

IUPUI University Libraries Faculty Organization
Minutes of January 27, 2000
UL 1116

Present: J. Baldwin, P. Boruff-Jones, M. Fiander, V. Goodwin, J. Harmon, R. Halverson, J. Hehman, D. Hoyt, D. Lewis, J. Makepeace, M. McCormick, P. McWilliams, M.B. Minick, B. Orme, K. Petsche, M. Stanley, S. Staum-Kuniej, R. Stocker, M. Wright
The meeting was convened by M. Fiander, ULFO Chair

Discussion Items

Post-Tenure Review Process

The following handouts were distributed:

- FACULTY AND LIBRARIAN REVIEW AND ENHANCEMENT: IMPLEMENTATION POLICY/UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES AT IUPUI
- MEMORANDUM from William Plater to David Lewis with Subject: Implementation of Faculty and Librarian Review and Enhancement.
- Initial Definitions of “Unsatisfactory” Used in School Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement Policies
- DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION

D. Lewis initiated the discussion by describing the development and current status of the review process for tenured librarians.

This year, for the first time at University Library, a post-tenure review process has been implemented for tenured librarians. (Previously tenured librarians have submitted an annual review report, along with other librarians.) The policy statement “FACULTY AND LIBRARIAN REVIEW AND ENHANCEMENT: IMPLEMENTATION POLICY / UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES AT IUPUI” was developed in 1999, in response to the mandate to each school to develop post-tenure review policies; this mandate was approved at the May 7, 1999 meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council.

The University Library policy statement mandates an annual review for all librarians, including librarians at full rank. “The University Libraries expectation is that all librarians, in terms of their job performance, will be performing at the excellent level, the level expected for the granting of tenure within the Indiana University Libraries (*IU Academic Handbook*, 1997, p. 56).” The evaluation of a tenured librarian is considered to be satisfactory as long as performance is rated as satisfactory, and either professional development or service, or both, are rated as satisfactory. A 1-page evaluation form (Appendix A to the Policy) will be submitted along with the annual review by tenured librarians.

In the event that a librarian receives a rating of unsatisfactory for two consecutive years, the University Library initiates a “review and development” process. Such a review must be carried out in accordance with academic due process as established in the *Indiana University Academic Handbook*, the *IUPUI Supplement*, and the *Indiana University Libraries Library Faculty Handbook*. A librarian can choose to appeal or ask for an enhancement review.

For this year, the evaluation criteria described in the FACULTY AND LIBRARIAN REVIEW AND ENHANCEMENT document will be in force. However, in a

memorandum to David Lewis, William Plater, has requested that University Library, along with other schools, revise its definition of “unsatisfactory” to better define the standards required of librarians, particularly in regard to expectations for professional development and service.

The document titled “DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION” suggested a revision of ‘unsatisfactory’ to initiate discussion. The DRAFT proposed a clarification of satisfactory and unsatisfactory ratings by defining performance in terms of “substantive contribution to the library goals”.

D. Lewis noted that excellence in performance, and in either professional development or service is currently required for tenure. It will be important to develop standards that apply to our environment, and which indicate the variety of librarians’ work, and that allow for objective evaluation of this work. It was noted during discussion that while satisfactory ratings must be achieved in each of the three areas measured, overall excellence is, in fact, required for tenure.

R. Stocker commented that librarians in the current environment do not share “core activities.” Librarians commented that campus-wide criteria for performance may include the contribution to teaching or the contribution to research.

D. Lewis suggested establishing a ULFO “subcommittee” to develop a proposal for a policy revision in order to meet the university deadline of the end of the current academic semester.

J. Harmon suggested that criteria for excellence in performance be identified and phrased in general language by looking at annual reviews. J. Baldwin noted that the contribution to meeting the goals of one’s team is a way to fairly permit the evaluation of an individual’s contribution within their own context.

B. Orme noted that for effective discussion, members would need time to study the documents, but that a serious commitment would be needed to resume the effort.

Librarians asked who would be responsible for signing the evaluation form for a librarian. M. Stanley indicated that this would be the person’s supervisor or the University Librarian.

D. Hoyt suggested that the wording of “unsatisfactory” be modeled according to the structure of parts b. (i) and (ii) of the definition employed by the School of Law. B. Orme added the suggestion that the wording of the school of law definitions, part b be adopted, substituting the word annually for regularly.

Others noted that it is not clear if the Law School review definition has been accepted by the University Administration.

The discussion ended with a proposal that the dialogue continue on email and be addressed at the February 25th meeting. M. Fiander will call an earlier meeting if needed.

ULFO Calendar

In regard to the question of whether ULFO needs to develop a yearly academic calendar, V. Goodwin suggested that this is no longer necessary since critical dates for the peer review process are now provided in a calendar expressly for that purpose. She noted that David Frisby usually sends out a yearly reminder of

the task to select unit representatives to the Faculty Council. J. Harmon added that research leave deadlines can be sent out by the Research Leave Committee. D. Hoyt indicated that it is probably more useful to have timely announcements sent, rather than for each individual to keep track of a calendar.

Action Item

Mary Stanley will contact Sara Hook, Assistant Dean of Faculty, to determine which Schools' Faculty/Librarian Review definitions of "unsatisfactory" have been approved, and report the result to ULFO.

Professional Development Presentation

Mary Stanley described advantages of developing a close liaison relationship with one's department or school in order to increase the value of the University Library to the campus community. Mary has been accepted as a member of the School of Social Work faculty senate and has co-authored a paper presented at a national Social Work conference. Most recently, Mary took a week of professional leave to prepare her contribution to a forthcoming social work handbook. Mary has prepared all instructional exercises to be incorporated. She also is writing two chapters, and approximately half of two others.

Mary suggested that in order to collaborate with faculty, it is important to talk to as many people as possible in order to identify opportunities to develop a productive relationship, with the "personality chemistry" to work together for extended periods. She advised that in a professional relationship, it is necessary to be able to accept criticism.

D. Hoyt added the suggestion that for those interested in publishing, Kenny Crews may be willing to review legal arrangements with publishers.

Announcements

B. Orme and M. Fiander were selected to be University Library candidates for election to the Indiana University Faculty Council. Upon election, these posts include automatic membership on the IUPUI faculty council.

For questions regarding faculty governance structures, David Frisby is a knowledgeable person to direct questions. J. Hehman also volunteers to assist with questions.

The SIRSI implementation deadline is on schedule. Version Unicorn 2000 is being installed. A trial database is being created with 100,000 items from the NOTIS database and 50,000 items from the Horizon database. Data is now being mapped and "interesting" cases examined. Testing will begin in April or May.

Future Agenda Items:

Determine a strategy to develop a revised policy for the post-tenure review process.

Next Meeting

Friday, February 25, 2000, 1PM to 3PM

Addendum Report

During the December finals week, several of the librarians participated in the student coffee service. Pat McWilliams, Brenda Burk, Polly Boruff-Jones, Martha McCormick, Jennifer Hehman, Carol Withers, and Fran Huehls assisted by making coffee, putting out cookies and supplies, keeping the area cleaned up, and turning off the urns. A number of students expressed appreciation for the refreshments that were provided.

Minutes submitted by Randall Halverson, ULFO Secretary