

SUNY LIBRARIANS AND FACULTY STATUS:
A CHRONOLOGY

through 1964/5 SUNY librarians removed from classified service salary schedule and placed on unclassified schedule.

April 1966 SUNY head librarians recommend to *President Gould "That the annual professional obligation of librarians be the same as that of instructional appointees...with additional remuneration for service beyond the academic year, commensurate with that awarded to instructional staff."

*Position is now Chancellor

1967-1968 Individual, campus, and SUNY-wide activity to collect and present information supporting faculty status for SUNY librarians.

February 1968 SUNY Faculty Senate proposed, and SUNY Board of Trustees granted, librarians academic status (i.e. librarian titles were defined as academic titles).

Late 1968 A Task Force on Academic Status, appointed by SUNY Conference of Head Librarians, polled all SUNY librarians on the formation of a SUNY-wide librarians association (97% voted in favor).

1969 SUNYLA formed, and was immediately involved with personnel and status issues, including responding negatively to a SUNY-wide manpower study requiring detailed reporting of all on-the-job activities. However, the Booz, Allen, Hamilton reclassification study, of which the manpower study was a part, was continued and subsequently left librarians on the Administrative Salary Plan and placed 85% of our positions at the PR-1 rank.

April 1969 Task Force is disbanded; Head Librarians pass resolution supporting academic year, four ranks equal to professorial ranks, remuneration for summer employment, and compensation equal to professorial compensation for SUNY librarians.

November 1969 Faculty Senate continues to demonstrate its support of faculty status for SUNY librarians by passing resolutions and working for their implementation.

September 1970 Position paper against Administrative Salary Plan and detailing requirements for full faculty status for SUNY librarians was presented to Chancellor Boyer and Vice-Chancellor Smoot by SUNYLA Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Status.

- November 1970 Chancellor Boyer addresses SUNYLA Annual Meeting and responds favorably to the position paper, assuring us that he would do all in his power to implement all requirements (except academic year, which would require more study).
- December 1973 UUP Committee on Librarian Concerns formed, to serve as "principle vehicle for bringing librarian concerns to the attention of the UUP Executive Board." These were: 1) transfer from administrative salary plan to nonstatutory (NS) salary plan, which necessitates the implementation of four ranks; and 2) placement of all librarians on academic par obligation without decrease in salary.
- September 1974 SUNYLA established a special committee which was specifically charged to deal with collective bargaining issues.
- 1975 UUP prevented SUNY Central from unilaterally placing many calendar year appointees on reduced schedules with corresponding reductions in salaries.
- 1976-1979 Work of the SUNYLA special committee resulted in the following benefits for librarians in the 1976-1979 UUP contract: 1) librarians were removed from administrative salary plan and placed on the faculty salary schedule; 2) four academic ranks were established and defined analogous to the four professorial ranks; 3) librarians were eligible for academic promotions following the same procedures as for other academics.
- 1977 Economic reopener in UUP contract resulted, for the first time, in a minimum salary for each rank of the faculty, although calendar year salary for librarians was comparable to academic year salary for professorial faculty.
- 1982-1985 UUP contract includes: 1) PDQWL grants, specifying a minimum of \$150,000 for librarians, and 2) disparity funds, which librarians received based upon our successful demonstration of salary inequities.
- 1985-1988 UUP contract includes: 1) unified salary minimas for all members of the UUP bargaining unit; 2) PDQWL grants; 3) disparity funds.
- 1987- Librarians begin formulating demands for next round of negotiatins with the State.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Benedict, Marjorie A., Gavryck, Jacquelyn A., and Selvin, Hanan C. "Status of Academic Librarians in New York State." College and Research Libraries 44 (January 1983) 12-19.
- Kreh, David. "Faculty Status and Collective Bargaining: SUNY Libraries 1965-1982." The Bookmark 40 (Summer 1982): 195-199.
- Gavryck, Jacquelyn A. "The SUNY Librarians' Faculty Status Game." The Journal of Academic Librarianship 1 (July 1975): 11-13.
- "State University of New York Librarians Win Fight for Academic Status." Library Journal 93 (September 15, 1971): 3068.
- "New York's SUNYLA Librarians See Gains in Participation." Library Journal 96 (November 15, 1971): 3714-15.
- "State University of New York Librarians Association Seeks Faculty Status with Class Grievance Motion." Library Journal 97 (April 1, 1972): 1230.
- "SUNY Negotiates with State for Faculty Status Rights." Library Journal 98 (March 15, 1973): 821.
- "SUNYLA Scores Union Contract on Faculty Status Findings." Library Journal 99 (December 15, 1974): 3170.
- Though not specifically about SUNY librarians, the following recent article summarizes nicely the major points of debate on the issue of faculty status for academic librarians as presented in the literature.
- Werrell, Emily and Sullivan, Laura. "Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A Review of the Literature." College & Research Libraries 48 (March 1987): 95-103.

