LILi Business Meeting  
Friday, May 18  
1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.  
Virtual Meeting

Meeting began at 1:08 PM

I. Introductions & Announcements  
   Present: Annie Knight  
   Charissa Jefferson  
   Marcia Henry  
   Mary McMillan  
   Tim Ream  
   Esther Grassian  
   Claire La Polt  
   Brianna Pullen  
   Susie Chin  
   a. Annie moved the agenda item for announcements to be made at end of meeting.

II. Approve minutes from January 26, 2018 meeting  
   a. Susie moves to approve. Mary seconds approval.

III. Conference Update (Annie and Susie)  
   a. Annie thanks Susie, Michael, Angie and Tim. We have received 8 proposals. We will not have as many presentations so there will be time to fill in the conference. What ideas are there for filling the time? Other ideas have been previously shared. Annie asks if there are any to add.
   b. One idea is to demonstrate active learning for 10 minutes each. Another idea to lead discussion of making connections between public, academic and school libraries more cohesive. A third idea is to create ad hoc circles (un-conference approach) to discuss topics of interest such as issues in IL or conference related topics.
   c. Annie opens discussion for input. Annie asks if would be helpful to post these ideas.
d. Mary likes the idea of opening the conversation with participants on bridging the connection between public, academic, school, and special libraries. Suggests a brief brainstorming discussion. Because there are only 8 proposals there must be a need to find connection.

e. Susie agrees that it will be an opportunity to do this because the conference is held at a public library. The proposals are divers this year including some from public libraries and their constituents. LiLi has traditionally appealed to academic librarians and we would benefit from having a crowdsourced conversation.

f. Mary suggest this as an end of day discussion and a way to gather feedback.

g. Esther reminded that when the conference was at Pierce College there were public library presentations. Esther suggests a panel.

h. Annie clarifies, should we target past presenters or cast a wide net to gauge interest in participating on a panel?

i. Esther reminded that many public librarians don’t necessarily refer to their practice as “Information Literacy”. Maybe we need to call it something else.

j. Mary made suggestion that people from different types of libraries be on a panel.

k. Susie said it will be better not to use IL but include the types of workshops that focus on fake news, etc. It is something that all librarians focus on. Susie said she’d be willing to talk with public librarians about a cohesive theme.

l. Annie suggested including school librarians.

m. Susie and Mary commented that they were hoping to see more of that in collaboration. Marcia spoke to ensure that the submissions selections are unbiased because there were a variety of proposals. Esther commented that although the theme is “It isn't just academic libraries”, that isn't criteria for rejection. The fact that the submission did not reflect connection, the discussions could foster that opportunity to share and build. Esther offers to help.

n. Annie observed that it sounds like a lot of us like the idea. Asks if there are other ideas aside from a panel and discussion.

o. Esther proposed having an information sharing opportunity for participants to bring work materials and exercises to get feedback from other librarians. “Working consultations”. What did you like and how would you do it differently?
p. Annie likes the idea for sandbox time to get feedback. We’ll be in a large auditorium and there will be tables. Do we want to know who will bring materials ahead of time?
q. Susie commented that we may find that people will just end up socializing.
r. The group discussed that we’d need to consider logistics. In the call for registration there could be an indication of who will bring materials. Esther suggested allowing participants to solicit feedback on handouts.
s. Susie brought up how the reviewers reviewed with a form with 4 different criteria. 8 proposals using a 1-5 Likert scale with comments. Criteria are: aligned with theme, interesting, well-defined active learning component; appeals to broad context of librarians.
   i. Averaged all the scores. There was interesting feedback such as this would be great if.. Can the presenter add this...
      1. Do we accept and give feedback for possible modifications?
   ii. Active learning is different in academic libraries than in public. Esther affirmed we should be more descriptive with what we mean about “active learning” to be inclusive. We did not describe but made an assumption because we, as academic librarians, are used to it. That shouldn’t count against proposals this time.
   iii. Mary said there’s nothing wrong with not being active as we’re describing, as sessions can still be engaging. Annie affirmed that she wants to hear about others’ practices and stories, but there is an appreciation to learning about their experience without a guided activity.
   iv. Susie says that’s fine but wanted to let everyone know that she averaged all the proposals. Now that we’re seeing issues emerge as the planning comes along, we could prioritize the criteria and consider active learning component lower. What is the conference going to look like this year? Based criteria on major key things and may not need to weigh equally.
   v. Mary suggested that the scores may not change very much. Would the low scores still be low regardless if that criteria was omitted and changed?
vi. Tim suggested averaging again without the active learning component. Thought there were good proposals and gave high scores. Not everything has to have an interactive program.

