

Minutes of the Library Faculty Meeting
February 11, 2002

Meeting called to order by Chairperson of the Executive Committee-David Allen at 10 AM Tuesday, February 11th 2003.

The agenda items were:

1. Library Committee reports.
2. Report of the Library Director, including review of budget situation.
3. Evaluation of department heads, library director, and others.
4. Library organization: roles of departments, teams, and committees. Need to define?
5. Rights and responsibilities of librarians in working with office computers.
6. New business

First order of business was the approval of the following meeting minutes:

-October 22, 2002 Faculty Meeting Minutes

-November 26, 2002 Faculty Meeting with the Provost

The minutes were approved without corrections.

Second order of business was the library committee reports:

Appointment and Promotions - Nathan Baum, Chair-Susan Werner reporting:

The A&P Committee met with Chris Filstrup, Dean of Libraries, to discuss the proposed 3-year appointment plan for new appointees. After their discussion, a letter was issued to Dean Filstrup stating the committee's concerns over the proposed plan. See below for letter. The committee has not met since issuing the letter. Questions opened to the floor, none.

Chris,

The A&P Committee met to discuss your proposal concerning three-year department chair appointments. We are interested in the idea and look forward to seeing a more detailed description, but recommend that the proposal be discussed at a faculty meeting and possibly at other meetings with library staff before any decisions concerning implementation are made.

Moreover, five of the six members who attended our meeting are opposed to applying this model to the current acting heads of Reference and Special Collections. If this action is taken, rightly or wrongly it will be perceived as being tailored to address these specific cases and, consequently, have a negative impact on the morale of the individuals involved. It would also make an objective evaluation of the proposal more difficult.

Sincerely,

Nathan Baum, Co-chair, Library Appointment and Promotion Committee

Committee Members

Nathan Baum, Co-chair

Susan Werner, Co-chair

Amelia Salinero

Min Huei-Lu

David Allen

Kristen Nyitray

Gisele Glover

Executive Committee – David Allen, Chair/reporting:

The Executive Committee also met with Chris Filstrup, Dean of Libraries, to discuss the proposed 3-year appointment plan for new appointees. A similar letter was issued to the one the A&P committee released. See below included after meeting, not formally read into minutes. Also, the Library held elections for open seats to campus wide committees. The following were elected:

- Gulnara Shafikova to Campus Computing Com.
- Dan Kinney to Academic Planning and Resource Allocation Com.
- Susan Werner to Academic Review Com.

Proposed revising by-laws at future meeting. Requested possible changes.
Questions were opened to the floor, none.

Letter issued to Chris Filstrup, Dean of Libraries on 3-year appointments:

Chris,

The Executive Committee met to discuss the ideas you presented at our joint meeting with the A&P Committee,

The members of the committee were divided in their views on the merits of three-year appointments for new department heads, and on the removable 10% addition to the salaries of department heads and associate directors. We look forward to seeing the statement you are writing on how these new appointments will be evaluated after three years, and would like to discuss this and related proposals at the next faculty meeting in February.

There is, however, unanimous agreement among the members of the committee that any new procedure should not be applied to the two individuals now serving as acting department heads. To avoid the appearance of discrimination (since your proposal does not apply to permanent department heads) and to counteract the impression that these two people are being singled out by this proposal, we believe it should be implemented only with new appointments. Hélène Volat and Kristen Nyitray have sufficiently proved their ability to run their departments, and should be given permanent appointments as department heads before this matter comes up for discussion by the Library Faculty.

David Allen
Chair

Library Faculty Executive Committee

Library Services – John Andrus, Chair-Godlind Johnson Reporting:

Library Services Com. met in the beginning of the semester and toured the library to inspect current signage, find ways of making improvements. Recommendations were forwarded to Jim La Piano. The committee also announced their current work on developing floor plans to be used to help direct library visitors better as well as announced that they are in the process of scheduling brown bag lunches and working on improving the overall look and condition of the various display cases throughout the library with an emphasis on keeping them up-to-date and their contents informative. Questions were opened to the floor, accepted.

Chris Filstrup raised the issue of whether or not the exterior display cases should be kept given that they are repeatedly vandalized and Elaine Hoffman voiced concerns over the 2nd floor core bathrooms needing signage. David Allen requested that these issues be postponed and discussed at Director's Council.

Health Sciences-not present.

