Addendum to 10/5 minutes of Library Faculty Meeting:
(See I c, "Faculty Compensation and Benefits")

Herewith a synopsis of faculty discussion (10/5/89) of Vice-Chancellor Ekstrand's Memorandum to Deans, Dept. Chairs, and Directors dated March 17, 1989.

1. Standard Merit Increases:

   a) "What procedures should be used to deviate from the traditional 40%, 40%, 20% weighting of teaching, research, and service?" considering that University policy "does allow deviations which reflect differential workloads:"

   Director's Comments: The official position is that librarians do not have differential workloads; exceptions to the norm may, however, apply [in ca. 10% of all cases; example cited: additional duties of the temporary acting head position in Reference where librarianship outweighs research].
   
   Regarding differential workloads, the procedure to be observed is, "softly speaking," setting up a contract between the faculty member and the dean [the director] in order to establish guidelines for interpreting such differential workloads.

   Comparing the library faculty to the teaching faculty, the 40:40:20 ratio should apply to the libraries' faculty: not as actual time spent on librarianship/teaching, research and service, but in terms of weighting these activities.

   Faculty Comments: The 40:40:20 formula does not adequately reflect librarians' job responsibilities: a research expectation (counting 40%) in addition to full-time job responsibilities is excessive;
   - having the primary job only count 40% in performance evaluation is not satisfactory;
   - the 40:40:20 formula only reflects weighting of responsibilities differences between teaching and library faculties exist;
   - the Libraries' faculty handbook emphasizes the 80:20 split in workloads;
   - the 40% research formula needs clarification: the comparison should not be directed towards the teaching faculty, but should be among librarians: we need to establish a standard spelling out what constitutes the norm of 40% research: i.e. if it is one article per year this should be the basis for evaluation;
   - we need to consider the greater flexibility of teaching faculties: their 9-months contract and relatively few hours of teaching leave sufficient time for research;
   - counter-argument: their teaching load is fulltime, their research is an extra-burden comparable to ours [the 40:40:20 formula would apply to libraries' faculty if weighting allows internal flexibility of responsibilities];
- should librarians have faculty status at all?
- that is not the question; the purpose of the discussion is to respond to the University administration's request for elucidation of difference: if we are different, we must say in which ways:
- we are a library faculty, the handbook specifies the 80:20 split: we should proceed from here; 80:20 represents the "traditional" view of our assignments (antedating the decision to abandon tenure for librarians);
- the 80:20 split does not represent an adequate solution;
- the libraries faculty handbook specifies 80:20, yet faculty evaluations and performance compensation are driven by ratings: the suggestion to rate all library faculty "excellent" was countered with the fact that regental policy requires compensation based on merit, that the number of publications may indeed determine the rating of individual faculty;
- internal competition may run counter to professional ethics and prove detrimental to the performance of primary job responsibilities;
- we need to push tenure track;
- if we want to be tenure-track faculty performing research, we need to establish standards for library faculty: i.e. a 9-months contract putting librarians on a par with teaching faculty; rephrasing the 40:40:20 split possibly into a 60:20:20 split; a redefinition of what constitutes "service" vs. "research;"
- in this context, a formula was suggested for establishing adequate ratios for teaching, research and service: of a total of 400 units/per year
  120 represent teaching [or 30%];
  220 represent research [or 55%], and
  60 represent service [or 15%].

- the pursuit of job responsibilities does not allow much variance: library faculty, especially those with administrative responsibilities, struggle with understaffing and performance of duties on all levels; a 50% staff increase is necessary to accomplish tasks as is; would like to do research, but don't have time;
- overall (vs. day-to-day) priorities need to be established to guide performance;
- this is the time to call the University administration's attention to our needs.

**Director's Summary:** Responsibilities need to be weighted, formula possibilities to be re-thought, including a 60:20:20 split;
- consensus exists that we are in fact a 12-months faculty; in our evaluations we emphasize our primary responsibility: librarianship, currently representing 80% of our performance.

**Faculty Response:** the 80:20 formula does not allow
Sufficient leeway for research, teaching and service; the 60:20:20 ratio appears more reasonable;
- concepts of research and service are ambiguous when applied to both teaching and libraries' faculties: during conference attendance, teaching faculty appear to concentrate on reading papers [emphasizing research vs. business meetings=service] while librarians focus on service networking; this service aspect needs to be singled out as a significant library faculty contribution.

1 b) "Should all units be required to develop a numerical merit evaluation in each area; teaching, research, and service; for each faculty member?"

