Minutes of the Faculty Meeting  
August 2, 2007

Time: 9:03  
Meeting Chair: Jennifer Knievel

Members Present: Stephanie Alexander, Susan Anthes, Darci Card, Marcy D’Avis, Chris Cronin, Michael Dulock, Michelle Falke, Anna Ferris, Marta Frydman (non-voting), Jennie Gerke, Alison Graber (non-voting), Skip Hamilton, Gene Hayworth, Sara Holladay (non-voting), Deborah Hollis, Anne Jennings (non-voting), Peggy Jobe, Charlene Kellsey, Carol Kriismann, Suzanne Larsen, Holley Long, Windy Lundy, Jack Maness, Pat Morris, Caroline Sinkinson, Jim Williams, Sue Williams

I. Recruitment Update:

The Head of Reference and East Asian positions are being advertised. Candidates are being contacted for the Cataloging positions. Scott is putting the final touches on the recruitment plan which is due tomorrow.

II. Approval of the Minutes:

The second sentence of Section II should read: “Non-voting members [according to the official template for taking minutes] should be listed as non-voting.”

II. Unfinished Business:

Faculty Governance Issues:
The document sent out by Janet was reviewed and it was suggested that the issues be decided on soon as the election ballot goes out in November.

Action Item 1: Options for combining different committees (PLEASE SEE APPENDIX A for complete text of Versions A & B discussed below)

The following points were made in the general discussion of Versions A & B:

- It’s logical to combine Ellsworth and Elections because the activities of the one occur in the spring while the activities of the other occur in the fall.

- There was some concern over combining three committees and a question regarding the workload of the Faculty Support Committee which was explained as not excessive.
Combining committees would result in a change to only the handbook, not the bylaws; handbook wording can be changed immediately but bylaws require a delay.

There was discussion of Appeals as a candidate for combination. The workload varies but stipulations on who may serve make combining it with the work of another committee too complex and best left alone for now.

Another solution to filling elected positions would be to have current members of committees nominate people to Elections.

It was pointed out that Version B calls for a membership of 5 which would allow people to be appointed from within the committee to take on certain tasks thus helping obtain a larger natural distribution of work throughout the year.

It was moved that the Faculty Support, Ralph E. Ellsworth Award, and Elections committees be disbanded at the conclusion of 2007, and be replaced in 2008 by a single committee whose charge would combine the responsibilities of the previous three committees. The new committee would have a membership of 5. In order to provide staggered membership for the new committee, the majority of members would be elected to two-year terms, and the minority would be elected to one-year term(s).

The motion was seconded and passed with 22 in favor of the motion, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

The Elections committee will come up with a name and a charge for the new committee.

**Action Item 2**: (Service and Tenure Committee advice—PLEASE SEE APPENDIX A)

It was moved that the Faculty request the Tenure Committee to clarify advice given to tenure stream faculty about CU Libraries Faculty service activities, keeping in mind that not all committee appointments are time-consuming, that even some time-consuming ones may relate to and even strengthen an individual's particular research or other interests, and that (a pattern of) broad faculty participation in faculty governance strengthens the faculty.

The motion was seconded.

During discussion the following points were made:
• Discouraging junior faculty from serving on FPC leaves tenured faculty as sole participants.

• Willingness to serve on FPC may be affected by how people perceive that service will be evaluated or how much ‘credit’ is given. It was pointed out that it’s the FPC who gives ‘credit’; the Tenure committee looks for national service but does not disregard local service.

• The Tenure committee sees a very active pattern of pre-tenure activity on committees that relate to operational issues.

• Service obligations are accepted as part of the 40-40-20 position.

The motion passed with 20 in favor, 1 opposed and 1 abstention.

IV. New Business:

FPC:
Suzanne Larsen proposed changing the make-up of the FPC to specify the inclusion of one non-tenure track member, leaving the rest of the positions open.

