LIBRARY FACULTY MEETING MINUTES
MAY 5, 1994

Present: Susan Dean, Susie Bock, Emily Epstein, Sheryl Horner, Bill Garrison, Debbie Mohr, Zhijia Shen, Harriet Rebuldeila, Phyllis Holzenberger, Wendy Baia, Pat Wallace, Beth Cramer, Laura Carter, Deborah Fink, Joan McConkey, Sue Williams, Jim Williams, Sara R. Williams, Janet Swan Hill, Laurie Sampsel, Karl Kroeger, Skip Hamilton, Liesel Nolan, Nancy Carter, Ben Lo Bue, John Culshaw, Susan Anthes, Jean Whelan, Bruce Montgomery, Melinda Chesbro, Keith Gresham

The meeting was called to order by Susan Dean and a quorum of faculty members was present.

Recruitment Update - Joan McConkey
The pool of applications for the Head of Cataloging Management was being re-examined to extend the search.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes for the April 7, 1994 meeting were approved with two corrections: under "Recruitment Update" "their" was changed to "its" and under "New Business" within "2. Motion to Expand the Tenure Committee" the "are" was changed to "is."

Old Business
The Motion to expand Tenure Committee was discussed but Janet suggested we discuss this under Tenure Committee business.

Handbook revision was briefly discussed, in particular a definition of faculty and article 4, before Skip moved that this matter be moved to the end of the agenda. It was so moved.

New Business -- None.

Committee Reports
Faculty Personnel - Sara Williams
FPC has finished scoring Part II: Research and Part III: Service. Review of Part I: Librarianship is underway.

Faculty Support Committee - Debbie Mohr
The committee requests further input regarding faculty support and will present draft proposals at the next meeting.

Faculty/Staff Development - Joan McConkey
There will be another presentation on government publications on the internet and a survey to measure morale and job satisfaction. The survey will require a high response and all are urge to make an appointment to complete the form.

Library Advisory Board
The Dean has given the Libraries the software Will Maker.

Promotion and Reappointment - No report.

Tenure Committee - Janet Swan Hill
The need to expand the committee was discussed. The small size of the committee raises questions of fair consideration and proper procedure, that is people serving on the committee who had a hand in other parts of the tenure process. The committee requested the Dean to get information
from Bruce Eckstrand and the Standards, Processes, and Procedures Handbook was consulted. The committee then drafted a letter to the Dean with their conclusion on how to go forward. Janet read the letter which proposed expanding the committee by using emeritus faculty and faculty from other departments on campus.

A motion was made to table indefinitely Ben's Notice of Motion. This was seconded. Ben commented that his motion was "tilting at windmills." Skip believed the committee's proposal put untenured track librarians in limbo and denied them recognition. Janet did not think this was germane to the question at hand. She restated that the issue is how the Tenure Committee can best do business. The motion was voted tabled indefinitely with one disagreement.

Further discussion revolved around the Dean's Review Committee mentioned in the Tenure Committee's letter, the danger that bringing other faculty into the process would open up the possibility of outside faculty playing a role in setting library standards, and re-emphasizing the need to expand the Tenure Committee. Janet suggested changing the draft letter to set priorities on who was brought on to the Tenure Committee so that outside faculty were a last resort. It was asserted that the Library Faculty set its own standards and the letter stated that library faculty would always be a majority on the Committee. There was some discussion of whether sympathetic outside faculty could be found and if faculty of the same subject background as the tenure candidates should be considered. The view was expressed that working jointly with outside faculty would be a positive experience. Jim noted that Eckstrand said we should look among the teaching faculty for our outside help because our contribution is seen as equivalent to teaching. Finally, it was noted that some of us who have worked with the outside faculty have seen their ability to "wrap themselves around" someone else's standards. There was some criticism of the VCAC model because it took authority away from the college.

Sabbatical Committee - No report
Nominations Committee
   Ballots for committee nominations were in-process.
Awards Committee
   Bill was congratulated for winning the Ralph Ellsworth Award.
Other Library Committees - No report

Administrative Reports - Jim Williams
   Jim announced that the compensation scheme would be in the range of 3-3.5%, with different percentages used across the University and the Boulder campus receiving the lowest increase. There is a planned conference call with III in which we hope to put the contract "to bed." The Libraries have received the loan for the new system and that John Culshaw and Keith Gresham have received faculty grants.

Announcements
Automation - Melinda Chesbro
   Melinda reported that more taskforces would be created and that current taskforces would be reporting at the open meeting on May 16th. Melinda reminded us that the email system was changing (contact either Melinda or Gary for help) and to alert Linda Yancey of your new email address.

Law Library - None
University Committees
Skip reported on a motion made at the Faculty Council that the Board of Regents mandate that administrators teach at least one semester a year.

Other Announcements

May 12th there will be a demonstration of the Full-Text Poetry Database.

Handbook Revision (from old business)

Article 4 Section II. Secretary. Discussed the term "moderator" which we are using instead of "secretary," this is a cosmetic change.

Article 4 Section III. Voting Procedures. - No discussion.

Article 4 Section IV. Parliamentarian

This is a new office established to assist the moderator, to be an expert on the Libraries's handbooks, and to exercise overall responsibility for records of committees. The draft suggests the position should be filled by appointment rather than election because few people would run for office.

Article 5 Section I. Executive Committee.

The FPC has been the defacto Executive Committee for the faculty and there should be a proper one established.

The faculty decided to vote on Sections already discussed so that we could clear away parts of the handbook revisions. It was determined that a quorum existed.

Voting results:

- Article 4 Section 2 Parts 1-5, accepted with the understanding the there term secretary required further clarification.
- Article 4 Section 3 Parts 1-2, accepted.
- Article 4 Section 4 Parts 1-4, accepted.

Article 5. Committees.

The definition of a standing committee was discussed and clarified, and the role of the FPC was reviewed.

Point of clarification: what did the previous votes mean? The votes represented preliminary consent to specific sections so that the committee could continue its work. The Committee felt it needed approval principle. Skip voiced concern over the details and his concern was noted by the Committee.

Voting results:

- Article 5 Section 1 Parts 1-2, accepted.
- Article 5 Section 2, accepted.
- Article 5 Section 3, accepted.

The faculty decided to continue discussion of the Handbook revisions at a later meeting, but not a special meeting.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Susie R. Bock.