Library Management Team (LMT) Meeting Notes – July 21, 2026

<u>Attendees</u>: M. Gaunt, R. Graves, K. Peters, J. Pierce, S. Pryor, J. Thompson, M. Toledo-Candelaria, E. Shaw, K. Whatley
<u>Support</u>: N. Whyte

Agenda for Upcoming All-Staff Meeting

LMT reviewed a draft agenda for the August 6 all-staff meeting. The Libraries have permission from the Provost's Office to open at noon that day so staff can attend; libraries will be closed to the public until noon. The meeting is planned for 10:00–11:30 a.m. in Ellis Auditorium, with bagels, coffee, and pastries set up by 9:45 a.m. Panera Catering will set up in the lobby outside the auditorium, and Nicole confirmed that a food exception was granted so attendees can bring food into Ellis Auditorium.

The group discussed what to include on the agenda. Items include the new Strautman Award, strategic planning updates, union updates, FY27 budget information, facilities/space updates, and new librarian/staff introductions. Advancement, technology, ACTS/collections, and other unit updates were discussed as brief updates.

Members agreed that updates should be concise. The group discussed allotting roughly 15 minutes for VP updates, 10 minutes for new staff introductions, 15 minutes for facilities/space/budget, and about 5 minutes for each unit update, leaving time within the 90-minute meeting for Q&A.

Additional suggested items included the Sedalia State Fair booth, faculty promotions, and staff reclassifications/promotions. LMT members were asked to identify new hires in their areas since the January all-staff meeting. (Post-meeting note: Kathy subsequently provided a list of new hires; LMT should review the list and see if they have comments to add.)

Meeting Load and Meeting Practices

Kara introduced the topic following the July 8 Department Managers Group (DMG) discussion, where meeting volume was raised as a workload concern. The group considered the idea of a weekly no-meeting or meeting-light day, possibly Mondays, and avoiding meetings during spring break, the week leading up to Thanksgiving, and similar holiday-adjacent periods when possible.

Members discussed whether a weekly light-meeting day would truly help if meetings simply shifted into the remaining four days. Several people noted that the bigger problem may be lack of uninterrupted work time, and the difficulty of restarting complex work after a meeting. There was also discussion about how many meetings in a day is reasonable, especially for employees with frontline and administrative responsibilities.

The group agreed to begin by surveying DMG rather than immediately setting a policy. Suggested survey topics included meeting pain points, meeting length and value, examples of well-run meetings, whether a meeting-light day would help, preferred weekday if implemented, average number of meetings per week, and whether staff have enough uninterrupted time to complete work.

Rebecca suggested that short meeting training or guidance might help, including reminders that meetings can be canceled when there is nothing to discuss and that organizers should consider what belongs in email versus in a meeting. Matt also supported using survey input to identify which meetings are least valuable and why.

LMT Meeting Time Adjustment

Jeannette shared that she has a recurring conflict with the current Tuesday LMT meeting time. Kara asked whether members would object to moving LMT meetings earlier, to 1:30 p.m. No objections were raised. Kara indicated that Nicole would move the recurring LMT meetings and related Tuesday division head meetings.

Covidence and Evidence Synthesis Tools

Rebecca led discussion of Covidence in relation to the planned evidence synthesis service. The service framework discussed included two tiers: one in which librarians are collaborators and one in which librarians are consultants. In this framework, Covidence would be made available to faculty/researchers who collaborated with a librarian (tier two). The Covidence pilot under consideration would purchase 50 projects, the first pricing tier.

Rebecca estimated that participation by MU and UMKC librarians could generate approximately 42 projects annually under a three-project-per-librarian model. If only MU participated, project demand could range from approximately 27–45 projects depending on usage levels.

The central policy question was whether the pilot should support research or learning. Kara said the pilot is being paid from her startup funds and her goal is to demonstrate the Libraries' impact on research for the campus, aligned with university strategic goals around increasing the impact of Mizzou-authored research. Kara recommended focusing the first-year pilot on faculty/researchers rather than graduate students, while reassessing next spring if expansion is needed.

The group discussed alternatives for students, including CADIMA, Rayyan, and SYSREV. Rebecca noted that CADIMA is free, Rayyan provides three free projects, and SYSREV is free for public projects but requires payment for private projects. LMT generally supported prioritizing faculty/researcher-led projects during the first year of the pilot while continuing to evaluate options for student support.

The group agreed to look more closely at pricing and campus participation, especially if there is a way for multiple campuses to share a higher tier affordably.

Events & Exhibits Policy and Procedures

Jeannette walked LMT through newly updated documents: Events & Exhibits policy, procedures, and a quick guide. She explained that she, Megan, and Ben had been discussing ways to clarify roles and streamline the events request process.

The draft policy clarifies purpose, scope, eligibility, proposal requirements, timeline expectations, space use, food and beverage considerations, host responsibilities, review/approval, compliance, and governance. Jeannette noted that course-integrated instruction and routine instructional activities are excluded from this process.

