Faculty Meeting Minutes  
February 2, 2001


Hill was the substitute parliamentarian. Recorder: Hollis

Crisis of no quorum was the first order of business. Eighteen out of thirty-three Libraries faculty were needed to have a quorum. A question arose about those who are on sabbatical or leave, or who have an excused absence. Hamilton expressed concern about cases coming before the University Privilege and Tenure Committee based on procedural error. Procedures passed without a quorum could be challenged in court.

Hamilton requested that reports be given while faculty members were called and asked to attend the meeting.

Administrative report by Dean Williams. The Dean asked department heads to give an update on recruiting activities.

Technical Services: Hill reported that evaluation forms have been completed for the monographic and serials positions. A committee for the principal cataloger is being formed.

Science: Fägerstrom reported that the Science position is being advertised.

Reference: Gresham reported that the Humanities and History bibliographer searches were underway. Fifteen applications have been received for each position. The suggested closing date is February 16, 2001 but there is no deadline.

Dean Williams reported that a new university administrative structure is in place. The Dean continues to report to Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs Phil DiStefano. The change that will occur is that Chancellor Byyny will spend more time externally in fund raising efforts.

Reports were temporarily suspended with a quorum present.

**New Business:** Hamilton called for a special meeting with only one agenda item which was the definition of faculty. He asked FPC Chair Barb Greenman to present the motion to the Libraries Faculty. After the motion was introduced the meeting would adjourn but no one present would leave. A second meeting would be called where a call for a vote on the FPC motion would be requested.

FPC Chair Barb Greenman referred to the handout that was distributed which contained the definition of "faculty." The proposed change to the constitution/bylaws was:

Article III. Membership.  
Section 1. Definition of Faculty

The Faculty is composed of all those at the rank of Instructor or above who hold permanent appointments of 50% or more to the University of Colorado at Boulder Libraries.

Hill explained that the current definition was crafted after the one in the UCB University Handbook. A question was raised about part-time instructors with permanent appointment status. After a brief discussion it was noted that no one is currently hired under such a
circumstance. Fägerstrom asked if all temporary hires are from year-to-year. Dean Williams answered that unless stipulated otherwise on the paperwork. Larsen pointed out that the Libraries has a definite number of faculty lines. Hamilton expressed concern that the university definition differs. No further discussion took place. Holmes put forth a motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded. The meeting adjourned.

New meeting:

Hamilton called the faculty meeting to order and requested a motion to revise the agenda. Motion made and seconded.

The next motion was made to accept the change in the definition of faculty. No discussion. A question arose about a proxy vote. It was decided that a proxy vote does not exist. The vote taken in favor of the proposed FPC definition of faculty was unanimous. None opposed and no abstentions. The Parliamentarian stated that this takes effect immediately.

Second item on the agenda: Definition of a quorum. Hamilton requested a discussion. Could a vote by mail transact official business? Holmes questioned why a meeting didn't count to get a discussion started. Hill responded that there were legal considerations. Hill explained that summaries of meetings without a quorum could be put with the files, and have been in the past, but they wouldn't equal official minutes. Hill continued by expressing concern that Robert’s Rules of Order would be used in some business but not in others. She cautioned that there was a danger in setting a quorum at 40%. Discussion arose about a smaller proportion of the faculty making the decisions. Some present stated that if faculty members do not attend meetings its not the problem of those who do. Sentiment was expressed that if the quorum isn't lowered the faculty will be held "hostage" by those who don't care enough to attend meetings.

A recommendation arose to provide agendas with more information than the current template that is distributed. Fägerstrom pointed out that he'd heard legitimate reasons for some not being at the meeting. Jobe recommended that a simple definition of what counts as a quorum by mail be made. Hill replied that the bylaws don't state that a quorum is necessary for a vote by mail ballot. What the bylaws state is that a motion be presented at one meeting and voted on by at another meeting. Some agreed with the need to lower the number that constitutes a quorum. Gresham expressed concern about decision making by mail ballot. Kellsey agreed and said if an issue is really important then request a mail ballot. Greenman suggested making sure that action items are made available. She suggested distributing the agenda via email. Hamilton responded that Ruth Leahy, Administrative Assistant to the head of Technical Services, prepares the agenda. It is kept simple for this purpose. The faculty cannot expect Leahy to take on additional clerical responsibilities. Hill responded that Leahy has been doing this for eleven years. Perhaps someone in Administrative Services could assume these responsibilities.

