Minutes of the Faculty Meeting  
February 1, 2007

Meeting Chair: Jennifer Knievel


I. Recruitment Update: Two positions: The Head of Reference Search Committee is starting to review applications. The ad for Librarian for Japanese Collections is out.

II. Approval of the Minutes:  
The minutes from the December meeting were approved with no corrections.

II. Unfinished Business:  
No old business.

IV. New Business:  
Hiring Additional Non-Tenure Stream Faculty:

Jim Williams has to make a decision and wants to hear voices in regards to the recruitment plans for next year requesting tenure stream faculty. The Provost is encouraging Deans not to hire tenure stream faculty, expressing a need more teachers to carry the load. The R2 report made a similar recommendation. There have been requests from Faculty Directors to hire non-tenure stream faculty. Jim Williams has sought advice from Tenure Committee. He has also received advice from junior tenure stream. One question is whether this would create a third class of faculty. Another is whether it is time to revisit the question of faculty rank for librarians on campus. JW says no way to both. There are discussions on campus that we would not be part of if we were not faculty. The issue is whether we have sufficient colleagues to handle workload. How many positions would we need? Would they be post specific? Would they reside in specific department? What worries people? Jim is committed to deciding that this would be a small group of people on our faculty.

Peggy: There should be real differentiation between Tenure stream and new people. There would be a third class.

JW disagrees.
Gene: Senior Instructors are different from senior instructors on campus. Is this an end run around the tenure system? This would cause contention between tenure track and senior instructors.

Jina: If we hire instructors, are we really creating a third class?

Debbie: Against this for a host of reasons. We forget that the management of tenure and senior instructors is handled differently across departments. Senior instructors are not let go. People in different departments are handled differently. Need more faculty lines and staff lines.

Janet: In support of hiring additional non-tenure stream faculty. They would not be a third class. Senior instructors are grandfathered in. They are a second class. In other departments, instructors are there for workload management. Some faculty should be engaged in research and some should be engaged at a lesser level to hold down responsibilities that are needed. Hiring instructors is not a threat.

Paul: What will the role of instructors to be? Will instructors be considered down the road for department head positions. There is talk of “doers vs. non-doers” and he doesn’t get it. What is it about 40-40-20 that is so important? There are lots of models for tenure that are very different from ours. If we were not 40-40-20, we could have more doers.

JW: Minority of Tenure committee wanted third class. Japanese bibliographer is member of faculty. Gov Pubs grant person has same benefits as other faculty. New instructors would be the same as current senior instructors. JW sent a letter once to the University Administration requesting a change to 60-30-10. This led to question of why should librarians be faculty at all. JW doesn’t pursue this conversation. JW doesn’t believe that 40-40-20 is the best for the library.

Peggy: Tenure committee is not unanimous in recommendations. They do feel there should be differentiation between tenure stream and instructors.

Charlene: two minds. Evaluations are strongly geared towards the tenure stream faculty. Bringing in instructors, you are still looking at service and scholarship. She is worried about fairness of this. Being on tenure track is difficult. Need extra perks or why would anyone want to be on tenure track. She suggested extra travel funds.

Skip: Campus politics drives the way we work in the library. This is why tenure system is the way it is. Have to work with the way the campus works. We have adapted to what the campus expects. If everything is equivalent between senior instructor and tenure track, then many tenure track faculty would opt to be senior instructors so that they could devote more time to their profession activities. Were non-tenure stream faculty consulted?
Wendy: What’s in the best interest of the library? If the department head requests a non-tenure stream position for the interest of the department, they should be listened to! How much research do we need? R2 made the recommendation because they saw a need.

Laurie: She is a tenure committee person in favor of the proposal. Comparing us with others on campus we have strikes against us: 12 month contracts, we are a service group, we have high tenure standards. Other departs have instructors to help with workload. We also need input from staff.

Skip moved that we postpone the rest of the agenda until the next meeting. Seconded Passed.

Katie: Tenure is important. Department heads recommendations based on departmental needs would never support research. Adjunct faculty in other department are second class. New instructors would be different. If there is not differentiation between tenure track and senior instructors, why would anyone want to be on tenure track? Librarianship is different from other disciplines. The campus must be aware of this. She regrets lack of time to devote to librarianship.

Alison: Said that she is that person new senior instructor being discussed. She gets lot of opportunities to support tenure stream faculty by being on committees and such. She doesn’t know if she would want to be tenure track or senior instructor. But she sees her role as positive.

Tim: Pointed out that other Universities have different criteria for library faculty on tenure track and there is no reason such system would not work on this campus.

