MEMORANDUM

TO: Libraries Faculty
FROM: David M. Fagerstrom
RE: Minutes of faculty meeting 6/6/91
DATE: 6/6/91


Began 9:00 AM / Adjourned 11:04 AM

Administration Report: NO report

Approval of minutes: passed unanimously

Old Business: (lengthy discussion, motions, changes to proposed "University of Colorado at Boulder Library Faculty Evaluation Packet")

Motion by Ben Lohse forwarded by Bill Garrison: As an amendment to pages 8 and 9 the note at the bottom of each page should read, "From year to year, numbers assigned are derived from a comparison of contributions of the total Libraries Faculty." Motion did not require a second as read by Garrison.

Discussion: Hamilton expressed concern on the word "expectations" and suggested as an example, the a "norm" for expectations could be established if only based on the previous year's average. Hamilton presented the Library faculty with a five-page packet titled 'Motion to amend Library Evaluation Packet'. Hill expressed her difficulty in filling the boxes on the VCQA form because of how the expectations of a junior librarian would vary from that of a senior librarian. In other words the numerical FPC rating does not translate well, if at all, into the VCQA form. The VCQA form does not recognize people at the beginning of their career who are exceeding expectations but who nonetheless are below the norm of professionals well into their careers. The VCQA form should not be codified. Garrison made the point that FPC's charge was to create a new evaluation form that could be reflected in the VCQA form. On that basis, Garrison questioned if the new evaluation form should be thrown out or use it for one year and make changes.

The question was called on Lohse's motion: It passed unanimously.

Hamilton presented a motion in his handout. II. Summary: "In light of the above discussion, I move that the Libraries Faculty charge the F.P.C., or its selected task force, to develop a definition of 'expectations' for use
with the new library faculty evaluation forms and the new VCAA forms. The charge would also include approval of the F.P.C. to develop and bring to the Library Faculty suggestions of new mechanisms, including committees, to handle the increased activity these new procedures may involve." It was seconded.

Discussion: Hill expressed that it would be impossible to derive standards for expectations. Hamilton stated that other departments are required to develop standards. Many faculty present stated that other departments have not developed such expectations. Hamilton pointed out that Engineering had developed such standards. This was acknowledged; however, Sani expressed that engineers, to begin with, tend to told personal high standards of achievement and would exceed if not ignore established university standards. N. Carter stated you can not have everything in black and white; that it was not professionally desirable.

Question on Hamilton's motion called: On a verbal count it did not pass.

Hill moved to approve the documents with changes to language concerning expectation made by... Hill put the motion on hold with the comment that the new evaluation form was a major improvement over the old system.

Larsen pointed out that there needs to be closer contact between a supervisor and the employee early in the fiscal year on what the expectations should be. Garrison referred to Page 10 of the new proposed evaluation form, last paragraph, that this paragraph was an attempt to meet Larsen's concern. There was a general feeling that this paragraph didn't address the same concern as expressed by Larsen.

N. Carter requested that the faculty move on Hill's held motion, except the new evaluation form and make improvements during the upcoming year.

Hill digressed to the introductory page, paragraph 3 of the proposed new form. Hill moved to strike the sentence "If a member of the Cabinet is serving on the FPC, one will not be appointed to participate in this portion of the annual evaluation process." Motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Hamilton brought forward another motion from his handout. Summary of 1.
"For the above stated reasons, I move that the formula established by the Task Force on Evaluation be adjusted to the formula listed as number 2, and the definition of 'marginal' in the faculty evaluation forms be changed from '(activities) or (contributions) significantly below expectations' to '(activities) or (contributions) below most expectations.' Strong feeling was expressed by many faculty that Hamilton's motion was not appropriate at that point as a concern in the evaluation form. It concerned the VCAA form. Skip withdrew his motion.

Fagerstrom asked F.P.C. to provide, as requested previously, a summary of this year's F.P.C. ratings and what constituted a specific rating. N. Carter said that would be forthcoming.

