

REVISED

COMMITTEE: Libraries Committee

MEETING DATE: 10/17/2012

PERSON PRESIDING: Robert Campbell

REGULAR MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Amy Lyndon, Chal Benson, Chris Oakley, David Wilson-Okamura, Gail Munde, Qin Ding

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Dorothy Spencer, Cheryl McFadden, Runying Chen

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Mark Sanders, Beth Ketterman

Agenda Item: Review and approve 9/17/2012 minutes.

Discussion: Correct misspelling of Chal Benson's name.

Action Taken: The Committee voted to approve the minutes of the previous meeting

ACTIONS OF MEETING

Agenda Item: Update on the recommendations made by the PPC for Joyner and Laupus Libraries to review unit codes, tenure, and faculty status for librarians.

Discussion:

Spencer says the PPC document suggested strengthening collaboration between the two libraries. 2) Review unit codes. Consultants come on 10/30 and 10/31 to look at Phase II. Campbell will be briefed on the process about the meeting with the consultant. Wilson-Okamura asked "What benefits are there to reducing tenure? These questions are being addressed in the review plan with the consultants in the meetings with both libraries.

All Joyner librarians will meet with the consultants, and then all Laupus will meet separately to ensure confidential conversations. Wilson-Okamura asked what role our committee will play in this process. Spencer said we might be able to see the two models presented by the librarians. We should be able to recommend or just receive information; we might, if desired, have a venue to discuss this at the faculty senate. Wilson-Okamura stated that the libraries committee needs a voice in the issue and that we should discuss the issues so that we have enough time to influence the process. Campbell said we could speak in November or December. Spencer said it might be too soon, as the consultants might not have the report ready. We should be prepared to draft resolution in November to give to the faculty senate in December.

Spencer discussed the role of faculty status at our peer institutions: It's a mixed bag, with some have both rank and tenure, others have either rank or tenure, and still others have neither option. Spencer said that teaching faculty at ECU are categorized as 1310, while library faculty are categorized as 1110. So the status of faculty/tenure-eligible librarians is misaligned in pay line vs. the line they're working under. The standards for who is eligible for tenure at peer institutions differ. For example, Chapel Hill has no tenure, but they have a ranked career ladder with advancement. Hopefully our librarians would be given multi-year contracts. Tenured librarians will not lose their tenure because it's an institutional right.

We suggest an 11/13 deadline for resolution to agenda Committee. We meet afterwards, but we can get it to them later. Sanders says we are mandated to analyze, not change. Spencer says there are problems that need to be fixed.

Spencer says that tenure wasn't a draw for recruiting and that some applicants don't care about being tenure-eligible. In addition, there were some negative experiences with previous personnel, which led to a policy of having everyone starting off with 1 year contract; if that year goes smoothly, they get a 3 year contract afterwards. This process has led to four tenured librarians after this process, which then gives them status and security. After the PPC process, we now know how to go forward with right "size" expectations.

Wilson-Okamura points out that multiyear contracts do not equal tenure, and asks whether librarians need tenure for the same protections as faculty. Wilson-Okamura says that librarians build collections that may be controversial (ex. Queer theory) or that deal with unpopular political or social opinions, so perhaps they do need the protections of tenure. Oakley says that tenure also gives librarians advancement opportunities.

Munde highlights the fact that comparing Joyner and Laupus libraries will be very difficult, as the two libraries are very different. Another positive in the tenure category is that going through the tenure process bonds people. It also makes it easier to recruit highly qualified applicants who may not be attracted to 1 year fixed term position. Applicants may feel they can't come for 1 year, but they may come to job with the potential for more stability. Tenure may thus help us get advanced personnel.

Spencer pointed out a problem that faculty librarians don't acquire annual sick leave, like other faculty non-teaching positions. This is a problem that needs to be fixed.

Munde mentions websites regarding faculty status for librarians. There are a lot of variations between institutions as to the faculty status for librarians. Munde questions whether the PPC recommendations aren't "hire cheap and low status jobs to save money"; Spencer says this is not the case.

Sanders shares that Joyner librarians seem to want tenure opportunity. See "Joyner Faculty Affairs Report."

Spencer states that in comparisons between 12 month service-based librarians vs. 9 month research/teaching/service faculty, librarians are "in the basement." Faculty status does not equal high salary. Faculty librarians can't win the faculty salary game; they don't get salary pool increases like teaching faculty do (when available).

Action Taken: We plan to draft a resolution to give to the Faculty Senate in December. McFadden will prepare the agenda committee to anticipate such a resolution.

ACTIONS OF MEETING

Agenda Item: Update regarding the Spring 2012 letter to the Chancellor regarding space allocations at the libraries.

Discussion: Campbell followed up with the appropriate parties; there is little or no chance of getting a member of the libraries committee on the space committee. However, if any library issue comes up, we can attend the relevant meeting, hopefully in enough time to influence any decisions about library space.

Action Taken: None at this time

ACTIONS OF MEETING

Agenda Item: Informing the University of Library initiatives, such as open-access.

Discussion: We should promote library-sponsored discussions on open access. In the last one, we discussed sending a notice to relevant faculty. Lyndon asked whether we sent a reminder notice to the library representatives for each department. The answer was no, just those on the library committee. Spencer shared that Joseph Thomas shared handout on choosing quality open-access journals. Because the journals are discipline-specific, he suggested that the liaisons share their opinions with the library representatives which journals are good, medium, and poor quality open-access. This way there would be a list of which open-access journals are good to get for the libraries. We should then be able to develop department based guidelines for e-resources.

Action Taken: Sanders will ask Joseph Thomas to send this document he shared via e-mail to the faculty.