State University of New York
at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, New York 11794

Main Library
Tel.: (516) 246-5650/1

Library
Library

Stony Brook

MEMORANDUM

To John B. Smith

From Judy Kaufman^{OK} Chairperson, Ad hoc Committee to Study Criteria for Continuing Appointment and Promotion of Librarians

Subject

Date August 7, 1981

As you know, the ad hoc Committee has been concerned that the criteria we recommend be acceptable to the President and Provost as well as to the Personnel Policy Committee and the Library Faculty. I reported yesterday to the ad hoc Committee on the conversation you recently had with President Marburger in which he expressed several ideas concerning promotion and tenure for librarians that may significantly affect our work. Specifically, his statements (1) that the Arts and Sciences Personnel Policy Committee need not be involved in reviewing library cases, although the reviewing committee should include some teaching faculty, and (2) that input from library users is crucial in the evaluation process, could influence the criteria we recommend.

Therefore, the committee has decided to cease its work temporarily, pending further indication from the President of any action or direction he plans to follow. Because you and some committee members will be on vacation during the coming weeks, we will reconvene in September, consider any new developments, and decide then on the appropriate course of action.

cc: Library Faculty

State University of New York
at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, New York 11794

Stony Brook

MEMORANDUM

Evert Volkersz
Special Collections Dept.

Main Library
Tel.: (516) 246-5650/1

To Library Faculty

From Judy Kaufman^{JK} Chairperson, Ad Hoc Committee to Study Criteria for Continuing Appointment and Promotion

Subject

Date June 16, 1981

The Ad Hoc Committee met with the Arts and Sciences Personnel Policy Committee (PPC) on May 27 in order to hear for ourselves the concerns of the PPC before we begin formulating new criteria and also to initiate what we hope will be a constructive dialogue between the two committees. We described the conditions that make it difficult for Stony Brook librarians to pursue professional activities beyond specifically assigned responsibilities: a structured work day/week within a 12-month year; the pressures of performing assigned tasks within a hierarchical administrative structure; the lack of large blocks of uninterrupted time; salaries low relative to other ARL university librarians; etc. We also pointed out that, if Stony Brook librarians were able to strike a new balance which would give more attention to contributions outside the university and less to daily job performance, the level of library service might be affected.

PPC members responded that librarians as faculty must meet faculty criteria. If conditions do not allow this, we should work to change conditions; the PPC would support us in pressing for such changes. The PPC reiterated that librarians must show evidence of, in addition to excellent job performance, visibility beyond the local institution and continuing involvement in and contribution to important professional issues. PPC members seemed willing to equate other activities, such as library association committee work, to publication. Internal library manuals, bibliographies and guides were also mentioned as appropriate for librarians' files. However, they would like us to spell out clearly which activities constitute achievement and eminence in librarianship and what types of evidence in a file can document these activities.

The meeting lasted almost two hours. Much longer, more detailed minutes are available for anyone to read at the Music Library circulation desk.

As we continue our study we would welcome input from all library faculty. You might also be interested in reading some of the documents relating to criteria that we are assembling from other universities, periodicals, etc. These are available to be signed out at the Music Library circulation desk.

cc: Sarah Fuller, Chairperson, PPC

JK/js

I. Criteria and Standards

1. Librarians hold academic rank and are on tenure-track positions. What are the implications of this faculty status for the professional profile of SUSB librarians? What should be expected of them in comparison with what is expected of librarians in situations where they do not have faculty status?
2. What does it mean to be at the forefront of the profession in librarianship? In what way(s) can an individual librarian establish a professional reputation nationally or locally in his/her field?
3. What are the expectations of achievement in the SUSB library for:
 - a) specific ranks: Full, Associate, Senior Assistant
 - b) tenure

II. Climate for Professional Activity in the SUSB Library

1. To what extent do senior and tenured library faculty now engage in professional study and research?
2. To what extent do senior and tenured library faculty encourage their junior colleagues to engage in study and research in librarianship?
3. How are junior faculty advised of what is expected of them for a tenure track appointment, and what are they told?
4. Does the Library actively seek to hire people with keen research interests in librarianship or in relevant specific subject specialties?

