

**Faculty Meeting Minutes
October 17, 2006**

2/3 majority of Library Faculty were present; the meeting was called to order by Executive Chair, Gisele Schierhorst at 10:10AM.

Director's report and meeting agenda were distributed to all prior to the meeting.

Agenda

- Approval of the May 11, 2006 meeting minutes
- Library Committee Reports: Executive, A&P, Library Services
- University Senate Committee Reports
- Director's Report (Chris)
- Health Sciences Library Update
- Library Personnel Policy and Procedures – status
- New business

Approval of the May 11, 2006 meeting minutes

(No changes to the meeting minutes were requested.)

Jason T. motioned to approve minutes. Godlind J. seconded the motion. Motion to approve minutes was carried by all.

Standing Committees Reports

Executive Committee—Gisele S. reported.

--The Library Executive Committee met August 29 and October 12 to discuss the Library Faculty meeting and the proposed changes to the tenure notification process proposed by the Library Administration, both times Richie F. of A&P was present to provide the committee with updates as to how the discussion and review of the proposal was shaping (See A&P report).

--The Executive Committee tabulated the votes from the fall 2006 elections and the following appointments were made:

- Dana A. was appointed to A&P as the non-tenured, voting faculty member
- Susan L. was appointed to Library Executive Com. as a voting faculty member
- Helene V. was appointed to A&P as a tenured voting faculty member
- Cynthia D. was appointed to Library Services as a voting faculty member
- William G. was appointed to Library Services as a voting faculty member

Appointment & Promotion Committee- Richie F. reported.

--The Library Appointment and Promotion Committee met to discuss discretionary increases and identify disparities between members' work and salary. From this meeting, recommendations were made to the Library Administration in the beginning of October and the final Dean's recommendation to the Provost left the Library on October 13th.

--A&P's majority of time has been spent working with Library Administration on the problem of notification for tenure and the overall slowness of the tenure process in the Library. Recommendations for a timeline were made to the Library Administration which they have agreed to follow and will notify the candidate when there are problems with the process as well as when items have been completed. If something obstructs this process the candidate will receive an explanation and clarification.

Discussion ensued with a question from Paul W. about the legitimacy of this agreement as a solution to the larger problems being experienced to which Richie F. responded that it is not meant to be a solution but an improvement to the current situation and an attempt to monitor the Library Administration's response to which from Paul W. was that it was not an impressive solution.

Additional questioning came from Elaine H. Regarding why the decision to move forward was not put in writing and made part of Library procedure to which Rich F. answered the intention was not to make things formal but get them going. Barbara B. then noted that is seemed to be covered in the Director's Report to which Richie F. clarified that was in relation to the next item to report.

--A&P had also been working with Germaine H. to reinstate the notification letter that used to be issued by the Library Administration which noted the proper date upon which tenure candidates should be using as a guide to navigate the tenure process. This letter which had been produced by members of A&P was no longer being done because of legal reasons as outlined to the Library Administration by the University's legal counsel who stated that such a document might hold the issuer legally responsible in the event of a problem. This was confirmed by Richie F. through confirmation of the communication and subsequent conversation with both legal counsel and Germaine H.

The question was then posed to the group for discussion as to "How does non-tenured faculty know when their time is up?" Following this statement, a discussion ensued regarding the previously mentioned work that the A&P was doing with the Library Administration on the proposed Evaluation and Reappointment Process (non-tenured faculty), see attached.

Gisele S. asked that a discussion take place for a short period of time on the matter with additional meeting to be held if necessary.

--Richie F. added before open discussion that A&P would hold another non-tenured preparation meeting at the end of October/beginning of November.

Discussion ensued with all members' agreement.

Sherry C. pointed out that the Library Administration devised the proposal because certain dates had been missed for employees and they wanted to streamline the process while still making it in line with the UUP contract and the separate SUNY Policies. Paul W. asked if there was still a way of making this and other notification part of the process. To which Sherry C. replied that Germaine H. felt it should be the local supervisor's responsibility to keep track of dates. Richie F. said that the letter when it was allowed was a perfect tool for doing so.

Additional points came from John A. who pointed out that in the original letter there was a disclaimer at the bottom which seemed to cover the legal counsel's concerns and which was pulled directly from SUNY policies.