Discussion: There was some concern about losing the voice and input of non-tenure track faculty but others expressed a belief in the fairness of the faculty as a whole. It was also noted that the ranks of non-tenure track faculty are waning.

It was moved and seconded that a mail vote be taken on this particular issue. Larsen will create the exact wording and will send it out as a mail ballot. It was suggested that this happen within the next 10 days.

Proposed Bylaws Revision:

Proposal:
Amend Constitution and Bylaws Article III: Membership, Section 1: Definition of Faculty

ARTICLE III. MEMBERSHIP Section 1. Definition of Faculty The Faculty is composed of all those at the rank of Instructor or above, who either hold full time permanent appointments to the University of Colorado at Boulder Libraries, or who hold a less than full time permanent appointment, and were appointed prior to 1990, or who held a full time appointment prior to entering the University’s phased retirement program.

The following points were made during discussion of the proposal:
• Temporary faculty should not be given the right to vote on issues of long-term concern, particularly those issues introduced by the FPC or any issue involving personnel or policy.

• The wording may not be in line with University faculty handbook wording.

• Some other departments do allow their adjunct faculty to vote.

• We always have temporary faculty and may be having even more as so many positions open up. They are entitled to more say.

• Temporary faculty are more willing to serve on committees which isn’t always possible the way they are currently defined.

• A motion could be made to allow them to serve on those committees to which they currently don’t have access; this raises concerns again about FPC issues which temporary faculty are not affected by. Also, people sometimes transition from temporary to permanent and a question was raised regarding pressure to vote along certain lines on contentious issues.

• Should temporary faculty (all of whom have advanced degrees) actually be hired as adjunct rather than temporary?

• Not allowing committee participation by temporary faculty sends the wrong message. Currently there are some inconsistencies in how temporary faculty are integrated and function within system. It would be best to resolve these.

• It may be that certain issues, such as personnel and policy issues, are not appropriate for temporary faculty to vote on. However, policing who may vote could be problematic.

• Mixed feelings were generally expressed.

After discussion, the wording of the proposal was sent back to have its legality checked.

V. Committee Reports:

1. Faculty Personnel:

The book issue (number of years that a person may be given credit for a book) is still under discussion. There is no standard across disciplines. The committee is going to come up with one, hopefully before the next meeting.

They are also looking at search guidelines and will send out the mail ballot on the make-up of the FPC.
Skip Hamilton would like to solicit email suggestions for new names for the FPC. Please email him with ideas at skip.hamilton@colorado.edu.

2. Faculty Support: They sent out awards to everyone who applied July; the next round of applications is due in November.

3. Promotion and Reappointment: They would like to schedule a meeting with Jeff Cox about the tenure process.

They will be setting up membership of PUECs in August for those who are up for review; no one has turned down serving as an external reviewer.

4. Tenure: None.

5. Elections: Met with the Dean to discuss the trouble they have filling committees. They talked about creating a service culture and would like to share those ideas.

6. Awards: None.

7. Committee of Chairs: None.

8. Appeals Committee: None.

9. Other Library Committees:
   a. Faculty Staff Development: None.
   b. Web Advisory: A survey on web usage statistics is going out to people who are responsible for updating websites.

Thanks are extended to Holley for getting the faculty profiles up and running. Faculty profiles are available to the public at http://libnet.colorado.edu/facultyprofiles/public/index.cfm. Faculty can create their profiles at http://libnet.colorado.edu/facultyprofiles/faculty/index.cfm.

Faculty will be prompted to authenticate using their windows login. This is the login you use to access your computer. The username needs to be preceded by lib\

For example:

Username: lib\smithj
Password: mypassword
c. Library Advisory: None.
d. Recruitment to the Profession: None.
e. Assessment: They suggested to the Cabinet that LibQUAL move to a three year cycle. In a three year cycle they will use the middle year to really drill down into the results. This year, for example, they will look at the Graduate Student Dilemma—exploring why they rate us differently than graduate students at other universities and what their needs and wants are. The hope is to raise ratings next time around.
f. Digital Projects Advisory Group: None.