III. Inadequacies in Present Dossiers

1. Library dossiers too often provide scant evaluation from outside specialists, while other faculty are evaluated according to the national and international standards of their profession.
2. The present documentation stresses job performance almost exclusively. The recommendations ~~make~~ distinguish insufficiently between individuals who perform a job adequately and routinely and individuals who exhibit considerable initiative and imagination in job performance and/or have active research interests.

IV. Expectations for Dossiers

1. More definite evaluation of individuals from outside the SUSB Library circle. This would include: a) a significant number of letters from distinguished library professionals from outside this campus; b) letters from SUSB faculty from other departments.
2. Concrete evidence of contribution to the profession, as manifested in contribution to professional societies and in publications and development of internal bibliographies and "working documents".
3. Concrete evidence of continued professional growth

Stony Brook

Main Library
Tel.: (516) 246-5650/1

MEMORANDUM

To Dr. Barbara Brand, Ms. Brigitte Howard, Ms. Judith Kaufman,
Ms. Catherine Swenson, Ms. Doris Tweedy

From John Brewster Smith, Director and Dean.

Subject Appointment of ad hoc Committee to Study Criteria for
Continuing Appointment and Promotion

Date May 13, 1981

As you know, recent discussions with the Arts and Sciences Personnel Policy Committee have revealed a need to clarify the library's criteria, procedures, standards, etc., for continuing appointment (tenure) and promotion. I am asking the above named faculty members to serve on an ad hoc committee to study this matter and develop recommendations. These will be presented for discussion at a full faculty meeting no later than October, 1981. The first meeting of the committee is to be held on Friday, May 15, at 9:00 A.M. in the administration conference room. I will be available then to discuss the charge (attached) and to provide help with initial organization. Thereafter, I will be available to meet with the committee as it feels necessary.

A chairperson will be chosen by the committee at its first meeting. Suggestions or comments may be made to any committee member.

JBS/g
att.

cc: Members of the Library Faculty

Ad hoc Committee
to Study Criteria
for Continuing Appointment
and Promotion of Librarians

CHARGE

The committee is asked to conduct a study of continuing appointment and promotion for librarians that will result in proposals to establish new criteria and procedures. These proposals should accomplish the following:

1. Identify appropriate high standards for Stony Brook librarians for appointment, reappointment, promotion and continuing appointment.
2. Develop specific criteria and procedures (consistent with the Policies of the Board of Trustees) for promotion to each of the higher ranks and for continuing appointment.
3. Consider possible alternative arrangements for review outside the library such as:
 - a. Administrative review only for first promotions (from Assistant Librarian to Senior Assistant Librarian).
 - b. Administrative review only for all librarian cases.
 - c. A seat on the PPC for a librarian.
 - d. Other.
4. Report to the Director and the Library Faculty as soon as possible but not later than October 1, 1981.

Mr. E. Volkensz
May 12, 1981

L LIBRARY FACULTY MEETING

The Library Faculty held its quarterly meeting at 3:00 PM on Wednesday, May 6, 1981.

1. Mr. J. B. Smith called the meeting to order at 3:05.
2. First, H. Schleifer reported that at present, and in the near future, we may experience difficulties with service contracts and supplies. Some of the vendors may refuse to accept orders without a written Purchase Order in hand. At the moment, our budget situation is not too clear. Mr. Schleifer is trying to remedy the existing difficulties as soon as possible.
3. For the Library Services Committee, Barbara Brand made a brief statement concerning the Committee's "Report on communication in the Library" (which took a whole semester to prepare) and invited comments from the Faculty:

Mrs. E. Massanek, current chairperson of the Library Staff Association, transmitted the desire of all its members to have Mr. Smith present at the meetings and to be, however briefly, addressed by him. Mr. Smith stated that he would gladly comply with the wish and that his presence at the meeting would be assured if he were informed of a next meeting ahead of time so as to arrange his schedule. He did not come to some of the past meetings simply because he was tied up by external business.

