Libraries Faculty Meeting 2 November 1995


Meeting was called to order at 9 a.m. Presiding: Susie Bock.

The minutes of the 5 October faculty meeting and the 19 October special faculty meeting were approved.

There was a discussion as to whether the minutes of the library faculty should be posted to the Norlin faculty listserve or to the Norlin listserve. Bock agreed to check to see what has been done in the past.

Under unfinished business, there was a question about the proposed vote in favor or against supervisors doing all parts of an evaluation (option 1). It was moved that there should be a mail vote, rather than a simple polling of present members, so that everyone could be included. This was seconded.

It was suggested that both options be included, but after some discussion, this suggestion was not seconded.

There was a vote in favor of the mail ballot for option 1.

A question was raised, asking if it would be possible that if option 1 fails to receive a 2/3 majority that the task force immediately report the results and send out a mail vote on option 2. This was seconded; there was a vote in favor of this.

A motion was put forward that in December the faculty vote on whether the option they chose will be the evaluation instrument for 1995. This motion was amended to say that if either option 1 or option 2 passes by a 2/3 vote, the evaluation task force will send out a mail ballot to decide whether or not to implement the selection option for the 1995 evaluation, a simple majority deciding this. The amended motion was seconded, voted upon, and passed. There was one abstention.

The terminology of option 2 was discussed. A point was raised that option 2 only addresses the annual evaluation for compensation not the evaluation for promotion and tenure. It was pointed out that there was a typographical error on option 2 item 4i which reads “one and two” and should read “two and three”. It was commented that either option 1 or 2 will a great improvement over what is in place now.

A suggestion was made that option 1 and 2 be amended to say directly that option 1 only addresses the annual evaluation for compensation and it was moved that the following phrase was given to the task force to take under advisement and be reworded so as to express the intent of the
faculty: "Although these documents form an important part of the dossiers for other processes such as promotion, reappointment, tenure and equity, the terminology and ratings are not binding."

The motion was seconded and was approved.

The meeting moved to new business.

A motion was made for a correction to the September minutes, that had been approved previously in regards to the source of funds for the Music recno project. On page 2 under "reports" the sentence that begins "In response to a question, Dean Williams ..." should be amended so as to continue "used $24,000 gift funds". This correction was seconded and was approved.

There was a motion to post a summary of the October 1995 special faculty meeting on the Norlin listserv, noting that it happened. This was seconded and approved.

It was moved that discussion of the special faculty meeting of 19 October 1995 be moved to the end of the agenda for this meeting. This motion was seconded and was approved.

There was a discussion as to whether the minutes of faculty meetings be posted on the library listserv or the library faculty listserv. The suggestion was made that only regular faculty meetings should be posted to the library list, but not informal faculty meetings which often discuss things out of context. The point was raised that the purpose of posting minutes on the library list is to inform the library community. The comment was made that the minutes are not always formatted for clarity. A motion was made that at the point when minutes are approved, the present members then decide whether or not to publish the minutes on the library list as part of the approval. This motion was seconded and accepted.

A motion was made to postpone all discussions of this topic until the next faculty meeting. This motion was seconded and approved.

The meeting then turned to committee reports.

The Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) presented a document headed "Draft Five: Salary Equity Evaluation System: Evaluation of ‘Career Merit’ and Procedures."

There was discussion as to whether new appoints would be evaluated, as well as how people with differentiated workloads or other special circumstances would be evaluated. Asked was the meaning of the phrase in the draft, "number of years in a professional position". It was stated that the issues concerning those who would undergo post-tenure review were not sufficiently differentiated in the draft. Another request that was made was that the draft clarify how the FPC differs from the Reappointment Committee. There was a motion to continue this discussion at a special faculty meeting in two weeks. This motion to adjourn was seconded and accepted.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40.

Respectfully submitted, Charles Egleston