Professional Staff-Kit Kassel reporting:

Professional staff met and discussed permanent appointments with Germaine Hoynos. Review guidelines are available if needed.

Director's Report – Chris Filstrup

The 2002-2003 budget was held harmless, making the 400,000 for collection development okay. There is a hiring freeze, but a memo was sent to the Provost about the Systems vacancies. 2% allowance must be sent back and Albany is looking at staff reductions. The Provost must cut 50 positions over the next year or so. Next year's budget asks for a 5% cut, amounting to 467,000 dollars. This does not apply to Korean specialist or Bibliographic instruction hires they are both not included in budget. There is a promise that the cuts will not come out of personnel but from serials. We will also leave certain positions open for '03-'04. These include Charlie, Brenda, Roger and Joan. We're looking at flat budget for '03-'04.

Opened to the floor for questions, accepted.

What ensued was a discussion of the selector's responses to the proposed cuts, hiring concerns for after the freeze is lifted, to which it was answered by Chris that money and applications would be there for the new hires.

Next order of business was the Administrative Appointments. David Allen requested to know why Chris outlined the items below to which the answer was that the items were requested, but that Chris is willing to discuss the issue.

Discussion ensued. The Dean presented the case that he feels strongly about de-centralized administration and that periodic reviews help an organization grow. He needs to have the ability to negotiate and the 10% money increase is something he feels he needs as part of his bargaining position as well as the fact that he would need to get the money from somewhere to give to others who want the position. He also feels that a 10% increase is adequate compensation for supervisors.

Open discussion of the response revealed that various members of the faculty felt that additional review of non-tenured librarians was redundant and unnecessary given the current system. Others argued that the UUP contract would not permit review of tenured librarians. Further consultation was decided upon involving UUP representatives as well as the Library Executive and Appointment and Promotions Committees.

Draft of proposed review plan below.

Draft

Administrative appointments

The basic proposal is to make all new appointments at the department head level and higher three-year renewable appointments. Salaries at this level would consist of a base salary plus a 10% administrative stipend for the three-year period.

This mode of appointment has several advantages. It makes review of these positions routine. This kind of review is good for the organization. New appointees will understand and agree to this process. The 10% administrative stipend makes it clear that managing a department(s) is remunerated and that stepping down or being removed from one of these positions incurs some financial loss. As it is now, the director can remove a person from a department head or assistant director position but without recouping any salary.

The criteria for evaluating a department head or assistant director are:

1. Supervisory record;
2. Success of the department(s) in reaching its/their goals;
3. Contributions to the Library beyond the department, to the Library as a whole;
4. Level of participation in Director's Council;
5. Level of cooperation with other department heads.

Since this is a review of job performance, those most knowledgeable about the individual's performance would contribute to the review. In the case of a department head, the supervising assistant director, other assistant directors, members of Director's Council, and the director would participate in the review. In the case of an assistant director, the other assistant directors, the director, and members of Director's Council would participate. This could be done with a form based on the criteria and submitted to the director. The director would make the final decision.

Including members of Director's Council in the review opens up the scope of evaluation. This seems to me an appropriate step toward a more collaborative organization.

CF

1-3-03

Next order of business is team functions.

Chris presents the document below as an explanation of his thoughts on the subject.

DRAFT

Teams, committees, and departments

Teams – appointed multi-departmental groups that have operational and/or oversight responsibilities; have operational staff and/or financial resources (budgets)

- STARS (oversight)
- Reference (operational)
- Instruction (operational)
- Publicity (oversight/operational)
- Digitization (oversight/operational)
- Web (oversight/operational)
- Social Events (oversight/operational)

Committees – elected groups that generally deal with non-operational issues such professional development and tenure; lack staff and budgets

- Library Services Committee
- Faculty Executive Committee
- Appointment and Tenure Committee
- Professional Executive Committee
- [Classified Executive Committee]

Departments –supervisory units

CF
1/21/03

The floor was open to questions and the question of whether Reference Department was an actual department was raised; Chris' answer was it was a department. Discussion ensued as to whether or not the list was accurate but overall the document was accepted as a draft for explanation.

Next order of business was computer rights. Chris requested that further discussion of this matter be taken up when a head of systems has been hired. None opposed. Will be carried over at a later date.

No new business was raised.

The meeting was adjourned at 12 noon.

Respectfully submitted,
F. Jason Torre
February 14, 2003