D. Tweedy suggested an Ad Hoc Committee which would deal with the individual parts of the report.

J. Lipkind commented that he had an intense feeling that all the members of the Faculty shared a wish to work together more closely, more as a team.

D. Allen, taking up D. Tweedy's idea, suggested that the Ad Hoc Committee should take up the recommendations of the report and put them in practice -- if all the findings are not to remain on paper only.

Then, on a motion by E. Volkensz, the 4 page summary of the Report which met with considerable praise, was accepted by the Faculty.

4. C. von Schon reported for the A & P Committee. A copy of her report is attached.
5. D. Tweedy presented the report for the Executive Committee. A three-part copy is attached.

6. Mr. D. Cook reported that the Committee on Personnel Policy had met with President Marburger regarding a University-wide review and evaluation of current promotion and tenure procedures. The President commented on three points:
 - a) Nature of the dossier. It was felt that future dossiers should be better organized than they are now, and that they should contain more material from external sources. The degree of the referee's competence should be explicitly stated. Future dossiers should also carry information on how well the individual in question fits the unit of which he/she is a member. Criticism: dossiers are generally not well organized.
 - b) Communication and standardization. It was felt that these two aspects represent a rather complicated task, and that the policy directives should come from the Senate.
 - c) Hard-to-get character. Tenure should be difficult to get. As our institution comes of age a flux of people is necessary to provide a supply of new ideas and a perennial rejuvenation. From now on the Deans may also participate in reviewing the dossiers.
7. E. Volkorsz reported that the Resources Allocation Committee resolved to consult, in its decisions, with the Provost, the Vice-Provost and the Dean.
8. J. Lipkind reported that the CED Council concerned itself with the planned revision of the curriculum for 1982. The Council will pass on the plan to the appropriate University administrative bodies for their review.
9. B. Brand reported that the Undergraduate Committee discussed the rising cost of textbooks and its consequences. Students seem to select courses for which the textbooks are inexpensive rather than those that they really need. In view of this, the Library will try to put on reserve as many of the more expensive textbooks as we possibly can. D. Osborne and B. Elkin will work together on this project.
10. P. Wiener reported that the Admissions Committee intends to expand the Engineering curriculum to be able to admit more students.
11. After the reports from the various committees, Mr. Smith briefly acquainted the Faculty with the request he had received from the Personnel Policy Committee. To be better able to evaluate promotion and tenure cases coming from the Library, they want us to present them with a set of criteria, specific to Library work, which they might apply.

11. (con'd)

At present, when dealing with promotion and tenure requests from the Library, they seem to be at a loss. They see dossiers far different from ours, dossiers of the Teaching Faculty which include lists of recent publications and detailed description of research activities. That sort of evidence seldom appears in our dossiers. Mr. Smith stated that there seems to be a fundamental misconception on the part of the members of other Faculties as to how much free time for research or publication a librarian in reality has. Not having to work 37-1/2 hours a week as we do, members of the other Faculties seem to be unable to put themselves in our shoes.

To find out how this question is solved in other institutions, Mr. Smith phoned 8 libraries (Ohio State University, Indiana, Houston, University of Illinois, University of California, among them) and obtained a variety of answers including a variety of solutions in practice. All of the approached institutions agreed to send us documents for further study. One pattern emerged from Mr. Smith's inquiry quite clearly: those institutions that require research and publications from their candidates for promotion or tenure give them release time in which they can carry out their projects. One of the requirements that the PPC Committee looks for in Teaching Faculty files is international and national reputation. Librarians, generally, will find it extremely hard to meet such a requirement. The PPC also informed Mr. Smith that it is the wish of the new President, Dr. Marburger, to tighten the standards for granting promotion and tenure.

Having presented the case, Mr. Smith invites comments from the faculty.

- a) I. Kron comes with a practical suggestion: since our work is so different from teaching and research why not work out special Library criteria and try to make the PPC accept them?
- b) J. Lipkind pointed out that most Faculty don't really know what we are doing at the Library, how much truly intellectual work it takes to build up a good collection, how many educated decisions a librarian, any librarian, has to make day after day.
- c) H. Schleifer suggested that we might study developments at the City University of New York where librarians have had faculty status for some time.
- d) J. Kaufman suggested that since we are unable to change our status, we should try to change the conditions of our employment.
- e) H. Pasternack suggested to include in our dossiers a more detailed description of what a person is doing on a day-to-day basis. Further he stated that although some of us may

11. (con'd)

- e con'd) be able to do research, there are quite a few who simply lack the necessary training.
- f) J. Lipkind suggested to invite some, or all, the members of the PPC to meet with the representatives of the Library Faculty. A meeting of theoreticians and practitioners of sorts, in which we could acquaint the PPC members with our work, with the variety of tasks we have to perform, with the problems we daily face.
- g) C. von Schon taking up the question of national and international reputation to send our publications to outside experts. Thereupon C. von Schon suggested rewriting our standards and forwarding them to the PPC Committee.

