

**Library Faculty Meeting Minutes
Special Tenure Meeting # 3 draft
Monday, November 26, 2007**

The meeting was called to order at 10am by the new Chair of the Executive Committee, Susan Lieberthal.

Minutes by Jason Torre with the assistance of a digital voice recorder; the recording is being preserved but will only be accessible to Library Faculty and Staff if needed.

Present: 18 voting members of the faculty: Gisele Schierhorst, Jason Torre, Richie Feinberg, Helene Volat, Dana Antonucci, Nathan Baum, Kristen Nyitray, Min-Huei Lu, Brigitte Howard, Dennis Andersen, Sherry Chang, Paul Weiner, Elaine Hoffman, Chris Filstrup (Dean) , Aimee De Chambeau, Susan Lieberthal, Dan Kinney, Amelia Salinero, Godlind Johnson, Cynthia Dietz

Agenda Items

Presentation and discussion on the Arts & Sciences Senate PTC committee with current A&S PTC chair, Joanne Davila presenting.

Meeting opened by Susan Lieberthal with a welcome to the faculty and Joanne Davila , thanking her for coming today to speak and also extended to Gisele for her work on the matter as former chair of the executive committee. Susan then reviewed briefly the reason for our being together, highlighting the previous two meetings on the PTC issue. At which point, the meeting was turned over to Joanne Davila.

Joanne Davila began by stating that she was happy to talk to all present and that she saw this as an opportunity to begin a series of open discussion that touch upon all aspects of the proposal and all parties, on all levels but that people in the Dean's office of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Arts & Sciences PTC were open to the prospect of the Library joining the Arts & Sciences Senate in this capacity but that concerns existed on their side as she was sure there existed on the Library's side as well. And that any outcome should entail a reciprocal review of from both sides, looking at the advantages and disadvantages for both parties or groups involved.

To this goal, she presented some questions:

1. What will the Library's role be?
2. Does Library participation make sense?
3. Are the A&S PTC qualified to review the Library's files?

With these questions posed to the group, she stated, "The PTC makes all effort to review based on the discipline's norms." Examples presented were the Marine Sciences and Journalism (still in process at this time). In these examples, the committee takes into account the unique aspects of Marine Sciences research and publishing focus which is larger regionally dominated but that clarifications are made at the beginning of the process by the Dean of Marine Sciences and the candidate's chair.

Two differences that she observed so far were the found in the Library's current policies on promotion (the 1991 LPPP guide). In this document, she noted that there are differences in:

- A) How scholarship is defined and what counts for scholarship?

- B) The type, number and weight letters from outside the university play in reviewing candidates for tenure.

In this there must be some conformity to the current Arts & Sciences PTC guidelines for formatting of the files but there can be flexibility in the type of scholarship that is expected and accepted from the Library. This issue could be resolved by having the Library prepare and present to the PTC on the matter as the Marine Sciences currently does.

Open discussion then ensued as questions were posed to the body.

Q: What does the A&S PTC or Senate get out of such an agreement? A: Nothing. There are mixed feelings on the advantages and disadvantages held by various members but more needs to be understood and done before such an agreement can be enacted. The biggest obstacle will be the learning curve of all parties, especially the PTC. Additional issues are:

1. How would the learning happen?
2. Does a Library person need to be on the PTC?
3. Are they qualified to review Library files?
4. Do they need a consultant to come in to assist on files?
5. Would a Library person want to review other files in Arts & Sciences?
6. If a A&S oversaw Library files an elected Librarian to the committee would not be allowed to take part in the deliberations.

Point by Faculty, Paul. We had been led to believe that a lot of this has been discussed already and that we were in different position and ready to move forward. Clarification offered by Aimee reviewed that such a proposal would need much work and that it must be reviewed by the Senate on three separate occasions before being voted upon so there is much to do. She and Joanne went on to say that any such movement would be made easier if a proposal or plan was prepared for review by all bodies.

Discussion continues.

Q: Is/was there a model or outline that was used for Journalism? A: No, but they worked together and separately to prepare guidelines with the PTC after an administrative decision was made by the University. There is no precedent for a group leaving the Arts & Sciences Senate PTC oversight, and then requesting to return. This is unique.

Q: How does scholarship differ? A: The differences are not a problem as much as they offer the group a challenge of being objective in an area that is outside their normal understanding which is why they would prefer to sit down and review the types of scholarship that are accepted so that no rash or inappropriate judgments are made based on a lack of understanding on their part.

Q: Are there any Marine Sciences or Journalism people on the committee? A: No, the A&S PTC has seven members from the existing disciplines. The Library could become elected through the Humanities reps, or through the at large members.

Q: There are problems with our own PTC understanding scholarship and other differences. What could be done to change our procedure to make them more compatible?

Discussion ensues regarding the make up of each PTC. The major differences are:

1. Size. A&S PTC has seven members while the Senate PTC has ten members.
2. A&S PTC meets every other week and has a strong sense of continuity and collegiality which could just be the people in this group while the Senate PTC has some trouble getting together.
3. Less diversity of opinion on the A&S PTC as all are open to different ideas but also have a common sense of what is called for while the Senate PTC does not.

A general feeling among the A&S PTC is that having the chair's letter and explanation holds a bit of sway with the group. This is not done in Senate PTC.

Dean Filstrup raised the issue of obtaining the letters from national leaders in the field which can be problematic because of the differences in opinion on what constitutes scholarship, etc. This is due to a lack of participation by our staff at the national level, albeit we are regional impact. This leads to differences in support when the letter return and contrary decisions to the Library PTC and faculty which need to be justified.

These justifications lead to our needing to provide context of the person's performance and job duties within our Library, detailing the importance of that work to people.

At this point, Joanne points out those steps are taken throughout the A&S PTC review to seek clarification and when it is needed, are sought from the appropriate person so that all are clear on the candidate. To make this work for librarians, it may need to be done in the letter from the chair to the PTC. Ultimately, the differences would need to be addressed. And they have to some degree in the LPPP 1991 guidelines that were looked at by A&S PTC. This document would need to very important to A&S and needs to spell out things.

Discussion continues by all raising issues of whether we don't do letters the way A&S does, would it matter, answer was it would. After some back and forth over the process and number, Aimee suggests that the Library change how it does its letter to match the A&S PTC whether we intend to join or not. All are in agreement.

***Action item 1: Review the wording in the letter sent to outside reviewers and updates it regardless of decision. Dean will look into this as will A&P.**

A&S PTC would recommend such a review and suggests that they comes back with more members to discuss the process and differences in depth, and that looking at a sample file by both parties may be called for in this case. She leaves the group with the question: Why do you want to join A&S?

Joanne then departs with the group's thanks and discussion continues.

Major points raised by all:

We still have questions regarding the HSL side, what are they doing? What are the general pros and cons? Overall, this last discussion was short. All agreed to return to these issues after some research into the matter. However, four other action items have been called for. They are:

- 1. The Dean will speak to other University center directors and see what they do at their University for comparison.**
- 2. Library Executive Committee will review the history behind the move to a Library Senate PTC.**
- 3. The status of the HSC proposal will be requested.**
- 4. The LPPP guidelines and general guidelines need to be reviewed against the A&S PTC in the areas of scholarship and outside reviewers.**

Susan Liebenthal will review these items and request assistance as needed.

Meeting adjourned 11:50AM

Minutes submitted by Jason Torre.