

**COMMITTEE:** Libraries Committee

**MEETING DATE:** 3/20/2013

**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:** Cheryl McFadden, Jan Lewis, Beth Ketterman (for Dorothy Spencer)

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Katy Kavenagh, Jan Mayo

Agenda Item: Review and approve 10/17/2012 minutes.

Discussion: None

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

---

## **ACTIONS OF MEETING**

The committee began discussing some difficulties in using Onesearch to find sources. It was suggested to use Local search or WorldCat instead of searching “inside library.”

Agenda Item: Proposed code model for ECU libraries

Discussion: Mayo and Kavenagh discussed the task to develop a model code.

The library was tasked to write a model that did not include tenure. After a process that involved consultants and feedback from librarians, the current alternative model proposed is the same status as the current model, but without tenure options. Without the tenure option, the evaluation component would consist of a checklist of accomplishments in lieu of a PAD. When asked by several members of the libraries committee about the nature of the problem that this proposed model code was attempting to fix, and the nature of the “library of the future”, the librarians reported that these questions had never been answered.

To examine relevant models, the librarians looked at ECU’s peer institutions, then cut that list to those that had similar health/undergraduate libraries. Several of these institutions, including VCU and UNCC, had both tenure and faculty status as options for librarians. Munde asked how the proposed 1, 3, or 5 year appointment periods were decided upon. Mayo said these periods were similar to others, depending upon personnel experience levels. For example, a director would be hired at the 3 or 5 year level, while a newly graduated librarian would likely be hired at a 1 year period. Munde pointed out that employees would always be on probation; SPA employees don’t have that. So there would be less stability for librarians than for SPA staff. In addition, there is no progressive discipline process, no reasons for termination like SPA staff have. Lewis agreed that the

evaluation component of the model needs more discussion. Another library committee member asked whether scholarship is still included in the evaluation in the new model; the answer is yes, just like faculty.

Action Taken: The libraries committee will write a letter to Mark Sprague to request that the library code and the issue of faculty and tenure status be placed on the agenda committee and other relevant groups. We request that this issue be resolved quickly, as it is in the best interest of the librarians. Chen suggests linking this issue to the NC emphasis as the importance of higher education.

---

## **ACTIONS OF MEETING**

Agenda Item: Automated Storage and Retrieval System (ASRS)

Discussion: Lewis advocates for including an automated storage and retrieval system that would house some of the university records, archival records, and redundant print documents to a long term storage to make room for a growing collection. The university is already using ABC storage to store these records and the service has had problems. Committee members asked wither people's necessary collections would be safe and available, to which Lewis replied "yes." Lewis provided a short description of the need for such a system and advocates that all librarians and those affiliated with the library discuss these talking points with their relevant committees and associates.

Action Taken: The set of talking points are disseminated.

---

## **ACTIONS OF MEETING**

Agenda item: Maury York's retirement party will be on April 11th at 3:00 pm in the exhibit area.

Discussion: Aside from the announcement, Oakley asked about the plan to fill his position. Lewis stated that the current plan is to replace his position with two people.

Actions taken: None.

March 1, 2013

In January 2013, Joyner and Laupus Libraries were asked to form a writing team to define and draft a new organizational model for the faculty of the East Carolina University Libraries. The structures of peer libraries were examined, as well as that of ECU's libraries, and as a result the team has identified the included model for consideration.

It remains our considered opinion, as well as that of the ECU library faculty, that the model under which we currently function is the best one for the ECU community, its libraries, and our librarians. It is a model favored by 9 of the 12 peer institutions on the IPAR list that have both general academic and health sciences libraries. In addition, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution on December 4, 2012 in support of continuing the option of faculty tenure, rank, and status for librarians at East Carolina University.

The librarians of Joyner and Laupus libraries continue to be concerned about the impact that a change in our status would have on our work and on the important peer relationship we currently enjoy with other ECU faculty members. We also have concerns and questions regarding how a change in our status might affect our contracts and our benefits. Those questions and concerns are outlined at the end of this report.

Should you have any questions regarding this document, we would be happy to address them.

