University of Colorado at Boulder Libraries  
Special Faculty Meeting Minutes  
August 20, 1992

Present:  
Anthes, Buczkowski, Carle, L. Carter, Chesbro,  
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Moderator:  
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Dan O'Mahony opened the meeting and turned it over to Janet Hill for discussion of possible revisions to the Libraries tenure document.

Recent history of the tenure document

The Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee (VCAC) has not seen any librarians for tenure review for years. The VCAC and members of the Libraries Tenure Committee met to discuss tenure criteria for librarians, and from this meeting it became clear that members of the VCAC did not understand librarianship.

Librarianship is both too similar and too different to the fields the VCAC is accustomed to dealing with--our differences don't show up clearly. Bruce Ekstrand appointed a task force composed of three members of the VCAC (Jane Bock, Luis Gonzalez-del-Valle, and Charles DePuy) and three members of the Libraries Tenure Committee (Sharon Gause, Janet Swan Hill and Karl Kroeger) to find a way to explain librarianship to the VCAC. The Libraries Tenure Committee believes it is vital to revise our tenure document. The Committee is also working on a cover letter providing an explanation of librarianship that will be sent forward with the record of each candidate.

The task force discussed the terms "research" and "scholarly research" at length. The term "research" tends to be interpreted as the type of research that librarians rarely do, while "scholarly research" is interpreted to include the type of research done in the humanities (including bibliographies). The task force agreed that "scholarly research" was the appropriate term to use for librarians. The term previously used in the Faculty Report of Scholarly Activity was "Research, Scholarship and Creative Work".

Discussion of Tenure Document

See the attached revised document for specific agreed upon textual and/or content changes. The following is a summary of the main issues raised during the discussion.

It was agreed to remove any text that is repetitive or was originally written to establish our credentials within the University.
It was agreed to remove "teaching" from librarianship/teaching throughout the document, since our librarianship is equivalent to the teaching done by faculty in other disciplines.

A question was raised regarding whether we are providing a separate definition of meritorious from that provided elsewhere in the University. Janet will look for a definition and if one is found attempt to link our statement regarding "meritorious" with any University definition to which we must adhere.

Luis Gonzales of the VCAC suggested that "Service" become section B and "Scholarly Research" become section C. Janet Hill believes doing so at this time would be detrimental to librarians facing a tenure review. She suggests it would be best introduced after the VCAC has seen a few candidates for tenure with heavy service records. Those present agreed that to do so now would better reflect reality, but that due to the political realities it might be best to wait.

The VCAC considers organizing a conference to be research, but organizing a conference program to be service. Terminology is very important in this regard. Whether organizing a conference program should be classed as scholarly research or service depends on the individuals contribution to that program. Both the sections on service and scholarly research need to provide a space for this type of activity.

How research outside of one's field is viewed by the VCAC in making tenure decisions was discussed. Janet reported that the VCAC made it clear that such research is not considered relevant. This is a key issue and requires further discussion by the Libraries faculty. Janet believes the Libraries Tenure Document should not address this, but that it should be handled on a case-by-case basis. It was suggested that a few words of support for extra-field research might be included in the document at this point to lay the groundwork for upcoming cases.

It was agreed to adjourn after discussing the document through the section on Scholarly Research. Janet will produce a cleaner copy incorporating the changes discussed today and distribute it before the next meeting. She welcomes and solicits comments regarding specific wording of problem areas.

The next discussion of this document will occur as part of old business at the next regularly scheduled faculty meeting on September 3. Another special meeting will be scheduled on September 17 to further discuss the document.