Library Faculty and Professionals Assembly Meeting on:

‘Report for the Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Unclassified Academic Staff in the Libraries’

March 26, 2014

Scott McEathron served as Parliamentarian. Deborah Dandridge, LFPA Chair, provided an overview of why the committee was formed, essentially in response to a request from the Provost’s office to formulate a policy to cover Library non-tenure track staff categories. She presented the report as an item to be discussed and approved by the Assembly. Dandridge recognized and thanked committee members for their work: Jennifer Church-Duran (chair), Mike Broadwell (ex officio), Fran Devlin, Caitlin Donnelly, Ada Emmett, and Betsaida Reyes. Committee activities included research, presentations and discussions with Library staff, a survey on issues surrounding theses staff categories, and generating the report itself.

Emmett and other committee members provided clarification throughout the meeting on the committee and document’s intent, mainly to differentiate among tenure-track faculty, non-tenure track staff, and unclassified academic staff in the Libraries, while fulfilling the original request. The report aims to explain the need for faculty status for librarians and protect this staff designation. The categories in the report are designed to distinguish between positions that require an MLS/MLIS (Masters in Library/Information Science) and those that require other advanced degrees and experience. The group talked about how the unclassified academic category is used across campus. The non-tenure track faculty category is rarely used in the Libraries, and is similar to the visiting professor staff type used across campus. The point was made by several that this is a good opportunity to be to draft such a policy.

Participants raised the following issues and questions:

- How does Library decide what type of position search to conduct (regional, national, etc.)? Library human resources staff stated that we do have some control over this, and that certain positions require different types of searches; this can also be adjusted at the campus level.
- Librarian 1, 2 and 3 staff categories came up and whether we need the non-tenure track category; discussion ensued about appropriate needs and uses for each category.
- Whether current unclassified professionals, either those with an MLS/MLIS or those with other advanced degrees, could be hired/moved into an unclassified academic position. Some Library faculty may wish to move to unclassified academic staff, which are not required to perform research. The policy for unclassified academics states:

‘Vacancies of all existing academic staff positions must be filled through a recruitment or search waiver process...’
• Group agreed to remove the page 10 section 10 titled ‘Examples of Unclassified Academic Staff’ as the verbiage on the MLS/MLIS makes this position type seem inaccessible to those with such degrees, and removing this language will make hiring and staffing more flexible in the future.

• Request to remove the possible unclassified academic title ‘Curator’ from the report, as this is already used in a specific way in the Libraries and in other units on campus, and that including it will be confusing.

• A concern was raised that as unclassified academic staff will go through the promotion process, it might be complicated due to these different staff having varied discipline expectations, i.e. percentages allotted for research, teaching and service.

• New unclassified staff had not been added to the LFPA list serv at the time of this meeting, so were not aware of it and did not receive the report. (They have since been sent the report and added to the list serv).

The Dean noted she needs to present the report (or pertinent sections) to the Provost’s office, as they are waiting on this report to approve some Library positions. Meeting attendees discussed off and on the correct process and whether a vote on the report was required. The body seemed to agree that the next step is for LFPA Exec. to endorse the report (which it did) and for the related governance documents to be updated with information from the report, discussed among LFPA members at a meeting, and then voted on by LFPA. Documents to update are: Code and Bylaws, Criteria for Ranks, Discipline Expectations, and the Faculty Evaluation Plan.

Dean’s Update on Post-tenure Review:

All faculty will go through this process, based on date of tenure acquisition, but they are figuring out when for each person. Faculty should receive a letter soon which provides more detail. Administrative positions are exempt from this process. The ad-hoc committee for this topic recommends that LCPT conduct post-tenure review.

Rhonda Houser took minutes.