I can provide an overview on the BLC workplan. They want to create a subcommittee to review library resources. I shared the draft of the BLC workplan with our group, they are reviewing allocation of library resources by a subcommittee. They want to develop guidelines for academic vigor around BAS programs.

**Final look at workplan:**

VM – goal number 3 had work done. We needed an action and deliverable around accessibility. We split out accessibility from 3.1 and made it a new 3.3 that speaks to accessibility.

MC – now we have a 3.3 that is about accessibility and has an objective, outcome, etc.

VM – Cheyenne is the lead.

CR – do we have an LLC accessibility committee?

MC – I think we just made it.

VM – so we will need a statement of principles in support of accessibility compliance.

HF – it says we do have an accessibility committee and Erica was lead.

EC – ITC is also working on accessibility and I can be reporting from ELC and ITC.

VM – We asked Aryana to report from ELC .

AB – Tim will be at the next meeting and Aryana will take over then.

CR – I put forward a motion to accept 3.3 added to our workplan as written.

**Motion approved**

VM – volunteers to help Cheyenne – Jane Blume, Gerie Ventura, Andrew Tudor, Erica Coe, and Vivienne McClendon.

MC – Moves that we approve the LLC workplan as amended. Seconded by Aryana Bates.

**Motion approved**

**Wrap-up/Take-aways and confirming IC reporting information:**

**Next Meetings:**

**Winter Online – March 1, 2018**

**Spring Centralia – April 1-17, 2018**

**Motions Passed:**

Mindy Coslor moves that we accept the proposal for the AiA grant as proposed by MaryAnn, including the budget for the second year, to submit to Jeff Martin at the State Library.

Motion passed.

Cheyenne Roduin put forward a motion to accept 3.3 added to our workplan as written.

Motion passed.

Mindy Coslor moves that we approve the LLC workplan as amended. Seconded by Aryana Bates.

Motion passed.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

Mary Ann send out email and registration info for AiA.

All deans/directors discuss the AiA grant project with their librarians and stakeholder to grow interest.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00pm

Respectfully submitted,

Cheyenne Roduin, Secretary