Facilitator: Sara Williams
Secretary: Suzanne Larsen (substituting for Bruce Montgomery)


1. Recruitment Update - McCoolkey

Anne Beach and Beth Cramer, successful candidates from the Science and Cataloging searches respectively, were welcomed to the faculty meeting.

Searches continue for the positions of Special Collections Cataloger and Cataloging Supervisor, Engineering Librarians, Reference Librarian/Undergraduate Bibliographer, and Head of Cataloging.

2. There were no corrections or changes to the minutes of the meeting on April 1.

3. Old Business

Sara Williams announced that the vote or the reply to the Zaffiroto memo sent to the faculty for a vote by mail was 36 in favor, 8 opposed. The document has been forwarded to the Dean. We still must respond to the original 3-3:4 memo. The original task force is willing to continue with help. One person has already volunteered and Krismann volunteered at the meeting.

Garrison announced that the FCP has been discussing the differentiated workload as requested by the faculty but no task force has been formed as yet.

Krismann, responding to a statement in the Administrative Report of the meeting of April 1, reported that no "Blue Ribbon" Committee to review the budget was ever appointed. She stated that at the most recent BPA meeting, the Chancellor said that the Libraries material budget would likely be cut.

4. New Business

a. Proposed changes to the Libraries Faculty Handbook

Garrison brought forth two proposed changes in the Libraries Faculty Handbook on behalf of the FPC. The first, which would create a new section number, 0174, was regarding differentiated workload for Libraries faculty. The text suggested would serve as a broad statement acknowledging this concept which will be supplant by the document that will be devised by the Task Force being created to address this matter. After some discussion the text was amended to read:

0174

Differentiated Workload

The FPC will be informed of approved differentiated workload arrangements when they are negotiated.

The second proposed revision, of section 1615, addressed the make-up of the FPC. Garrison explained that the intent was to give insight into the needs of faculty in each category; tenured, tenure track, and non-tenure track. Hill moved that the areas where the words "administrator of administrative" are used be deleted and the words "Associate Director who serves as" replace "one member of the administration". This amendment was agreed upon.

A lengthy discussion ensued concerning the intent and possible advantages or repercussions of requiring the membership of the committee to be so specific. Sanji submitted a proposed revision to the proposed revision. Her concern was that the FPC concept would be divisive and that anyone elected to the FPC was supposed
to act in the interests of the entire faculty, not a particular group. Sani feels strongly that it is the role as responsibility of the Nominations Committee to put forward a strong slate of candidates for the FPC, even if it involves some "arm twisting". She also stated that she feels that we need to go back to see serving on the FPC as an honor and a responsibility, not something that is dreaded.

Many agreed with Sani. Garrison responded that the intent was not to turn the FPC into factions. Chesbro clarified the intent of the FPC statement by explaining that the role of the FPC in the comprehensive review process as well as promotion and tenure was one of the driving forces behind this proposal. In order to have credibility with the campus-wide committees reviewing our recommendations in these areas, we need to have the tenured and tenure track faculty play a stronger, more visible role on the FPC.

In the light of this state of play, Garrison withdrew the proposed revision to 1615. He moved that a Task Force made up of the faculty at large with a member of the FPC meet to address the issue of participation on the FPC. The Task Force will be in place by September and will report to the Libraries Faculty in November.

Sani requested that her revision be considered by the Task Force.

A vote will be taken on the addition of section 0174 to the handbook at the next meeting. Hill moved that the editorial changes she suggested to the revision to 1615, which were accepted by the Faculty, be incorporated into the current version of 1615. She will submit a written version to the faculty for the June meeting so that it can be voted on at that time.

b. Culshaw introduced the proposed Library Advisory Board Charter to the Faculty. This committee is not listed in the Libraries Faculty Handbook since it is a mixture of faculty and staff and is not involved with faculty governance. However, recognizing the important role of such a body, the Faculty endorsed the document.

5. Committee Reports

a. FPC

Garrison reported that the FPC has not yet received all evaluations and will not send out composite scores until this happens.

b. Faculty Support

Sani said that she received a notice of a meeting on Campus about the new travel requirements. Anyone interested in attending may get the information from Joan.

c. Faculty/Staff Development

McConkey reminded the faculty of Wendy Baia's talk for the Faculty Seminar Series, entitled "Cataloging Heresy: A Serial Cataloger's Perspective" which is scheduled for Monday, May 24 at 3:30pm in N410.

The Faculty/Staff Development committee will be meeting on Monday to outline their agenda for next year. Everyone is urged to forward any suggestions they might have. The Faculty Seminars and Research Seminar series will continue, among others. Sani said that the LAS has some suggestions that will be forwarded to the F/S Development Committee.

d. Library Advisory Board

Culshaw reminded the Faculty of the Service Awards Reception to be held this afternoon.

e. Promotion and Reappointment

There was no report.
1. Tenure

Gauss stated that the committee had met with 2 faculty members coming up for comprehensive review and expected to meet with 2 more soon.

2. Sabbatical

Kroegs reported that notifications had been sent out to those eligible for sabbatical or extended administrative leave. He will be stepping off the committee soon and asked that any questions be directed to Sheryl Hornor.

3. Nominations

There was no report.

4. Awards

Nolan reported that the Ellisworth Award will be awarded at the reception this afternoon and thanked all those who had been nominated or provided supporting statements.

5. Administrative Report

Jim Williams thanked the faculty for the well written “Zafiratos memo.”

Williams reported that in “version 2e” of the University budget, the Libraries is hanging in with a 15% increase in the materials budget. This will increase the budget to $7.7 million. He said that there has been much discussion about decreasing the campus contribution to the athletic budget. There is a 3% increase to faculty salaries in the present budget. The Regents meet later this month and something may be decided but, their traditional budget meeting is in June. It is noted that the individual faculties will be allowed to decide whether the 1% merit bonus from last year will be added to the base salary or just disappear, as was originally planned. At any rate, Williams pointed out that the campus is still facing a $6.2 million short fall that will have to be dealt with.

Williams indicated that Eskeland feels that Zafiratos will agree that outside letters of recommendation will not be necessary for the comprehensive review portion of the tenure process. This is for the entire faculty and not just the Libraries. Williams said there was a good deal of concern about the Business School, whose new dean resigned abruptly, expressed at the Dean’s Breakfast he had attended prior to the faculty meeting.

6. CARL Announcements

Chebsn reported that CARL will be unavailable over Memorial Day weekend due to a hardware change.

7. Law Library

Dorian reported that the read aloud program they had during Library Week went well.

8. University committee reports

Sani reported that there was an unusually large attendance at a recent Faculty Senate meeting concerning faculty governance. It is a hot topic generating lots of interest for a change.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.