VI. Administrative Reports:

The Dean reported that at this time we have no budget but this is not unusual. We DO have a new bottom line in terms of faculty compensation.

The Chancellor still wants 25 new faculty lines and also talks about adding new staff lines. Hearings will be later this year.

Students want late night study place. The Dean hopes to discuss this with the Provost.

The new CIO for this campus is Ric Porreca (formerly the CFO).

The Chancellor’s Flagship 2030 strategic planning committee has new plans—e.g. three full semester year (no summer school). We need to have a faculty meeting to discuss how this may impact our operations.

We’ll be seeing more activity around capital projects (i.e. the Commons and our service point culture in Norlin). The other big project is Pascal 2. We will be looking for sub-lease but this should be no problem. Legal problem with Health Sciences Center regarding our ability to keep Pascal where it is was resolved with the help of the fabulous legal counsel that CU now has.

VII. Announcements:
1. University Committees: None.

Meeting adjourned at 10:14 AM.

Recorder: Michelle Falke

APPENDIX A:

Faculty Governance Issues
July 20, 2007

Some months ago at a faculty meeting, a concern was raised about the issue of participation in faculty governance. Several faculty expressed an interest in pursuing the matter, and have become an ad hoc task force (Chris Cronin, Gene Haworth, Janet Swan Hill, Jennifer Kneivel, Suzanne Larsen). We forwarded to the faculty a discussion document "Faculty governance participation", and are forwarding that document again as a supplement to our present agenda item.

At this time, we are bringing forward several action items, all related to the final bulleted list from the "Faculty governance participation" document. For convenience’s sake, that list is reproduced below:

*****************

Possible ways to address this situation might include:

- Discussion of why we are faculty, what being part of a faculty means, and what obligations a faculty member has
- Reassessment or clarification of advice given to tenure stream faculty about service (e.g., not all faculty committees are time-consuming)
- Re-examination of current restrictions to committee memberships, representations, etc. to see if they are valid and necessary
- Reduction in size of committees
- Reduction in number of committees, either through elimination or combination
- Reexamination of charge, purpose, and meeting schedule of LAB to make faculty service more attractive Ceding to the Dean authority over some matters currently in the charge of faculty committees that are difficult to fill

*******************

The ad hoc task force is bringing three motions. The first has highest priority, because it affects the construction of the ballot for faculty committees next year. The others are actions that the task force believes might be relatively easy to pass. Following these action items, several matters are being brought forward for discussion if time permits.

Currently, the Faculty has the following committees:

- COMMITTEE OF CHAIRS. Membership is ex officio. Rarely meets
- ELECTIONS. 3 members, seasonal work
- FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE. 5 members, year round work, min.2 TT; min 2 NTT. Members not simultaneously serve on Prom/Reappt or Appeals
- PROMOTION AND REAPPOINTMENT. 3 members, seasonal work, NTT. Members may not simultaneously serve on FPC or Appeals
- TENURE. Membership is ex officio of all tenured faculty, year round work
- FACULTY SUPPORT. 3 members, year round work, though sporadic
• RALPH E. ELLSWORTH AWARD. 3 members, seasonal work
• APPEALS 3 members, seasonal work. Members may not simultaneously serve on FPC or Prom/Reappt

ACTION ITEM 1.

This action item is put forward as a means of reducing the number of faculty committee slots there are to fill. The task force sees two possible ways to achieve this, and would like to hear discussion before moving one or the other.

Version A: BE IT MOVED that the Faculty Support Committee and the Ralph E. Ellsworth Award committees be disbanded effective at the end of 2007, and that they be replaced in 2008 by a single committee, whose charge would combine the responsibilities of the previous two committees. In order to provide staggered membership for the new committee, two members would be elected to two-year terms, and one would be elected to a one-year term.