A motion is made and it is decided that Mr. Smith will meet with the 3 chairpersons of the Standing Committees and in cooperation with them will nominate the members of the Ad Hoc Committee that will deal with this problem.

12. Finally H. Pasternack presented the proposed placement of a whale skeleton in the Galleria of the Library -- a project initiated by the Registrar, Mr. Strockbine. Originally three other locations were suggested, however, the Campus Environment Committee found only the Galleria acceptable as a temporary shelter for the skeleton -- until enough money is secured and a permanent museum erected (which may take as much as 5 years). The campus Environment Committee charged H. Pasternack with the task of assessing the opinion of the Library Faculty members as to the practical and aesthetic aspects involved in the project. Blueprints, which Mr. Pasternack brought, were circulated and a vote taken. The project was rejected by a vote of 12 against, 9 for, and 6 abstentions.
13. At the close of the meeting D. Allen commenting on the topic he had previously placed on the agenda: "Librarians' involvement in priorities for budget cuts" stated that we should never give written recommendations.

H. Schleifer noted that, to his understanding, it was not a question of actual budget cuts but a mere restructuring of priorities. As far as the Library is concerned he recommended our participation whenever improvements for the Library might be achieved. We should participate in the decisions, watching out not to open ourselves to the possibility of vital services being cut out of the Library.

Thereupon the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by

Oldrich Toman
Secretary

State University of New York
at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, New York 11794

Main Library
Tel.: (516) 246-5650/1

Stony Brook

MEMORANDUM

To Library Faculty

From Library Faculty Executive Committee. D. Tweedy. Chair. *ST*

Subject Quarterly Report

Date May 6, 1981

Elections were held for vacancies on the SUSB Senate Standing Committees by the Executive Committee in my absence. Results were distributed.

The committee met with Mr. Smith to discuss released time and to recommend establishing a training program for new employees tailored to meet the needs of the new person and the department. The intent of the training is to provide a more thorough knowledge of the operation and procedures of the library and make available on-going training where needed. It was suggested that the program be organized and implemented by the Personnel Officer in Administration, in consultation with department heads.

G. Vasco has resigned from the committee. Rosalind Walcott has agreed to serve the remainder of his term.

The travel Budget was received for review April 30th.


The Executive Committee will meet May 12th to outline a proposal for released time for research and to discuss a proposal by J. Kaufman for an amendment to the by-laws.

Main Library
Tel.: (516) 246-5650/1

Stony Brook

MEMORANDUM

To John B. Smith

From Library Faculty Committee. D. Tweedy. Chairperson. 

Subject Released time

Date May 1, 1981

In view of the requirements for promotion and tenure, the Executive Committee recommends that a positive statement be made directing supervisors to encourage and support staff:

1. To attend and participate in the professional organizations and workshops (to demonstrate continuing professional growth).
2. To participate in library and university committee work (to demonstrate effectiveness of university service).

In addition, it is suggested that emphasis be placed on the fact that this type of service is required for promotion and tenure; and is, in reality, as much a part of the librarian's regular work as departmental work.

MEMORANDUM

To John Brewster Smith, Director and Dean of Libraries

From The Library Faculty Executive Committee, D. Tweedy, Chair.

Subject Released time for research

Date May 5, 1981

The Executive Committee recommends that:

- 1) Research subject should be as specified in the criteria for promotion and tenure.
- 2) A written proposal be made to the Director indicating:
 - a) Subject of research
 - b) Purpose
 - c) Description of the project or methods
 - d) Estimate of the time required.
- 3) The Director and a peer review Committee (with experience in research) meet with the applicant to discuss the research project.
- 4) The Director and the Head of the Department involved and applicant should discuss the use of time (departmental)
- 5) A written report be required.
- 6) A record of the request (if denied) should be put in the personnel file to be mentioned by Director at the time of promotion or tenure request.
- 7) The Director gives a list of on-going research in the library to be circulated to library faculty.