Pat: Strongly need to make an argument to change balance of research and librarianship. We are understaffed and falling behind. In order to do the things we should be doing, we need more people or people who have more time to do the things we need to be done. We need to show the University Administration what is done on other campuses. Need to make that argument. What benefits are were really getting as faculty? Pat could have done so much more if she had not had to concentrate on research. We need the manpower to keep the library going where it should be going.

Yem: If we do go down this path. How will the University Administration look at our requests for addition non-tenure stream faculty?

JW: There is a risk.

Scott: Other departments hiring instructors as worker bees. We have classified staff.

Peggy: Not opposed as an experiment. She is opposed to hiring instructors with same rights and privileges. Unfair. This would reintroduce contentiousness between classes.
Debbie: We do not live in a socialist system. We are librarians in faculty clothing. We should not tinker anymore. People are going to be unhappy, but let’s move on. Make decision soon.

Gene: If dept head make decision, there would soon be not tenure stream lines. The perception is that the tenure stream faculty are not doing the work. Has the Dean already made up his mind?

JW: No he hasn’t. Faculty Status is very important.

Tim: Reminded everyone of Jim William’s comments at the beginning of the discussion where is said, “The Provost is encouraging Deans not to hire non-tenure stream faculty.” This would seem to indicate that there is not much risk to the library in hiring non-tenure stream faculty since it is what the Provost is recommending. If the University Administration is not hearing Jim’s request to change workload for tenure stream faculty, we should invite the Provost to come to our faculty meeting.

Janet: We don’t want to disadvantage the tenure Stream faculty. We can’t go into this fuzzy. We would have to have clearly defined workload, etc. We are all doing the work of academic librarians. Some do more librarianship, service, research, it is all the work of academic librarians. We have to be careful when talking to staff about workload.

Jina: Doesn’t know contentiousness. We have moved beyond this. Need to look at from this point on what is best for the institution. The need is so strong in the Cataloging and Metadata Dept. This is a long range need. We need to be poised to meet the challenge of librarianship in 21 Century. As dept heads, it is our responsibility to champion the rights of tenure stream faculty as well as instructors and staff. This would not be risky. Regardless of what other academic depts. do, we are different. We have to do something so that we can move ahead. She is a strong supporter of tenure system, but feels we may want to change 40-40-20.

Thea: Agrees with Peggy, Charlene, Katie and others that the tenure track might not seem worth it if there is no differentiation in benefits between tenure track and new instructors. If Jim does decide to hire new instructors dedicated to librarianship and/or service, perhaps that differentiation could be in benefits associated with research.

Yem: We need for someone to do more work and she would support hiring instructors. We need to look at positions and protect faculty positions. Let’s look at broader picture to get the work done and scholarly communications.

Peggy: Would people be supportive of hiring non-tenure track librarians if there was a differentiation between? Straw poll: If we hire off tenure stream, would we prefer it to be with differentiation of benefits: Yes 8, No 7, Abstentions 8.

Chris: Discussion should be framed around broader question of staffing in the library overall. Open Positions should belong to the library and decisions made as to where the
position is most needed. He agrees with Pat. Discussion is needed to meet immediate needs. There is a difference between tenure track, non-tenure track, and staff. Differentiated workload. Library need vs. departmental need. Not strategic.

Marcy. There are already differentiations between non-tenure stream and tenure stream: sabbaticals, evaluations are slanted towards research.

JW: Rank is important. He will not reduce the number of faculty and create general professional positions. To maintain comprehensive research category, University must have tenure stream faculty. The University Administration wants to see this University as strong as possible. Jim wants to keep the lines that we have. As a result of this discussion, he has even more to worry about. Opinion is all over the map. This is a milestone for us and most troubling. Does he take a change in faculty workload to the campus, to the new Chancellor, to the Provost. The majority opinion seems to be yes. The fact is that the VCAC does hear Jim telling them that librarians are different.

Peggy: It might not be to our benefit to ask for change 40-40-20. Tenure stream should be supervised by tenure stream

Skip: R2 report was needed very much. However, he recommends not bringing up 40-40-20.

Janet: VCAC does look at disciplines differently. Candidates are judged according to the standards of the disciplines. When our dossiers go forward with our recommendations, the VCAC tends to listen to the recommendation. What we send forward as 40-40-20, they accept. If we changed to 60-20-20, they might see things different and might not expect any less.

Katie: Strong proponent of looking at workload, but not right now. Look at workload. Look at other institutions workload.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM.

Recorder: Tim Byrne