TO: Library Faculty
FROM: Skip Hamilton, Recorder
SUBJECT: Library Faculty Meeting: August 4, 1983
LIBRARY FACULTY ATTENDING: 21

Administrative Matters. Chair: Leo Cabell, Associate Director of Libraries.

1. Mr. Walton is at U.C.L.A. attending the special seminar for senior library administrators.

2. Librarians from CU Boulder University Libraries will be attending a technical briefing concerning the online system at the Auraria Library, Wednesday, April 10, 1983. The briefing will be only 2 hours, so it appears to be designed as an introductory session and not as an in-depth instructional session for library workers. It is hoped that there will be new information to bring back for library faculty dissemination.

3. Contact has been made with Campus Security and a new lock system will be installed in the Norlin Library’s exit/entrance areas. The new schedules for obtaining entrance to the library will be announced to library faculty and staff.

4. Nora Quinlan was introduced to the faculty.

Items of Business: Faculty Moderator: Jean Measinger.

1. Minutes for the July 7, 1983 faculty meeting were approved as presented.

2. Committee Reports:

   a. Faculty Personnel Committee: The FPC had a special meeting with the heads of the task forces on August 1, 1983. The progress of each task force was discussed and from that meeting the FPC brought one suggestion and two points for consideration to this faculty. The suggestion was that the tapes of these faculty meetings be kept for one year before they are erased. The two points for consideration were (1) what was the exact nature of the faculty’s vote on the University Libraries, University of Colorado, Boulder, April 13, 1982 document titled “Proposed Criteria and Standards: Promotion and Tenure” as accepted by CAPPS November 16, 1982, (hereafter this document will be referred to as the "CAPPS Document"); and (2) what is the library’s faculty’s definition of peer review?

   The suggestion that the tapes of the library faculty meetings be kept for a year was discussed first. The suggestion generated the anticipated discussion on this issue plus raised other related issues as well. One particular suggestion was that in the future, before the library faculty votes on any particular issue, that the specific wording of a motion be available in writing to the faculty before the vote is taken. Since a variety of points in favor of and in opposition to the suggestion were raised, the FPC decided to take this and other relevant ideas back to their meetings for discussion and see the sense of the faculty they had gathered on this topic to bring a specific motion or motions before the faculty at the next faculty meeting.

   The discussion on the nature of the faculty vote on the "CAPPS document" revolved around whether or not our vote on this document has bound us to the precise words and concepts contained therein. Of particular concern in relation to this issue is the exact nature of the senior instructor appointment, reappointment, or promotion. This discussion also introduced the idea of what will the exact nature of library faculty in the future.
The discussion concerning peer review began by delineating viewpoints which have been emerging in the separate meetings of the task forces. One alternative sees all library faculty as being peers and colleagues, as such, all should be able to take part in any committee or discussion relating to any library faculty matter. A differing perspective is that those faculty members who have tenure and where appropriate, those who are on tenure track, are the only faculty members who should be involved in the deliberative activities relating to appointment, promotion, evaluation, etc., of the tenure/tenure track peer group. Extensive consideration of alternative viewpoints occurred.

From the above discussions, the FPC felt that they had received input which would be informative for their future meetings. From what had occurred, they would try to bring to future Library Faculty Meetings, other related issues or motions which would address the points considered here. It was suggested that each faculty member read the "Administrative Policy Statement: "Implementation of Regents Policies on Tenure."

b. Nominations Committee: There was no relevant activity. The committee had nothing to report.

c. Sabbatical Committee: Karl Kroeger did not have any additional information to report.

d. Travel Committee: The committee has $6000 to support library travel and to date has received only 1 application. The committee was asked to respond to a query of whether the ACRL Conference should be considered "travel" or if it would fall under the same classification for support as the yearly support for the ALA Convention.

e. Tenure Committee: The committee reported that they were "plodding along" with their work.

f. Library Advisory Board: The L.A.B. will meet with the Director in October. They did ask the Director whether or not he had any additional information about faculty raises. The Director responded that he felt their was nothing additional to add to what he had already said.

3. New Business:

a. The Staff Development Committee is attempting to organize a University Libraries Job Exchange Program. They are attempting to begin with a small scale effort, which may be expanded next year.

b. Deborah Pink announced that on August 24, 25, 26, 1983; the university is having an opening day program. The Library will be holding 8-10 "introduction to the library" workshops as part of these activities.

c. Jeanmoster polled the faculty in relation to whether or not they desired to have faculty meeting next month. September 1, 1983 is the second day of the fall semester and she felt some branches might be seriously pressed to attend a library faculty meeting. Support, however, was given for holding the faculty meeting as scheduled.

4. Professional Opportunities: It was announced the D.U. will hold a class on Systems Analysis Fall Semester, 1983. If there was any interest among the library faculty, a carpool effort could be arranged.