Garrison referred to Page 6, proposed evaluation form; there was a need for the library faculty member to sign off on Item V. Motion was made by
O'Mahoney, "Move that p.1 of the Library Faculty Annual Evaluation Form be revised to reflect the faculty member's acknowledgment by a list of comments made at all levels of supervisors." It was seconded and passed unanimously.

O'Mahoney introduced another motion, "Move that an equity page be added to the Annual Evaluation Form." This was seconded and passed unanimously.

Motion by Hill made: "Move that the new evaluation forms be approved as amended, with the understanding that the use and interpretation of the term 'expectation' poses significant problems. Be if further moved that the F.P.C. be charged with addressing these concerns, and reporting to the faculty with proposals for alternative language or definitions." This was seconded.

Discussion: N. Carter questioned if amendments should immediately become part of the Library Faculty Handbook. San pointed out that such amendments always have. That the document is on computer, easily revised and that once approved the new evaluation form will become a working document. Hill pointed out that while the VCAA form is not a public document it is tied to promotion, tenure and retenement. Hamilton pointed out that definitions as points are applied in the VCAA form, specifically level 1 and level 4 should be looked at.

Question called on Hill's motion: Passed unanimously.

Recommendations passed to F.P.C. (not as motions): Garrison requested that the word 'provisional' be changed on the introductory and page 7 of the new evaluation forms. Hill requested that 'VCAA equivalent' be changed to 'approximate VCAA equivalent', and that some language should indicate a conditional rating on pages 7, 8 and 9. Hamilton requested F.P.C. look at the VCAA rating scale for revision. F.P.C. asked that recommended changes to the new evaluation forms be in writing.

Horner requested that the minutes reflect our appreciation to the F.P.C. for their efforts and frustrations. All present concurred.

New Business: None

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Faculty Personnel:

N. Carter stated that F.P.C. can only function with the cooperation of the faculty and administration. F.P.C. was not, as mandated in the Libraries Faculty Handbook, asked to participate in the salary recommendation process despite repeated overtures by the F.P.C. to the administration to let them be a part of the process on pay raises. Hill expressed the necessity to meet a deadline. Many faculty present pointed out to Hill that this has happened repeatedly and they are frustrated with this repetitive situation. F.P.C. members were available the day that the salary adjustments were being made by the administration. F.P.C. is particularly frustrated with the Public Service Office's downgrading of an above average 6.7 rating in service being reflected as average in the VCAA form. F.P.C. asked the administration for a list of faculty with
special merit. To date they have not received such a list. The T.F.C. will send a table/graph for ratings in a) research, b) service, and c) total research & service with samples for what determined each rating.

Sabbatical: No report

Promotion and Reappointment: No report

Nominations: Results of election are forthcoming.

Tenure: No report.

Faculty support: O'Mahoney reminded the group that estimates for FY 1991-92 support should be submitted by June 15.

Awards: No report.

Library Advisory Board: Larsen reminded people there will be a picnic party honoring new staff & promotions Monday, June 17 at 11AM - 1PM north of Morlin's loading dock.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Law Library: No Report

Library committee: Candidates for the Reference search will be interviewed on June 14, 17, and 19th.

University Committee: Hamilton reported on ERUS. Hamilton has been appointed as continuing co-chair of ERUS next year. ERUS will be sending a letter to President Albino concerning the personal reports ERUS received from campus administrators about the implementation of university administrative policies. ERUS is still working toward standards for pretenure faculty and may consider the conflict of interest policy. Hamilton has sent out the written standards for pretenure to those in the library faculty who had expressed interest. Hamilton is willing to send this document to any other Library faculty who are interested.

Sanjot notified faculty that Ekstrand's memo concerning the $30,000 to a faculty member's health benefit and the $85C toward retirement was in error. Too, the state passed a bill considered inequitable that so much would be paid toward a health plan for the individual versus the family.

Bill continues work on the campus equity review process and is finding it very interesting with potential useful application when recommending library faculty for promotion or tenure.