Aimee D. then asked if the Provost has such a timeline and do they give it to our Library Admin. Richie F. responded that it does have a timeline but that Germaine can only verify for the faculty member if asked the proper timeline but not provide. To which John A. pointed out that the letter's final wording should allow her/us to do so.

Janet C. then pointed out the following:

1. Why is the Library trying to determine this as it seems a case for legal counsel or UUP, and what is other doing on campus?
2. What do other universities do?
3. Does the candidate's supervisor receive a copy of the offer letter and dates when the candidate begins to work for them?

This last question brought an answer from Brigitte H. who answered that they do in most cases but that there is a difference between the teaching faculty offers and the Library's in terms of the offer and the appointment times.

Discussion then ensued with Sherry C. pointing out that it had been a long time since someone had not been reappointed but that we should discuss this with Germaine H. at a separate meeting of the appropriate parties.

Aimee D. voiced her agreement with Janet's view that these are not all issues that we should attempt to solve which was voiced also by Nathan B. who felt there was a need to have some written policies but that individual supervisors needed to take some of the responsibility in the process, and that the discussion was blurring different issues at this point which raised the issue of A&P being allowed to see letters written by supervisor which Elaine H. pointed out was part of a written agreement years past. Further discussion ensued over the viability of A&P being allowed to see supervisor's recommendation letters during the process. General disagreement was held over this issue and it was decided:

*The faculty will hold a separate meeting to discuss these issues in particular. Further discussion held until that meeting.

LSC Committee: Mimi L. reported.

The Library Services Committee hosted the following events since the last Faculty meeting in May. See report below.

Library Services Committee Report
Library Faculty Meeting
October 17, 2006

The Library Services Committee accomplished the following since last library faculty meeting in May.

On June 29, Godlind gave a talk about her experience with the relief work in New Orleans. Susan Liberthal shared her report from ALA which was also held in New Orleans.

Junior librarians at Stony Brook University Libraries had one-day retreat on May 30. Everyone attending gave a presentation or displayed a poster. After this event, the Committee hosted a library forum and invited junior faculty members to share their retreat presentations or posters with all library staff.

The library services committee started offering a new program, "Trend Spotting". Originally suggested by some of the junior faculty, the purpose of this program is to try and find trends in library services and technology through literature review and follow-up discussions. The kickoff Trend Spotting was held on September 26, led by Susan Liberthal on a topic of "Instruction via instant messaging reference".

Lastly, the committee's co-chairs, Dana and I, have expiring terms October 2006. We welcome two new faculty members, Cynthia Dietz and William Glenn.

Respectfully submitted by Kyungmi Lee

University Senate Committee Reports

CCC- Jason T. reported. Committee will be holding its next meeting with the new IT Director this Friday. Nothing else at this time to report.

Student Life—Dana A. reported. Student Life committee is having trouble getting students to attend meetings and that during the meeting in which students did show up someone suggested a 24 hour Library but that no serious comments had been made on the matter.

University Senate/exec. – Aimee D. reported. The new Senate President is Bernard Lane of east campus. A number of issues had come up during a meeting one was regarding CEC's proposal for a smoke free campus. After heated discussion, this proposal will take a staged approach over the next few years but that some resolutions were already issued against this proposal.

CAPRA –Aimee D. reported. Gary Marker of history is the new chair. President's 50 new lines are exactly new lines with a few of those going to heavy established names but the remainder being new faculty lines not replacements.

Undergraduate Council—Janet C.
Nothing to report at this time.

Director's Report- Chris F., Dean & Director absent. Report sent to Gisele S. See below.

Director's Report

(Budget update):

The provost has a request for \$400K increase in monograph budget. I spoke to him about it last week; he's aware that we need the money soon. I believe the request is part of a larger provostial request to the president. I'm optimistic.

(re: status of the budget for new employee lines (Germaine mentioned in the last Director's Council report that additional funds would be needed to fill the new lines):

Same status as request for collections funds: waiting for response; part of total library budget request

(re: rumor of possible disbanding of University Library Senate PTC next year?)

I dont' know about this. What do the faculty think? What are the pros and cons? Would we need a subset of CAS faculty to review library faculty files? In terms of promotion and tenure criteria, is it time to part ways with our colleagues across the road?