Comment: The missions of the current committees are related, and the workload would not be insupportable. This action would decrease the number of total committee slots by three. If the action passes, the Parliamentarian will combine and revise the charges and bring the revision back to the Faculty for approval. The Election Committee will determine how to determine who gets the one-year term and who gets the two-year terms.

Version B: BE IT MOVED that the Faculty Support, Ralph E. Ellsworth Award, and Elections committees be disbanded at the conclusion of 2007, and be replaced in 2008 by a single committee whose charge would combine the responsibilities of the previous three committees. The new committee would have a membership of 5. In order to provide staggered membership for the new committee, the majority of members would be elected to two-year terms, and the minority would be elected to one-year term(s).

Comment: The workload would still not be insupportable and would be sporadic year-round. A membership of 5 could enable the committee to share the workload, perhaps having one person as "primary" for awards, one for elections, etc. A membership of 5 would decrease the total number of committee slots by four. (A membership of 3 would decrease the total number of committee slots by six). If the action passes, the Parliamentarian will combine and revise the charges and bring the revision back to the Faculty for approval. The Election Committee will determine how to determine who gets the short and long terms.

ACTION ITEM 2: BE IT MOVED that the Faculty request the Tenure Committee to clarify advice given to tenure stream faculty about CU Libraries Faculty service activities, keeping in mind that not all committee appointments are time-consuming, that even some time-consuming ones may relate to and even strengthen an individual's particular research
or other interests, and that (a pattern of) broad faculty participation in faculty governance strengthens the faculty.

**ACTION ITEM 3:** BE IT MOVED that the Faculty request the Dean consider the charge, purpose, and schedule of the LAB, with the aim of making faculty service on the LAB more attractive and feasible, consulting the LAB and members of the faculty as necessary, and reporting back to the faculty no later than November, 2007.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS AND OTHER MATTERS:**

1. The task force supports the proposal being brought by the FPC to reduce the minimum number of non-tenure-track positions.

2. The task force is proposing no changes for the Appeals Committee at this time. Even though the committee has very little work to do during the year, its function cannot be easily combined with that of any other committee. Considering the difficulty that the Election Committee often has filling out the ballot, the possibility of having the Appeals Committee membership change each year by putting one outgoing member FPC, Prom/Reappt, and Election/Support/Award (or Support/Award) onto Appeals was raised. This would, however, be a radical change, requiring significant discussion. It might be, that with the combination of the two (or three) other committees, that the difficulty of putting together a ballot will be eased enough not to consider such a change.

3. The task force is also not suggesting changes for the Promotion and Reappointment Committee at this time. Its function is not easily combined with that of any other committee. It should be noted, however, that as the number of non-tenure-track faculty continues to decrease, there will come a time when it will be necessary to devise some other mechanism for considering promotion and reappointment cases for these faculty. For instance, if the number of NTT faculty is no more than 9, the review process would become increasingly awkward. Discussion of other possible models will have to be had at some point.

4. Several items from the previous document have not yet been discussed, such as examining whether the restrictions against simultaneous service on the personnel-related committees are necessary and valid, and how/whether/when to go about organizing a discussion about why we are faculty, what being faculty means, what obligations for participation/service faculty have.

5. Some other possible future activities were brought up, including: Surveying the faculty to find out why they come to faculty meetings (or not), and why they volunteer to run for committee slots (or don’t); looking back at who has served on what over the past X years to see if any patterns emerge; looking back at faculty meeting attendance over the past X years to see if patterns emerge (e.g., to see how much of a hindrance geographic separation seems to be); considering whether the length of terms on faculty committees is appropriate or a help or hindrance in encouraging participation in governance; considering whether restrictions on succeeding yourself on committees are appropriate or a help or hindrance in
encouraging participation and assuring quality of service. Comments, questions, suggestions, etc. are always welcome.