It is perceived that if, indeed, Stony Brook is a research University then one of the library's primary goals need be to achieve a greater excellence of quality of librarians. In order to achieve this goal and generate incentives an atmosphere conducive to producing this kind of excellence in librarianship needs to

be created and with comparable pay. Support and encouragement from administration is of prime importance. It is inconceivable to think that librarians can meet the criteria for promotion and tenure without the released time to do it in. It has been demonstrated that the library and the public benefits as much by the time spent away from the library as by the time spent in it. •

It is recommended that as far as released time for research is concerned, as much flexibility as possible be allowed. The Executive Committee would like to emphasize again the fact that this type of work is required for promotion and tenure and is as much a part of the librarians regular work as the departmental work.

DT:nfc

Stony Brook

Library
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Long Island, NY 11794
telephone: (516) 246-

MEMORANDUM

To Library Faculty

From Catherine von Schon for the A & P Committee

Subject Quarterly report

Date May 6, 1981

Since the last faculty meeting, the A & P Committee has met four times.

Contract renewals for two faculty members were discussed, as well as one application for tenure and promotion to Associate Librarian. We also considered ad copy for two positions falling vacant because of retirements.

More general matters included proposals that we set up a sample promotion/tenure file and that we recruit volunteer advisors to help librarians preparing dossiers. After some discussion, it was reluctantly decided that the sample file was impossible to construct, since there are too many variables. We did, however, act on the other proposal. A memo was sent out soliciting volunteers, and the following seven persons agreed to act as consultants: Barbara Brand, Don Cook, Judy Kaufman, Irv Kron, Harold Schleifer, Evert Volkersz, and Rosalind Walcott. (This list is in the hands of all members of the A & P Committee.) Anyone wishing to get help with preparation of a dossier for promotion or tenure is invited to approach any of these volunteers.

A plan was proposed for setting up impartial salary standards for all degrees of experience, education, supervisory responsibility, etc. The only clear conclusions so far have been:

1. there should be standard raises for promotions: \$1,000 for promotion to Senior Assistant, \$1,500 for Associate, and \$2,000 for Full Librarian;
2. those librarians who did not receive raises in Phase I of Mr. Smith's plan should receive \$1,000 raises in Phase II, but this principle should not necessarily be extended in the future to all librarians with one year's experience;
3. some monetary recognition should be given for supervisory responsibility.

The committee chairman and Mr. Smith attended a meeting of the Personnel Policies Committee, at which our criteria for promotion and tenure were discussed and compared with those of teaching faculty. Research is now under way to determine how faculty status for librarians is handled on other campuses.

AN INFORMAL STATEMENT ON
RELEASED TIME FOR LIBRARY FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

On a Continuing Basis

Each librarian shall have available on a continuing basis a reasonable amount of released time (as a guideline, about four hours a week) for the following broad purposes:

1. Professional reading and study including formal course work.
2. Research and writing.
3. Other appropriate activities related to librarian development.

Additional time beyond the guideline can be approved by the Director on recommendation of a department head and assistant director in appropriate cases. The most usual reasons for such additional time would be to attend meetings off campus, to work intensively on a short-term project of professional significance or to visit another library for professional reasons.

It is understood that service and work flow requirements of the library must take precedence in arranging released time and that the decision to release a faculty member from regular duties is always in the hands of the department head. However, since the general policy of the library is to encourage professional development and research, no request for released time will be unreasonably denied.

On an Occasional Basis

In appropriate circumstances, faculty members may apply for short faculty development reassignments. These will release the faculty member from regular duties for up to four weeks. The reassignment will permit faculty members the opportunity to accomplish specific, short-term projects of professional value. The following guidelines apply:

1. An application for a reassignment must be submitted to the Director at least two months prior to the time the reassignment is to begin.
2. The application must include endorsement of the department head and assistant director, as appropriate.
3. The Director will make the final decision on granting faculty reassignments.
4. On completion, a full report of accomplishment will be submitted to the Director, who will make evaluative comments in writing. Both the report and the comments will become a part of the faculty member's personnel file.
5. Except in unusual circumstances, no individual will be permitted more than one reassignment in any twelve-month period.

