UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
FACULTY MINUTES
NOVEMBER 5, 1998

Present: Anthes, Baia, Bock, Boysliewicz, Byrne, Czeck, Fagerstrom, Gause, Hill, Hollis, Jobe, Kelsey, Krismann, Larsen, Lo Bue, Maloney, Sani, Shen, S. Williams

Recruitment Update: Bock passed Scott Seaman’s message that various search committees are reviewing the applications.

Approval of Minutes: Minutes from the October 1 meeting were approved.

Unfinished Business: Post-tenure review-Multiple Measures for Librarianship was moved to the end of the agenda.

New Business: None.

Committee Reports:
1. Faculty Personal - No report.
2. Faculty Support - No report.
3. Faculty/Staff Development: The committee has publicized James William’s presentation on November 11th. The committee continues working on training and looking into other types of training on computers.
4. Library Advisory Board - No report.
5. Promotion and Reappointment - No report.
6. Tenure - Lo Bue reported mail ballots on the General and Specific Tenure Criteria had been counted. The final vote was 13-3 in favor.

Lo Bue also called for discussion and vote on the note dated Oct. 20, which was handed out to all the faculty by Promotion and Reappointment Committee, to incorporate the new university policies plus the header Post-tenure Review and Faculty Professional Plan into the Library Faculty Handbook.

Discussion followed and questions were raised about the implementation of the new policies and whether this would apply to annual merit evaluations. Lo Bue explained these policies would only apply to the tenure-related reviews and not the annual merit evaluation. The new policies will be implemented and the faculty must submit their professional plans in the fall of 1998. A draft form of the plan and a sample of that form filled out have been sent to every tenured and tenure-track faculty member. The faculty member should work with his/her supervisor on the plans. It was suggested that the non-tenure-track supervisors should also have a copy of the materials since this is supposed to be discussed with them.

The motion on incorporating the new university policies into the Library Faculty Handbook passed.

7. Elections - Krismann reported the committee was sending out forms for volunteering. She urged everyone to volunteer for all the committees. The committee expects to have the forms back by November 17.

8. Awards - Sue Williams reported the committee was sending out nomination forms for the Ellsworth Award this week and the deadline will be December 4.

9. Committee of Chairs - No report.
11. Faculty Handbook Task Force - Hill reported the committee had been waiting to see what's to happen regarding the issues that had just been passed by the faculty. The committee will meet again to work on the next step.

12. Appeals Committee - No report.

13. Other Library Committees - No report.

Administrative Reports:

1. Off-site storage - Keilsey reported on the progress of the Louisville project. The moving will start on December 1. The projected moves will be for May 1, Sept. 1, 1999, and Jan 1, 2000. That should complete the move to Louisville.


3. Law Library - No report.

Unfinished Business: Multiple Measures for Librarianship Taskforce report

Hill pointed out two problems with the list. First, the chair's evaluation and the dean's evaluation are not measures. Those are required to be part of the dossier after it is put together, so they wouldn't count. Second, there is a confusion of measures with evidences. E.g. awards are not measures; they are evidences. Questions were raised about the differences between the measures and evidences. It was suggested that the FPC, the tenure committee, and the taskforce should work together for clarification.

Questions were also raised on application of the multiple measures. Hill explained the multiple measures were only to be used for the tenure-related landmark reviews, i.e. the reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Merit evaluation is separate from these landmark reviews. It was suggested that in the long range these measures may be included as part of the merit evaluation process for all library faculty, so that we will be evaluated under the same umbrella.

Hamilton explained that the list is not considered mandatory or exclusive. Any other measures can be added. Hill suggested that we urge every faculty member to take a look at this in terms of their own jobs and send to the taskforce, the tenure committee, or the FPC any information about some other ways they have to evaluate their work, which are covered here on this list.

Other Comments:

There was confusion regarding the deadline of the mail ballot. Since "By November 5" could mean "by the beginning" or "by the close" of November 5, it was suggested that in the future we make it clearer by spelling out what we mean when we use something like "by November 5."

Adjourn: 9:50

Respectfully submitted,
Zhija Ihen