Respectfully,

Megan E. Besaw, MLIS  
Research Assistant Professor  
Liaison to the College of Allied Health Sciences  
William E. Laupus Health Sciences Library  
[besawm@ecu.edu](mailto:besawm@ecu.edu), 744-2289

Katy Kavanagh, MILS, MA  
Assistant Professor  
Instructional Design Librarian  
J.Y. Joyner Library  
[kavanaghk@ecu.edu](mailto:kavanaghk@ecu.edu), 328-0734

Jan Mayo, MLS  
Assistant Professor  
Head, General Collections Cataloging  
J.Y. Joyner Library  
[mayoj@ecu.edu](mailto:mayoj@ecu.edu), 328-0293

Katherine A. Rickett, MSLS, MEd, NCC  
Research Assistant Professor  
Liaison to the Brody School of Medicine  
William E. Laupus Health Sciences Library  
[rickettk@ecu.edu](mailto:rickettk@ecu.edu), 744-2217

## Proposed Code Model for ECU Libraries

### I. Faculty Status, Tenure, and Rank

#### A. STATUS

Excluding ECU Library faculty who have already been hired into tenure-track/tenured positions, ECU Library faculty hold non-tenure track positions and are described as General Faculty. General Faculty appointments are typically full-time appointments for a specified term and do not lead to tenure. General Faculty members hold the same basic benefits, rights, and responsibilities as tenured or tenure-eligible faculty except that they shall not be afforded tenure or tenure eligibility. The ranking system, which parallels that for faculty on campus, permits General Faculty certain faculty privileges: membership in Faculty Senate and faculty committees and voting privileges in faculty elections.

All General Faculty Librarians must have an ALA-accredited master's degree or international equivalent in library or information science.

General Faculty shall be appointed to one of the following ranks:

- a. Instructor: This is an entry level faculty rank that requires little or no experience. Appointments at this rank require expectation of successful overall performance and the potential for a promising career in librarianship.
- b. Assistant Professor: Appointment or promotion to Assistant Professor indicates satisfactory job performance over time, demonstrated potential for scholarship and professional growth, and a record of service.
- c. Associate Professor: Appointment or promotion to this level requires a sustained record of achievement as an Assistant Professor, demonstrated achievement in librarianship, sustained record of scholarship and professional growth, and leadership in professional service.
- d. Professor: The rank of professor is the highest career rank. Appointment or promotion to this level requires successful service over time as an Associate Professor, consistently outstanding job performance and an extensive record of scholarly activity and professional service.

### II. Code Issues:

#### A. TERMS

Terms would be given in lengths of 1, 3, and 5 years. The length of the initial term would be based on experience. The search committee is responsible for recommending an initial length of term to the Dean/Director at the time that a candidate is selected for hire. The length of subsequent terms is based on evaluation

scores and the terms would increase over time with positive job evaluations. The librarian can submit a letter to the Dean/Director requesting reappointment up to 120 days before the expiration of the current contract.

The Dean/Director passes the letter on to the Personnel Committee, who reviews the librarian's performance during the current contract period and makes their recommendation regarding reappointment to the Dean/Director. If the contract is not extended, the librarian will be notified at least 90 days in advance of the end of the contract period. If the Personnel Committee does recommend that a new contract be extended, they may also recommend the length of that contract.

## B. EVALUATION

Given the rich history of ECU librarians' work in the field, professional and scholarly activities should be a part of the expectations of a professional librarian. Faculty Evaluation Worksheets will consist of the measurement of activities that commonly comprise faculty work. An evaluation document and corresponding point values would be determined by each library. In this way, librarians at ECU can be evaluated annually both on their goals, as well as their research and service activities. Evaluation shall take into account the following components as percentages, which are agreed upon by the librarian, the supervisor and the Dean/Director during the annual evaluation process:

1. Performance of job duties (60-90%)
2. Creative work/research (5-20%)
3. Service to the university, the profession, and the community (5-20%)

Completion of the evaluation matrix would allow for a raw score, and for the total points to be calculated via a weighted value into a numerical score ranging from 1-5 for the purposes of annual evaluation and merit increases. The evaluation document would first be completed by the librarian in the form of a self-assessment. The supervisor of the librarian would then complete the same assessment. During a meeting between the librarian, the supervisor, and the Dean/Director or their designee, the final point totals would be discussed and any issues or discrepancies would be resolved that that time. The finalized worksheet would be submitted to the Dean/Director and the Personnel Committee annually. In case of a dispute, the university's appropriate grievance procedures would be afforded to the librarian.

## C. PROMOTION

At the end of the librarian's contract, or in special cases, when initiated by the librarian or their direct supervisor, the librarian may be eligible for promotion to a higher rank. The promotion will be determined by the scoring on the librarian's past Faculty Evaluation Worksheets, as well as Annual Reports, when necessary for clarification. These items will be submitted to the Personnel Committee, and will be approved by the Dean/Director.

## III. Committees

Since service will continue to be an important part of an academic librarian's duties, methods for fulfilling that responsibility must be provided. General Faculty Librarians should be represented in the Faculty Senate and allowed to serve as voting members on standing faculty committees.