vii. Proposals seem thinner than usual. Annie suggested that it is because it may have seemed as though we asked for lightning talks. Tim suggested that it’s because the theme is it’s not just academic and many members are from academic libraries.

viii. Annie said that she will communicate to the proposal authors that there is more time needed to let them know of their acceptance or not.

ix. Esther suggests taking the top 6 if the other 2 are not at the level of the top 6. Also made the suggestion to indicate the comments for improvement to those who did not get accepted.

x. Marcia asked about the range of submissions.

xi. Esther did not remember the topics themselves but suggested that we could possibly accept all of them.

xii. Mary said it could be a good opportunity for librarians to get conference presentation experience. Tim agrees to give people a chance. Esther said we should accept everyone with comments and keep presentations at 15 minutes plus 5 minutes Q&A. We’re being supportive by giving a chance for all submitters to present with guided colleague feedback.

xiii. Annie confirms that we will accept all proposals, as outlined in xii.

xiv. Brianna asks about breaks. Annie confirmed there will be 5 minute breaks in between.

xv. The group is in favor of this idea.

IV. Elections Update (Mary)

a. 3 advisory board member terms are expiring.
   i. We will put out a call for nominations including self-nominations.
   ii. Mary will send confirm what announcement will say and send out announcement.

b. Tim will be webmaster

c. Mario Macias will be listserv manager
   i. Listserv reaches approximately 100 people, most in California, but some in other states and a few in other countries.
V. LILi Website and Webmaster update (Tim)

a. Spreadsheet of resource links on website (carried over from the previous LILi site). Currently reviewing links to determine those that may be outdated and those that are still relevant and should be included.

b. Should be finished before conference. Will unveil new website at the conference.

c. Seeking new materials, resources, and interesting tools that people find useful.

d. Annie suggested throwing out a suggestion at conference for people to recommend content.

VI. Discuss reviewing bylaws (Annie)

a. LILi bylaws tend to go through a review every 5 years. Last reviewed in 2013. Annie asked Esther if it needs to be formal. It’s always good idea to review, but it does not need to be formal.

b. Annie can put copy of current version in Google doc and members can share comments on that document and go from there. Annie will set a deadline for comments. Will be a summer activity. Esther thought this a great idea.

c. Annie asked if there is anything to add on to previous agenda items before announcements.

d. Claire announced that she is changing schools from Milken to Flintridge Prep. She will be starting her new job during week of conference and is waiting to find out if she can attend because of orientation.

e. Lynn at Fullerton College and Redondo Beach Library and will be starting at Compton College full time.

f. Esther announced that there are changes to administration at Pierce college regarding the library and department chair. Potential tenure track job opening.

g. Tim at Fullerton College expressed his appreciation for the group.

h. Mary (El Camino College) gave staffing announcements. Library has a new director, Dr. Martin, new positions filled systems and outreach and programming librarian. Working on next accreditation visits. Campus is involved with guided pathways to look for ways library can harness in curriculum development.

i. Annie asked for other announcements
Instruction Swap

- Esther Grassian presenting on an assignment calculator implementation project at Pierce College.

- A google doc of Esther’s notes for this talk was sent to the LILi Google group by Annie: https://goo.gl/dhSFSX

- Esther talked about the Assignment Calculator. Esther asked if anyone has tried it? Created at the University of Minnesota. It was created using open source code. It was supposed to be 10 steps for undergraduates. Esther had a student intern adapt the php code for UCLA.

- Springshare said that if you want to mount it in a LibGuide, you can convert script to Javascript and then mount it using remote script access. Has been mounted in LibGuide at Pierce College, for testing. There are a few tweaks needed. Hopes to be up and tested this summer. Will share url on Listserv when it’s ready for testing this summer. Then, when it’s finalized, anyone could copy the code and adapt in their institution.

- The University of Minnesota also created a dissertation calculator for graduate students, adapted from their Assignment Calculator.

- Esther wishes to publicly thank the Jerilyn Veldof, University of Minnesota for sharing the code.

- Annie thanks Esther for sharing about this calculator.

Meeting adjourned at 3:03 PM.