Stony Brook

University Senate
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, New York 11794
telephone: (516) 246-3438

MEMORANDUM

To University Senate
From Joel Rosenthal, President, University Senate
Subject Library Personnel Policy Committee Guidelines
Date September 25, 1984

At the Senate meeting of September 10, the March 1984 Guidelines of the Library PPC were distributed. At that meeting a number of questions and suggested improvements and clarifications were discussed. In addition, an amendment to the Senate constitution was offered regarding the composition of the Library PPC.

The following pages contain the suggested changes to the March 1984 Guidelines (pages 1 and 2) and the suggested amendment to the Constitution (page 3).

We will vote on each suggested change, ad seriatim, then on the entire document as amended. If the document is accepted by the Senate, we will then discuss the amendment. To amend the Senate constitution, the proposed amendment must be discussed at two consecutive Senate meetings and then be approved by two-thirds of the Senate, in a mail ballot.

Please bring your copy of the Guidelines: they were in the agenda packet of the September 10 meeting.

Amendments to the Draft
Library Personnel Policy Procedures
March 1984

- p.1 Add 1(f) "To further the commitment to affirmative action at SUNY Stony Brook, the following additional criteria will be applied when evaluating candidates for promotion and/or continuing appointment:
- (f) contributions to enriching the life of the university by correcting discrimination and encouraging diversity - as demonstrated by significant research in line with the emerging scholarship concerning the conditions of life of women and minorities; teaching; and/or university service. A candidate's effectiveness in this regard will be judged where appropriate by accepting a diverse range of publications and vehicles for service, which address the special needs and interests of minorities and women in their efforts to obtain equal opportunity."
- p.4 Add 1.1 (f) "contributions to..." (as above)
- p.11 2.6.3 Current wording: "The rank of all members ... must be at the level of Associate Professor/Associate Librarian or higher."
- Change to: "The rank of all members... must be at the level of Associate Professor/Associate Librarian or higher except for the one non-tenured library faculty member."
- p.12 2.6.4 Current wording: "All members... must hold continuing appointment."
- Change to: "All members... must hold continuing appointment except for the one non-tenured library faculty member."
- p.12 2.6.7 Current wording: "The Committee does not require a quorum and therefore does not require a majority vote of all eligible committee members. Rather a majority of the voting members present is sufficient."
- Change to: "A quorum is required and consists of a majority of the members eligible to vote on the specific candidacy under consideration."
- p.12 Add a new 2.6.9 (change current 2.6.9 to 2.6.10): "There shall be no direct communication whatsoever between any member of the Committee and the candidate concerning his or her case. Communication between the Committee and other members of the candidate's department shall be in writing only."

p. 12 Change current 2.6.9 to 2.6.10 and revise as follows:

Current wording: "Where situations not covered by the Procedures specified in this section arise, the Committee on Library Personnel Policy, the Director and the Provost shall consult to devise suitable means to deal with the case."

Change to: "Where situations not covered by the Procedures specified in this section arise, the Committee on Library Personnel Policy and the Executive Committee of the University Senate, in consultation with the Director of Libraries and the Provost, shall devise suitable means to deal with the case."

p.13 4.1 Current wording of last sentence: "If the Provost disagrees with, or has questions about, the recommendation of the Committee on Library Personnel Policy, the Provost may confer with the Committee before formulating a recommendation."

Change to: "If the Provost disagrees with ... Committee on Library Personnel Policy, the Provost should confer ..."

Amendment to the Senate Constitution
Regarding the Committee on Library Personnel Policy

The present article in the Senate Constitution regarding the composition of the Library Personnel Policy Committee (Section 2.h) reads as follows:

Committee on Library Personnel Policy

The teaching faculty membership shall consist of two members from the College of Arts and Sciences, two members from the Health Sciences Center and one member from the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences. In addition, there shall be three library faculty members, two from **Main Campus Libraries** and one from the Health Sciences Center Library.

The Proposed Changes:

The teaching faculty membership shall consist of three members from the College of Arts and Sciences, two members from the Health Sciences Center, and one member from the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences. All teaching faculty members shall hold continuing appointment and rank of Associate Professor or higher.

In addition, there shall be three library faculty members, two from Main Campus Libraries and one from the Health Sciences Center Library, all three of whom shall hold continuing appointment and rank of Associate Librarian or higher.

Finally, there shall be one non-tenured library faculty member who shall hold a one year one term position. This non-tenured seat shall be held for two consecutive years by Main Campus librarians followed by a Health Sciences Center librarian for one year.