The meeting was called to order at 10am by 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: 21 voting members of the faculty: Gisele Schierhorst, Jason Torre, Richie Feinberg, Helene Volat, Dana Antonucci, Nathan Baum, 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, Janet Clarke, Fiona Grady.

Old Business: Approval of November 26, 2007 meeting minutes. Accepted with corrections by all present.

New Business
Agenda Items
Stony Brook University Libraries
Faculty Meeting
February 27, 2008

Agenda
1. Discuss history and rationale for the formation of a separate Library Promotion and Tenure Committee at Stony Brook

A brief summary with thanks to Jason Torre
Library Senate PTC Establishment
Outline of Events

Judy Kaufman (faculty member and Library Personnel Officer) and other members of faculty voice concern over issues in tenure for Library Faculty.
May 6, 1981 Faculty meeting it is related that the current University Senate, Library Faculty and University President are concerned with issues related to the attainment of tenure by Library Faculty.
President Marburger is quoted as saying that the issue should be reviewed by the University Senate, and indications are that he left ultimate decision making power in their hands, although he was aware of the issue.
August 1981, Jack Smith asks for an Ad hoc committee to be formed to deal with the issues and make a proposal.
1984 Library Personnel Procedures Guide is developed.
November 1984 University Senate adopts new policies and review structure.
September 24, 1985, Library Personnel Policy Committee meets to review its first case for promotion/tenure.

Discussion Opened by Susan L.

Susan opened the discussion with a review of the above history, see agenda item 1. She pointed out that the meeting was part of the ongoing discussions of whether the West Campus Library Faculty wanted to switch from the current Senate approved PPC to the Arts & Sciences PTC committee for our tenure and promotion files. During her introduction, she presented the following points:

- The historical documentation of the formation of the Senate Library PPC indicates that the committee was founded specifically for west campus librarians by order of President Marburger.
- HSL Librarians were not present at the initial formation of the group or writing of the first LPPP guidelines, indicating that the Senate committee could remain intact if we so chose, and that the HSL departure should not have a direct affect on our status.

    At this point a question was forwarded by Elaine H. who asked about the further documentation from the Senate indicating the expansion of the PPC to include HSC representation? And why would the HSL is excluded, if this was the case?

    Response: The initial formation was without the HSL. The senate request came at a later date when the HSL wanted to join.

Susan L. continued her introduction and review of the matter, outlining the items discovered by Chris F. (Dean), see agenda item 2 discussion points below.

2. Compare policies of 4 SUNY research centers

P&T policies and practices at SUNY Center libraries with thanks to Chris Filstrup

SBU   Guidelines treat refereed articles as one of several criteria; in practice, refereed articles are not required; two external letters solicited by dean; review by special PTC (not CAS).

Albany   Guidelines stress refereed pubs; in practice, require 3 refereed articles. Faculty committee selects 4-5 external references. A university-wide faculty committee reviews library faculty files.

Buff   Guidelines stress refereed publications; in practice, tenure requires 3 refereed articles. Director selects 4-5 external references. Files reviewed by university-wide PTC.

Bing   Guidelines do not require refereed publications; practice follows policy but new hires support publication requirement. No external references. Candidate's file goes from library dean to provost, no review by non-library faculty.

Two questions:
1) Do you give junior faculty release/research time to work on their articles and professional activities?
Binghamton   No

Buffalo   Yes
Albany   No

2) Do your mentoring committees significantly assist junior librarians write publishable research?
Binghamton   No
Buffalo   Yes
Albany   Yes to question #2 (As in provide suggestions on topics, critiques on drafts, offers to co-author, assist identifying appropriate publications, and offer general advice if solicited. I should add that "significant" depends a lot on who the mentor is and some new faculty decline to take full advantage of a mentor.)

The above was reviewed by Susan L., highlighting the major points the following hold more weight:

- 3 refereed articles are required
- Outside references
- The local guidelines are subordinate to their overseeing bodies procedures
- Our local criteria does not match up with the other centers policies

Point was offered by Cynthia D. who stated that the guidelines and the policies of the other centers varied very greatly from our own in the areas of: mentoring, references, and release time given to faculty all of which would greatly impact our ability to make a move.

Susan L. Buffalo is only center that offers release time to faculty.

Amelia S. Policies are not consistent but they do offer engaged mentoring committees.

Open Discussion, floor opened to statements and comments.

Susan L. We have a working system but would receive a warm welcome by the A&S com. if we chose. We need to have a final discussion before we bring this topic to a final vote.

Chris F. (Dean) Asks for the floor to make a statement to the group.
"I've thought a lot about this. It is important to move the promotion out of the current committee to the central campus arena. The scholarly record is important to Librarianship. In the long run it will need to move to increase out standing [with campus]. The proposal that I am offering is that we move to A&S with a grandfather clause for current hire within the system, but new hires would be in under the new guidelines. This would make us more along the rest of campus."