Opinions resulting from the discussion included:
- the Libraries have traditionally used a numerical system for faculty rating;
- compared with other faculties (e.g. Earth Sciences) our system appears more "humane;"
- Colorado law [Colorado Open Records Act] requires that faculty ratings be made available to the media;
- compliance with this law vs. right to privacy was discussed;
- a summary report of ratings is made available to the media by the Libraries.

1 c) "How should the quantity and difficulty of teaching assignments be considered in evaluating teaching?"

**Director:** Weighting of teaching must consider job responsibilities;

**Faculty:** it is difficult to compare teaching responsibilities among all libraries faculty;
- half-time positions pose special problems: e.g., reference bibliographers have to do more than their part-time appointment would seem to warrant;
- if we want to be equal to teaching faculty, now is the time to re-evaluate ourselves; if we want faculty status, we must strongly state so;
- if we want to be tenure-track faculty, we do it their way;
- majority response to doing it "their way" was no, we need to find our own way.

**Director's Summary:** the Libraries document will state that teaching evaluations are tied to primary job responsibility.

1 d) "Should a core group of teaching elements be adopted for the evaluation of teaching in all units? . . . "

**Faculty Response:**
- yes, a core group should be developed;
- the Libraries faculty handbook [0175 A] already states our interpretation of "teaching/librarianship";
- what is the definition of "all units"?
- the ambiguity inherent in the Vice Chancellor's document regarding "all units" may be explored to the Libraries' advantage allowing us to determine the meaning of "all units" and "core group".

[Further discussion of the document was postponed to be continued at an additional faculty meeting, set for October 12, 1989, at 8.30am, Norlin 410].

**CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION: October 12, 1989**

2. COMPRESSION: This section of Ekstrand's memo addresses salary compression in the assistant, associate and full professorial ranks and asks:

"Should such a [remedial] program be continued for the several years that would be required to bring full professor average salaries to the AAU level?"

**Director's Response**: Few of the libraries faculty have professorial rank; however, the problem of salary compression exists in the lesser ranks as well and needs to be addressed.

3. BLUE BOOK: "Should the Blue Book cost be controlled by some sort of cap or allocation? What would be the effects of departmental ceilings on salary offers?"

**Director's Comments**: As one of only two Academic Support units, we control our own Blue Book, allowing us to move positions internally while not losing them to other campus units. We have to submit an annual recruitment plan and take our salary offers to the FPC.

An official memo, received this year, defines our position regarding the Campus Blue Book.

The Faculty agreed that there should be no cap on salary allocations.

4. PROMOTION/TENURE: "When individuals are given tenure and/or promoted should there be a standard increase in salary? Should these funds come from departmental allocation? From the dean... Academic Affairs...?"

**Director's and faculty positions**: Yes, there should be a standard increase in salary; it should be added to the base.

Allocation should be from a general pot, not the department even though the general pot may be small in a given year.

Granting of tenure and promotion to associate rank are
understood to go hand in hand.

5. BENEFITS: "Faculty salaries are approaching the average for the AAU...our benefits remain near the bottom... tax advantages if benefits are increased at the expense of salaries... Should we give a priority to improving benefits?"

Faculty Comments: Colorado law states that faculty formerly enrolled in PERA cannot change over to TIAA/CREF [J. Williams will address correction of this situation].
CU's contribution to faculty benefits is low compared to the contributions of other institutions. We should move towards raising the institutional contribution [the anticipated 10% increase will barely offset the imminent and very significant increase in faculty insurance rates].
Faculty Consensus: Improved benefits offer tax advantages over an increase in salaries, therefore the majority of the faculty present expressed a desire for improved benefits.

6. EXCEPTIONAL ACHIEVEMENT: "Should a portion of salary increase funds be designated for exceptional increases or should this problem be dealt with within the standard allocation procedure...?"

Responses:
- The question should be rephrased: Should the Vice-Chancellor's office release certain funds to units [from over-realized enrollment, etc.] for recognition of striking achievement?
- Or should special recognition come out of our standard allocation taken "off the top" by the Vice Chancellor [i.e. he gives money for recognition, but our pool will be reduced]?

Consensus reached:
- No portion of the salary increase funds should be designated for excellence recognition;
- Permanent money should be reserved for excellence recognition: the Vice Chancellor should set aside a central pot, establish a special fund for competitive offers and not intrude on departmental allocations for salary increases.

7. OTHER PRIORITIES: "What is the proper balance among these competing needs? Which non-salary items are of the highest priority?"

Opinions: We compromise everywhere: faculty travel, space, staff.
Consensus: Highest priority should be given to the Libraries and Staff.