Library Faculty Professional Assembly Meeting Minutes
June 4, 2014


Kim Glover, Vice Chair, convened the meeting, explaining that Deborah Dandridge, Chair, was unable to attend.

Recognition of Members
Kim thanked all who have served on LFPA meetings over the past year. She then extended a special thanks to the following: the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Non Tenure Track Classification (Jen Church, Ada Emmett, Betsaida Reyes, Fran Devlin, Caitlin Donnelly); the Ad Hoc Committee on Post Tenure Review (Scott McEathron, Julie Petr, Whitney Baker); the Code and Bylaws Committee (Sara Morris, Kathy Graves, Marianne Reed); LCPT (Geoff Husic, Whitney Baker, Sara Morris, Tami Albin, Lyn Wolz); Nominating and Ballot Committee (Letha Johnson, Beth Whittaker, Betsaida Reyes); Ken Lohrentz for serving as parliamentarian, Lars Leon for managing Adobe Connect, Marianne Reed and Erika Dickey for technical assistance, LFPA Exec (Keith Russell, Kim Glover, Rhonda Houser, Sherry Williams), and to our chair, Deborah Dandridge for her leadership this past year.

May 1 LFPA Meeting Minutes
The May 1 meeting minutes were unanimously approved, with the motion for approval made by Ada Emmett, and seconded by John Stratton.

Nominating and Ballot
Letha Johnson explained that there have been a number of ballots recently because of problems with Ballot Bin. Her committee will be suggesting in its annual report that LFPA look into using a different program for next year.
Criteria for Academic Rank of Library Faculty

The draft under review was previously distributed to all LFPA members. John Stratton moved that the Criteria for Academic Rank of Library Faculty be reviewed in order to accept the proposed changes. Marianne Reed seconded the motion.

Discussion

Question: In line 21 are the exceptions to an MLS in keeping with the MLS requirement?
Response: This would apply to Unclassified Academic Staff, and an MLS is not necessarily a requirement.

Question: If non tenure track classification is intended to be temporary, does it make sense to have Librarian II and Librarian III categories?
Response: We are required by the provost’s office to have these categories. We could also hire someone in to a position at a Librarian II or III level.

Question: Do non tenure track faculty who are here for a longer time get tenure by de facto?
Response: No

Question: Why would there be a promotion opportunity for non-tenure track positions?
Response: While these are temporary positions, people can be reappointed. This is codified in campus documents. It was suggested that this be checked for accuracy.

Question: Why wouldn’t we use the unclassified academic staff category for new hires and let the non-tenure track category die?
Response: We are required to include non-tenure track, but, in reality, the Dean can choose to not place new hires there.

Question: Why don’t we use “Visiting Librarian” to be more consistent with others on campus that use a “visiting” designation.
Response: We could do that.

Question: Library faculty can go for promotion from Associate to Librarian within six years, but for promotion to Librarian III (non-tenure track) and promotion to Senior Specialist (unclassified academic staff) a minimum of six years is specified. Why are they different?
Response: This was the way Jen presented it in her report. She checked with other
institutions and units across campus. It was concluded that it is used this way with other units on campus, and a check of the policy library substantiates this.

Question: In lines 81–83 A Librarian I position cannot be converted to a tenure track position, but no mention is made of Librarian II or Librarian III. Can they be converted? Response: No, that is an oversight. It was agreed that Librarian I in line 82 should be replaced with ‘Non tenure track faculty.”

**Amendment:** Carmen moved this change as an amendment, and Scott seconded it. The vote was unanimous.

Question: The Dean was asked to speak on how she intends to use these categories for new hires. 
Response (from Lorraine): She does not intend to have a general swell of appointments to non-tenure track positions. She would prefer to use Academic Unclassified staff for new hires, and let the non-tenure track category sunset when the two people who are in that category are no longer here. She reiterated that we have approval from the Provost to go ahead with the unclassified academic staff category, and to continue using tenure track appointments. The academic staff category gives us more flexibility to hire people who have expertise who may, or may not have an MLS.

Question: In line 116 the wording states that we would hire someone with an advanced degree, but not with an MLS. Is this what we mean? Response: No.

**Amendment:** Marianne moved and Rhonda seconded and amendment changing lines 116–117, to read “At a minimum, candidates must hold a master’s degree or a Ph.D. in an applicable field. The rest of that sentence would be eliminated. This amendment was unanimously approved.

Question: Have we made it harder for someone who is a certified archivist but who does not hold a master’s degree to be hired as an unclassified academic staff than a faculty position? Response: No, the faculty position would require the terminal degree in the field.

Question: What do lines 123-124 mean “Rank is designated at the most nearly equivalent in academic preparation or experience to that of the criteria for Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, or Librarian.”
Response: The source is the Policy Library. It was suggested that we reference our source. A
look at the policy library revealed better language.

**Amendment:** Judith Emde moved and Angie Rathmel seconded that lines 123-124 be amended to read

“These titles are viewed as matching the equivalent faculty ranks, Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, and Librarian.”

The amendment was unanimously approved.

Question: Lines 149 – 153 requires national recognition, but national recognition is not required in the Discipline Expectations document (line 66). Should they be aligned with what we require of tenure track positions?  
Response: Yes. We will address this in the Discipline Expectations review.

**Vote on Criteria for Academic Rank of Library Faculty**

The question was called, and a vote was taken on the motion to approve the Criteria for Academic Rank of Library Faculty, as amended, and to send the document for vote by ballot. The motion was unanimously passed.

**Discipline Expectations**

Rhonda Houser moved, and Ada Emmet seconded a motion to adopt the Discipline Expectations as previously distributed with the following revisions:

- Line 27 add an ending )
- Line 59 change mission to missions
- Line 60 replace “the profession” with “a measure of national recognition in their area of specialization or a related field.”

**Discipline Expectations Discussion**

Comment: Line 66 says “... and growth as a librarian.” Librarian should be changed to “professional”

All agreed that this change could be made wherever appropriate in the document.

Question: Line 66 How will we measure continued effectiveness and growth? Do we need more specificity?  
Response: Flexibility is desirable. The positions are hypothetical, and we don’t know what they will be, so we can’t be more specific. This will be clearer at the point that the job is established. LCPT will be guided by the information provided to them.
Given the time, Angie Rathmel moved, and Letha Johnson seconded that the discussion on the Discipline Expectations be tabled, and discussed further at an additional meeting. This motion was unanimously passed.

**Announcements from the Dean**

The Dean has sent a question to the Provost’s office regarding a clarification on using administrative stipends as a determining factor in whether or not someone goes through post tenure review. It is possible that this determination will only be used for those at the level of Assistant Dean and up.

There will be a small pool available for merit. We will find out the amount later this month. Everyone will receive letters with this information, and a date for post tenure review, for those affected.

We can continue using the tenure track category for new hires, but are required by the provost to increase the percentage of effort for research to 20% for new hires. This will take effect with the African and Global and International Studies Librarian hire. So we will be managing a two track system for research in the future. It was suggested that LFPA look into how we will manage this, including looking at issues such as time off for research, etc.

Respectfully submitted,

Sherry Williams
Secretary, LFPA