University Libraries Faculty Meeting  
March 5, 1997


I. There was no recruitment update.

II. Approval of Minutes:

After corrections were made to the spelling of "Krisman" and "Ijessel" the minutes of the February 8, 1997 Faculty meeting were approved and will be posted to the Faculty listserve.

III. Unfinished Business:

Lester Nolan read his motion regarding the Election Committee and background information pertaining to the issues she raised at the February Faculty meeting. Ms. Nolan will post this information to the Faculty listserve for further discussion and a vote at the next Faculty meeting.

IV. New Business -- None.

V. Committee Reports:

[Note: Those present consented to re-ordering the items on the agenda. The ODI Report was moved to item number one under Committee Reports.]

1. Wally Baa presented a draft of the Library Supervisor Evaluation form to the faculty on behalf of the ODI committee. Ms. Baa noted that a copy of the form was mailed to every library employee. She clarified a few changes to the form and stressed that the form is still a draft. Questions and concerns were entertained.

Discussion involved the following issues/concerns/remarks:

- Concern that this form would contribute to the culture of avoidance that already exists in the organization. Some individuals will "shelve" up their frustrations and unload them using this form.

  - Ms. Baa responded that staff from the CU Employee Development office will assist with the results and tabulation and the Supervisor is to discuss the results with the unit.

- Sentiment was expressed that this is a traditional "bad evaluation" - to save feedback like this until a specific time of the year, rather than have an ongoing evaluation process throughout the year.

  - Ms. Baa asked for other suggestions and alternatives.

- It was pointed out that this form would assist tenure employees who need help in documenting certain circumstances that a Supervisor does not respond to in any other manner.

  - Ms. Baa stressed that this is a trial to see if the form and process work and it will be evaluated. Others present noted that this is just a vehicle for comment and should not be viewed with fear.

- Other opinions included that the form seemed too generalized rather than individualized. There was no session that addressed the following: "When a supervisor was made aware of a situation there was an effort to resolve or deal with the issue." This would show that the individual took the initiative to approach a supervisor and did not avoid a particular issue or circumstance.

  - Ms. Baa responded that these kinds of comments could be addressed in the narrative section of the form.

- It was noted that there are staff who fear filling out this form will haunt them. It is important to have an educational process about the goals of the form, e.g. that there is a difference between constructive criticism versus personal attack.

  - Ms. Baa reminded that the ODI group is planning an all employee meeting where the staff from Employee Development would attend to explain the whole process to all employees of the University Libraries.

- Further discussion included support of this initial attempt combined with other issues such as definitions. What does "approachable" mean? Terms like that could be defined differently.

- Some faculty expressed the importance of having the form filed out based on direct knowledge, not "feelings" or hearsay. Opinions were expressed that perhaps the organization was banking over backwards for a small number of people who are problematic.
Ms Bala responded that there are several options. The second level supervisor could meet with the supervisor to discuss the results. Peers could be brought in to add numbers of returns on the evaluation. Or for a very small group it doesn’t need to be done. She said it was also suggested that only the gold information could be tabulated and based on the blanks left it could be discerned that someone was fearful about the impact of this form.

"One faculty member suggested that this process could be done in the same manner as the administrators evaluations are conducted. Nothing definite was decided about this suggestion."

"Concern was expressed about the form being "just opinions" with no burden of proof or determination put on the employee to provide concrete examples. The form appears to be subjective with no statement of objectives."

Ms Bala responded that this form is meant to improve communications and is only one piece of information about a supervisor.

A faculty member stressed that this form should not be viewed as punitive but instead as something positive. Perhaps a supervisor could learn something from it. In support of this notion another faculty member expressed the idea that a supervisor would see what the responsibilities of the supervisor are by looking at the layout of the form. This might help focus people’s thinking. Finally Carol Krissmann suggested revising the discussion on this positive note. Wendy Bala thanked everyone for their candor and said that she would take the comments back to the CCI Task Force.

2

FPC — Carol Krissmann reminded everyone present to turn in their Faculty Report of Professional Activity (FRPA) which was due February 10th, 1997. She said the committee will be calling for any documentation for equity review after the group completes the evaluation process. Ms. Krissmann distributed a handout with the following explanation. The majority of the libraries faculty is on the tenure track. Until the Vice Chancellor agrees to go with a 40%/60%/70% evaluation formula, the FPC recommends making the standard formula 40%/40%/20% with the cation for the liberal use of the differentiated work load. It was noted that there are no official documents in the University that state a stipendary percentage. Should the University Libraries write a specified percentage down under these circumstances? The Dean was asked if 40%/40%/20% would be made the standard campus wide? He responded no. It was his appeal to the V/CAD due to our profession’s service nature. Ms. Krissmann pointed out that this issue will be unfinished business for the next faculty meeting.

3

Faculty/Staff Development — no report.
4

Library Advisory Board — no report.
5

Promotion and Reappointment. It was reported that this committee’s short one member.
6

Tenure — no report.
7

Election. David Fagerstrom reported that he could resolve the situation of the RRRC. Marcy D’Avis was nominated to fill the vacancy on the RRRC. He asked for and received a motion to elect Ms. D’Avis.

She was unanimously voted on to the committee.

8

Awards — no report.
9

Committee of Chairs — no report.
10

Faculty Handbook Task Force — no report.
11

Other Library Committees — no report.

VII Announcements. Skip Hamilton is a member of the University’s Tenure Committee. He reported that another document relating to the issue of tenure will arrive via e-mail shortly. It looks as if a new definition of tenure is in the works with no guarantee of future employment. The second draft of the post-tenure review document will require tenure faculty to write a professional development plan. It’s faculty member receives two years of "below normal" expectations a review process would be triggered. There are four or five scenarios that could develop as a result of a poor review one of which includes possible termination of employment. Mr. Hamilton asked everyone to review this important document once it arrives electronically to review the potential ramifications.

He also reported that there is a movement to exempt athletic coaches from at-will employment and includes librarians instead. Speak to him about these issues if you’d like further information.

VIII Administrative Reports. Dean Williams reported that he shared the budget document with everyone via email. He and the Cabinet received nine questions about their budget proposal. He expressed concern that a drop in student enrollment will impact the libraries. He was encouraged that the discussion about faculty salaries has not been shut down yet.

Susan Knake reported that in the search for the Assistant Director of Administrative Services the field has been narrowed to six candidates with two on a reserve list. Phone calls for references are being scheduled.

No announcements or reports from Automation, the Law Library or other areas of the University.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Holts

Government Publications