Byrne supported lowering the quorum but expressed concern about a vote taken by mail. He pointed out the difference in a vote on a general issue versus a vote to change the bylaws. Further discussion ensued. Hamilton requested an official motion. Larsen introduced the motion to lower the quorum to one fourth of the full faculty. It was seconded. Gresham stated that he would be more comfortable with making it a third of the faculty. Larsen agreed to the amendment. Hamilton stated that one-third would equal twelve faculty members. The motion was seconded. Culshaw recommended that perhaps changing the time of the faculty meeting would be a solution? Jobe stated that email reminders the day before the meeting would helpful. Larsen recommended putting that discussion on a future agenda but for now those present should concentrate on the definition of a quorum.

Byrne brought forward a motion that, should the previous motion be approved, amend it to include that any meeting with fewer than 50% of the present faculty, and that deals with amendments to the bylaws, requires a vote be taken by mail ballot. Jobe expressed concern that twelve people could potentially make changes to the Libraries Handbook, not the bylaws. Hill
responded that only the bylaws are introduced at one meeting and without a quorum, voted on by mail ballot. D’Avis raised the proxy issue. She noted that it is included in the *Robert’s Rules of Order*. Hamilton responded that the proxy issue is separate from the current issue. Hill seconded Byrne’s motion. Hamilton asked if tenure policies and procedures are located in the Handbook or the bylaws. Hill responded that they were in the Handbook. Holmes pointed out that a quorum under the old definition was needed next month to pass the proposed motion. Hamilton closed the discussion.

Hamilton entertained discussion on the proxy issue. Hill proposed the motion that it be stated explicitly in the bylaws that votes may be taken at meetings and by mail ballot, but not by proxy. Yue seconded the motion. Culshaw asked if anyone could call for a mail ballot at any time? Hill responded that the bylaws were written with the assumption that there would always be a quorum. It is assumed that a mail ballot can be requested at a meeting with a quorum. Baia questioned the concern about the proxy issue. What was the objection? Hill brought forth a motion to discuss this further. Her concern was based on experience with the Tenure Committee. The fourth motion made was that a vote be taken by mail ballot if requested at a faculty meeting. This totaled four items of unfinished business.

The meeting returned to the original agenda beginning with item II.

II. **Minutes** of the November 2, 2000 faculty meeting were approved. The December 7, 2000 faculty meeting was not "official" due to a lack of a quorum. Hill summarized the meeting. A brief discussion took place about posting the minutes of the meetings on the web.

IV. **New Business**, the Tempe Principles. Hamilton suggested an additional faculty meeting to discuss the principles. February 15 was suggested. An email notice would be sent out as a reminder. A quorum would be necessary.

V. **Committee reports**.
   1. FPC: In the process of examining supervisory relationships on committees. Reminder that the evaluation paperwork is due soon.
   2. Faculty Support: Research Discussion Group meetings held bi-monthly. A web site is under construction. Planning for workshops is underway.
   3. Faculty/Staff Development: No report.
   4. Library Advisory Board. No report.
   5. Promotion and Reappointment: No report.
   6. Tenure: Working on procedures to add to the Handbook. PUEC has completed the Shen case. Transfer of Senior Instructors to Assistant Professor is scheduled next.
   12. Other Library Committees. No report.

VI. **Administrative reports** resumed. English Professor Jeffrey Cox was named chair of the Libraries Blue Ribbon Panel. The Board of Regents passed the vote regarding supervisors and staff evaluations. Evaluations not completed by the deadline will result in the faculty or staff supervisor’s suspension without pay.

No Off-site Storage report.

Meeting adjourned.