The proposed process would centralize initial review with designated leadership roles identified in the draft documents as the Outreach & Engagement Librarian and the Coordinator of Donor Engagement. Ben would serve as the primary contact for proposal intake, completeness checks, communication with submitters, and moving proposals through the process; Megan would meet with Ben regularly to review submissions. The intent is to avoid multiple people contacting the submitter and to keep one clear communication channel.

The draft procedures define standing members and designated partners. Standing members include positions such as the Executive Assistant, Facilities Project Coordinator, IT/AV representative, and Safety Team representative. Designated partners and other stakeholders would be included in a Microsoft Teams environment for awareness and consultation, but the group would not hold regular large meetings unless an issue required it.

Jeannette outlined the draft event classifications: Standard, Special, Signature, and Escalated. Standard events could move through quickly when there are no triggers. Events involving extended hours, significant staffing, complex setups, non-routine AV, food service coordination, safety/security concerns, financial support, external partnerships, reputational issues, or other concerns would receive additional review or escalation as needed.

Kathy raised concerns about furniture and AV, noting that those can become major issues without adequate notice. Jeannette said early involvement of Sheila and Chase is part of the intent. The group also discussed proposals submitted with less than 30 days' notice. Jeannette preferred allowing Ben and Megan to make the first determination; some late requests might be feasible with a reminder about the timeline, while others might need to be declined or escalated.

Kathy emphasized that the Libraries should not become a general second-choice venue for campus events when other campus event services are unavailable, and that library-related events should remain the focus. Jeannette agreed that the procedure is intended to be more generous with designated partners while avoiding opening the Libraries too broadly to external events.

LMT agreed to review the draft documents and send comments to Jeannette.

Vice Provost Updates: Laptop Checkout Kiosks

Kara reported that she and Ernest had discussed laptop checkout kiosks. MU Libraries already has one kiosk, and DoIT has ordered two more for other campus locations. DoIT would like to use FOLIO checkout for the additional kiosks, which raised questions about permissions, workflow responsibility, loan periods, fines, service points, reports, and whether policies should be standardized across kiosks.

Kara stated a preference for standardizing the loan policy, loan period, and fines so that students do not encounter different rules depending on kiosk location. Kara indicated she would like the Libraries to consider conforming to IT's preferred 24-hour loan period.

Kathy asked about usage statistics from the spring semester. Steven agreed to determine whether spring semester usage statistics were available.

Jeannette said usage was good and she was not aware that the kiosk ever ran out of laptops. Ernest reported that Mark Twain and the Student Recreation Center are the planned locations for the two new DoIT kiosks.

The group also discussed whether laptops could be returned to a different kiosk than the one from which they were borrowed. Kara and others noted that this would likely create balancing problems if some kiosks filled up while others emptied. Steven noted that a longer loan period could make that issue worse.

Kara said DoIT is willing to do training and handle some of the workflow, but LMT needs to decide whether the Libraries want IT to do that or whether library staff should manage it. Kathy raised questions about fine revenue and where it should go, especially if IT equipment fines are being handled differently from library fines. Kara and Ernest planned to meet soon because the new kiosks were expected to arrive this week.

Vet Med Library Reopening

Kathy asked about the Vet Med Library reopening. Rebecca reported that some renovation work was already done, but final furniture was not expected to ship until August 12.

The group discussed a grand reopening for September. Rebecca said Jennifer Brady was putting together a proposal for September 9 from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.

Action Items

Owner	Action Item	Timing / Notes
All LMT members	Identify new hires in their areas since the January all-staff meeting; ask department heads for help as needed.	Before August 6 all-staff meeting
All LMT members	Keep all-staff presentation updates concise; departments/units should plan brief updates that fit the agenda.	Before August 6 all-staff meeting
Kara / LMT	Develop and send a DMG survey on meeting pain points, meeting-less day interest, average meeting load, and examples of well-run meetings.	In time for Fall semester planning
Nicole	Move recurring LMT meetings to 1:30 p.m. and adjust related Tuesday division head meetings as needed.	As soon as practical
Rebecca / evidence synthesis group	Continue reviewing Covidence pricing, campus participation, and project allocations; consider free/low-cost student-facing alternatives such as CADIMA, Rayyan, and SYSREV.	Ongoing

LMT members	Review the Events & Exhibits policy, procedures, and quick guide drafts and send comments to Jeannette.	Before next LMT meeting
Steven	Check whether laptop kiosk usage, damage, and circulation statistics are available for spring semester comparison.	Before follow-up decision-making
Kara, Ernest, relevant stakeholders	Meet to discuss DoIT laptop kiosk rollout, including loan periods, FOLIO service points, fines, training, and workflow responsibility.	Soon, given kiosk arrival timeline
Jennifer Brady / Rebecca	Prepare proposal for Vet Med Library grand reopening on September 9, 3:00–5:00 p.m.; confirm budget before approval.	Before event planning proceeds

Future LMT Discussions

- Approve or revise Events & Exhibits policy/procedure drafts after LMT review.
- Review results of DMG meeting-load survey and decide whether to pilot meeting-light Mondays or a similar approach.
- Review and finalize Covidence pilot parameters, including campus scope, faculty/researcher eligibility, and how alternatives will be presented for students.
- Finalize laptop kiosk policy/workflow decisions with DoIT and relevant library staff.