MINUTES
LIBRARY FACULTY MEETING
MARCH 19, 1992

ATTENDING: See attached

Twenty-four faculty members met to discuss the Academic Quality and Productivity Committee Recommendations. Some of the committee's recommendations were not seen as applicable to the library, but those that were reviewed and endorsed are listed below:

In section I. The Delivery of Instruction and Quality of Teaching, the faculty endorsed A. 2 which would require "multiple means of evaluating teaching" by "using information contained in a portfolio ... developed by each faculty member". It was pointed out that we already do this in our annual evaluation. No. 4 of part A was also endorsed but Susan Anthes mentioned that if freshmen and sophomores would be required to take more special courses or do more projects that the result would be different use patterns of the libraries in resources and staff. It was agreed that the libraries would do all they could do given limited space and staff. Section B. 2 was endorsed although some of the faculty felt that it would be worthwhile to hold a special meeting of all interested library faculty to discuss tenure vs. non-tenure as an option. Wendy Bais said that this would give interested faculty an opportunity to give their views on the subject. C. 2 which would "implement existing differential workload policies" for tenured teaching faculty and would award them appropriately for their increased duties, was endorsed given the library faculty's special situation as non-teaching faculty. No. 9 was broadly endorsed.

Section II deals with Scholarly and Creative Work. Points A-G were all endorsed and comments were made about A and C which are recommendations for increased graduate and undergraduate help for faculty. Susan Anthes mentioned that II. A is similar to what we are doing in hiring non-tenure support personnel to help tenure track library faculty. II. C was endorsed as it could create opportunities for undergraduates to assist librarians. Part C was endorsed as this is considered part of the Libraries' mission.

The faculty agreed to support everything in section III on Cost Containment, but some questions about B. nos. 1-2 were raised—would salary increases then be every two years? Would the evaluation be good for two years? Streamlining the annual evaluation process was widely supported. No. 5 was supported in general terms although it was agreed that it deals just with reappointments and not tenure. When discussing no. 5 the question was asked about the definition of faculty development programs. Numbers 1-3 in section C concerning a reassessment of faculty course questionnaires was endorsed with no comments, as was section D, nos. 1-3.

There was agreement on a general endorsement of section IV on Faculty Salary Equity, but questions were raised about the meaning of the phrase "cognate units".
The meeting ended with the creation of a small committee to draft a response to the AQPCR recommendations. This will be distributed to all library faculty for comments. It was hoped that the final memo could be given to Dean Williams by the end of March.

Every School and College is being rated this year. Dean Williams has requested we be treated average among all rated. It is not determined how this will come out.

There is nothing out on the budget yet or how the 10 points the President has specified will be put into the budget.

CARL: ERIC is file 52 and is the 1991 data in a test file. In approximately 6 weeks the full database will be up with boolean.

Law: No report

University Reports:

Personnel Benefits: Retirement program options were passed by the Regents. The Blue Cross Blue Shield contract is coming up. Those faculty on PERA will be able to convert to TIAA.

Meeting adjourned