(SUNY-level conference news and information)

I think everyone knows that we are committed to a two-year pilot central university press collection. 2007/08 is the second year and the collection for this year will reside at SBU. I believe the Center libraries should take the lead in building this collection. It does not

make sense to purchase multiple copies of most university books. As an aggregate, they do not get much use. If individual titles start circulating enough to create hold situations, the individual libraries can buy more copies. I think use should drive collection development. Fang is taking a look at circulation stats by date and classmark. Buffalo is doing the same. Preliminary reports indicate that we can reduce duplication and spend our money on broader collections. I have spoken to the provost about this at some length and in the long run I believe the case for monograph money is easier to make in a SUNY-wide context.

(re: communication with the A&P Committee on various issues, including the time it takes for a tenure file to move out of the library, and whether the prohibition of a timeline for new faculty came directly from the Provost's office.)

I'm sure A&P will report on this. We're in agreement that each librarian will have his/her own schedule for evaluations as well as for promotion. Germaine will meet with A&P to set up a reasonable schedule for each promotion file and she will keep the librarian and A&P informed about delays. Everyone in the library likes the erstwhile letter showing the promotion and tenure schedule for each librarian, but the provost's office asked Germaine to desist for legal reasons, i.e., what constitutes a letter of appointment in a law suit. At A&P's request, she requested from the provost's office that she resume such a letter. The provost's office sent it to Legal Counsel which has not responded.

I keep hearing the junior faculty are confused about the schedule and criteria. Since they have mentoring committees and lots of tenured colleagues, this surprises me, but problems do seem to persist. We need to work on this.

(re: status of the junior faculty research leaves, and data from ARL concerning what is being done at other academic libraries)

In late spring I discussed it with provost and he asked me to query other ARL libraries. I received a number of responses from ARL libraries that grant this kind of leave. I shared this with the provost. At our last library faculty meeting, I think there was agreement that the first request should be modest, that is, not six months. I will consider a request after the library receives its full budget for 06/07. The request should have a strong research proposal and less than six month duration. I will take up with the provost a request which is persuasive: it's important to succeed on the first try.

(any additional news)

Southampton. LIU is running the old library this AY. SBU electronic resources are available in a SINC site. I am working with Martin Schoonen on 2008/09 when we will be responsible for library services. This includes a library faculty position. LIU says they will move the print collection to other LIU campuses; biology has already gone to C.W. Post. My eyes are mostly on the new building and developing with Student Affairs a state-of-the-art information commons.

I'm sorry to miss the meeting. There is a possibility of working with the Spy Museum in Washington to create an exhibit for our new George Washington letter, and Tuesday was the only time they are available before the ARL meetings.

At the end of the Director's report, Aimee D. clarified that the Senate suggestion to disband Library PTC was a rumor and was not a suggestion of the current President but a side comment made during discussion that was wrongly attributed to him. Some discussion ensued, ending with Andrew W. clarification that the changes being made by the Senate were in response to the overwhelming need for administrative changes to the University Senate in general and that standardization would be a focus of the Senate for

the next term. During this clarification he was asked to comment on the LPPP and the HSL to which he said that HSL did still not know their reporting, budget, etc, and that they had one Librarian, Susan Warner, going up for tenure under the old guidelines. This brought further discussion as to whether or not a choice could be made between the two procedures and it was clarified that those hired under the old guidelines would be kept to those procedures and that all new hire would be allowed to use the new guidelines if they are approved prior to their start. Aimee D. suggested that we get the Senate PTC to approve the procedures 1st and then ask for a resolution to allow those that were hired during the revision to be allowed to choose which guidelines to follow.

*The faculty then decided that members Helene V. and Kristen N. of Library PTC would discuss this at the next Library PTC meeting and begin this process.

Health Sciences Center Library- Andrew W. of HSL. Report.

Andrew W. additionally reported that Mary Chimato would be leaving for a post at NC and that he would see who would replace her as liaison to west campus.

Library Personnel Policy and Procedures – status

Covered during former discussions.

New business

Library E-voting and LPPP. It was suggested that the HSL write a letter stating they had no objections to the new guidelines in the LPPP and that changes can now be made at a later date once they know what their reporting structure. Andrew White indicated that this request was not unreasonable given their current administrative reporting structure.

E-voting. Gisele S. asked Nathan B. that if we were to go to e-voting if a by-laws change would need to be made to which he responded that it would have to be put to a vote in accordance with current by-laws and that the vote would have to be a paper one.

No additional business.

Motion to adjourn Jason T.

Seconded Aimee D.

Meeting adjourned 11:40AM

Respectfully Submitted by

Jason Torre