Richie F. Asks for floor top make statement on matter.
"I am voting status quo. The old system has worked for this library. I am not convinced that if we move to the A&S it will bring up our status in the eyes of the rest of the campus…. Because most of us do not have P.H.D.'s faculty on look at us differently that we do ourselves. This along with the fact that the other centers have larger staff puts us behind [?] It would only be fair if we work out a way to enable this new faculty to succeed. It is difficult to do, while other centers have more flexibility or at least the appearance…"

Dennis A. "Albany has a library school and more opportunities."

Cynthia D. "I'm voting for new guidelines because the top people in my field have indicated that they think they are falling behind. We need to team with faculty and collaborate on projects, otherwise the outside will leave us behind."

Dana A. "This seems to be two different issues. We are throwing around numbers [regarding articles and letters]."

Susan L. "It seems we can't move over unless we up our standards."

Chris F. "I'm not keen on the three ref. articles. We can demonstrate we are on par in the record…we don't want to be more strict."

Paul W. "I agree with Chris. We don't need to think about 3 articles. There are a number of reasons why?" Paraphrased.
- Whether online journals will count towards ref. publications
- Different types of work being done by different staff
- Total number of Library relate ref. journals is smaller
- Less research is being done in librarianship

"If we are not accepted by other faculty who perceive us a different… are in trouble."

Susan L. Asks for further statements and informs the group that we must vote on the matter but that whatever votes that is made might not be upheld by the new Provost, majority rule might not hold with him.

Amelia S. asks the question of "how much release time is being given to people?"

Chris F. "Leave can be given and time can be taken."

Paul W. "Has anyone ever been denied?"

Sherry C. "…members of tech. services think that public services people have more flexibility in time and asked for time to do research. Was not formally enacted because of the concern that people would just take time off and not do any research."

Helene V. "We should be given more time off. We need time off for research and we need a better mentoring com. that addresses publications from the beginning."

Susan L. "We can go to A&S or stay with status quo."

Helene V. "Not exactly. HSL has left the LPPC. It may be disbanded and a new formula enacted."

Chris F. "The proposal I would prepare would grandfather in people… but we can't have this same discussion in 5 years from now about going back."

Open Discussion ensues with the following point being made:
- **How are our guidelines different from A&S? Janet C.**
- **Albany places the guidelines in files as part of review. Chris F.**

- **Sticking points are how file is formatted and timelines. Helene V.**
- **A & S guidelines are procedural. Janet C.**
- **Scholarship and letters of recommendation need to be addressed. Dana A.**
- **Identify a list of potential peer groups as Albany does. Chris F.**
- **Librarian can be elected to the A&S com. Aimee D.**
- **If a Librarian is on committee they have to review all files. Sherry C.**
- **They are under no obligation to use or read our guidelines. Aimee D.**
- **There are differences between us and the other centers as well as us and our fellow in the teaching research faculty that need to be addressed. Richie F.**
- **Our letter need to be more personalized and detailed to the candidate. Aimee D.**
- **Letter was revamped by Germaine H. reported Gisele S.**
- **They will be very strict about the letter and the relationship between candidate and reference. Aimee D.**

Open Discussion ends.

Susan L. requests action items from group. See excerpt from letter to A&S email as sent to the com. chair.

1. At present we require 2 external letters for tenure. Your committee requires 7. Would you consider files with less than 7 external letters? Would we have to fall in line with your requirements of 7 letters in order for our files to go through CAS tenure process?

2. When our files are presented to your committee, the dean would come in and describe how the file fits in to our specific library guidelines and what the librarians consider scholarship in our particular field. This presentation is a one shot deal. If you had further questions would you contact the dean again to clarify? Please let us know how that works for Marine Sciences.

3. Assuming there was a librarian on your committee, he/she would not be allowed to take part in the deliberation of a librarian's file. Is this correct? We would like the option that he/she could be there for the deliberations but recused for the vote.

We would still use our own guidelines but they are subordinate to CAS guidelines, is this correct?

3. Online voting

Susan L. announces after the above questions are answered we will hold the Flashlight survey via email. The survey will be anonymous and the final decision of the body.

4. Provost's visit

Susan L. instructs the body that the Provost will be touring the library and meeting with the Faculty and Professional executive Committees as well as having lunch with department heads. The agenda is open. The executive committee solicits questions to ask him. Questions to address:
- Book Budget/financing and timing
- Public Space
- Professional job creep

Other items should be forwarded to Susan L.

Meeting called to adjourn and seconded.

Meeting adjourned 11:30AM

Minutes submitted by Jason Torre.