General Faculty Librarians should also serve on committees formed for the purposes of hiring new librarians and evaluating, reappointing and promoting existing librarians. Finally, they should be integrally involved in the development of policies and procedures which govern the libraries.

Service is not limited, however, to library and campus committees. General Faculty Librarians would be encouraged to serve at the state, regional and national levels. To that end, permission to travel to attend conferences and support for that travel, including funding and administrative leave, would be essential.

## **Concerns with Changing Unit Codes**

We have the following questions and concerns regarding benefits, should our current status change:

1. How does this change make the university better or make the libraries more efficient in their use of funding?
2. How would the adoption of this proposed model affect tenured and tenure-track librarians already employed at ECU?
3. If someone who is already tenured in the old system applies to a different position within the libraries, especially if the new job has higher responsibilities, would that person be able to keep their tenured or tenure-track status?
4. How would current fixed-term faculty be affected? Would their benefits change? If so, when would the change take effect?

5. How will the current review process affect fixed-term faculty up for contract renewal this summer?
6. Would there still be funding and administrative leave allotted for professional travel?
7. Would there still be research leave? If so, would this option be extended to Laupus faculty?
8. We have heard conflicting information about the academic status of librarians under the proposed code. Would librarians be considered a form of fixed-term faculty, or EPA Non-Teaching?
9. If we were changed to EPA Non-Teaching:
  - a. How would sick leave be handled? Would we start with a zero balance?
  - b. Would vacation leave have to be accrued? What would that mean for leave that was already planned, for which there may not be sufficient time to accrue the needed days?
  - c. How would Family Medical Leave be handled? Would we have to accrue sick leave?
  - d. Would individuals currently in the Optional Retirement Plan be able to continue with the plans in which they currently participate?

## Automated Storage and Retrieval System

**What** is an Automated Storage and Retrieval System (ASRS)? The **ASRS** is a high-density, environmentally controlled storage system for up to one million barcoded books, or thousands of boxes of archival materials. The ASRS will allow us to store eight or nine times more books than conventional shelving.

**When:** We need this now. The University Archives has already run out of space to house records and the university is *already paying* for remote storage. The North Carolina Collection and Rare Books and Manuscripts will run out of space in the next 3 years. General Collections are likely to run out of space in the next 3 to 5 years without *significant weeding*. The ECU master plan includes a 22,000 square foot “library addition,” which will become the ASRS, with planning and design scheduled for 2023 and bidding and construction in 2024-2025.

**Why** does ECU need an ASRS?

1. Joyner Library’s physical collections have expanded beyond our current capacity for storing them.
2. Learning Space: Currently Joyner offers only 1,238 study seats, clearly not enough for the 23,500 on-campus students and faculty we serve. In addition to more study rooms, an ASRS could help us offer more specialized learning spaces, such as a consolidated research desk and reading room for all special collections.
3. Improved efficiency and service delivery of library materials. Each book is scanned into an inventory-control database, and stored in a uniquely-numbered bin. Robotic arms retrieve the bin whenever a book in it is wanted. Returned books are rescanned and redeposited to their bins.

**What** would be stored and what would remain available for browsing? Approximately 55% of the storage space would be devoted to university records, archives, manuscripts, and other special collections materials—20,000 linear feet. Stored materials from the general collections would be those that do not easily lend themselves to browsing or those with low use, such as back volumes of journals, directories, volumes of statistics, or earlier census materials. The ASRS could accommodate about 440,000 volumes, leaving a browsing collection of some 660,000 books remaining in the main library shelving areas. This browsing collection would focus on areas of strength, such as education or maritime history, and titles which are frequently checked out.

**How** would I get the books stored in the ASRS? How soon? Clicking a button from the catalog record will initiate the retrieval of the book, which would be delivered to a service point within minutes.

**Where** will the ASRS be? On the west side of the building, an addition that would be adjacent to the circulation department. The ASRS would occupy 14,100 square feet, and could free up about half of the library's second and third floor space--valuable real estate that could be repurposed for other educational activities as well as providing room for future growth of the library's collections.

**What** will the ASRS cost? Last projected cost was **\$4.7M**, in the 2009 *Joyner Library Master Plan Feasibility Study*, by Hansbury, Evans, Wright, Vlattas + Company.

**Who** already has an example we can see? North Carolina State University has the [bookBot](#). Examples are also in service at the University of Utah, Eastern Michigan University, the University of Chicago, and the University of Nevada-Los Vegas, among others.