

IUPUI University Libraries Faculty Organization
Minutes of April 25, 2000
UL 1116

Present: B. Burk, M. Fiander, V. Goodwin, J. Harmon, R. Halverson, J. Hehman, F. Huehls, M. Jafari, D. Lewis, M. McCormick, P. McWilliams, R. Stocker

The meeting was convened by M. Fiander, ULFO Chair.

Action Items

The minutes for March 29, 2000 were approved with no changes.

A motion to approve the revised agenda for today's meeting was made by R. Stocker and seconded by B. Burk.

Discussion Items

Vote: ULFO Bylaws Revision

R. Halverson reported the outcome of the online vote to revise the ULFO Bylaws (Revised 3.97). Ten votes were in favor of the revision; one vote was against. Article IV, Section E, of the Bylaws regarding online votes, specifies that a majority of votes cast is required for passage; the revised ULFO Bylaws, (Revised 4.00), with Duties of the Chair, and Duties of the Secretary, were approved.

Nominations for ULFO 2000/2001 Officers

The Nominating Committee will solicit nominations for ULFO Chair and Secretary by email. The entire ULFO membership is eligible. After obtaining permission from each nominee, a vote will be conducted online/or by anonymous campus mail.

V. Goodwin noted that candidates are also needed for next year's Primary Peer Review Committee. As this year's Chair Elect, Jim Baldwin will serve as Chair next year. Four additional committee members need to be selected. Members of the Primary Peer Review Committee must be tenured; Mary Stanley will provide a list of eligible candidates. Voting will be conducted online or by anonymous campus mail.

M. Fiander suggested that we develop written guidelines for ULFO committees for use in the future.

Discussion of Post-tenure review policy - definition of unsatisfactory

The document under discussion was drafted by the ULFO Post-tenure Review Committee, a committee made up of tenured and untenured librarians:

Proposed text for Post-tenure Review definition of unsatisfactory (4/00) University Libraries

Earlier definitions of "unsatisfactory" were included in the document "IUPUI Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement" as approved by the IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting, December 2, 1999. See URL: <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/reviewenhance991202.htm>

J. Hehman asked if the "Red Book", that is the *Library Faculty Handbook*, which we use as a reference for librarian policy, is consistent with the *Indiana University Academic Handbook*.

V. Goodwin - there is no conflict; the Red Book refers to other documents, such as the Academic Handbook to specify criteria for performance.

D. Lewis - the *Faculty Handbook* provides a “contract” developed by the Trustees of Indiana University. The Red Book interprets the standards that are relevant to librarians in the process of attaining promotion and tenure. Policy for post-tenure review goes beyond the scope of the Red Book. There is no system-wide post-tenure review. Policies must be negotiated campus by campus with approval by the Trustees. A “toothless” policy is in force in Bloomington.

D. Lewis -- we need to approve a post-tenure review policy, and establish a review committee.

V. Good win - we also need to include the issues of mitigating circumstances and lack of results in the policy.

M. McCormick - our document does require that effort be demonstrated.

D. Lewis - a due process portion is included in other documents, and is not necessarily needed in the definition of unsatisfactory. The effect of our policy statement is similar to that of the policy submitted by the Law School.

J. Harmon - the policy gives a library director a way to specify if someone were not going their job.

D. Lewis - exemplary achievement in professional development or service is not sufficient if performance is unsatisfactory. Satisfactory performance is a requirement regardless of other considerations. The relative emphasis upon professional development versus service for a librarian may be expected to vary year by year; achievement in these areas must be examined over the long run.

R. Stocker - to clarify, a definition of unsatisfactory comes into play when the supervisor makes that determination on an annual review.

M. Fiander - it would be good to refer to specific areas of University documentation so that we don't resume the same discussion on email that we are having here.

D. Lewis - we do need a definition of unsatisfactory soon. It would be helpful for me to construct a larger “wrap-around” document that would “contain” the definition of unsatisfactory. The larger document will specify who is on the Post-tenure review committee, and the process used. This policy would be needed only if someone received two consecutive ratings of unsatisfactory; thus we have some time to complete the policy development.

D. Lewis -- the Red Book does an adequate job of defining performance; however the definition of achievement is circular. What is meant by words such as “service” varies by academic area. Referring to a clear definition protects librarians if a campus review goes to a higher level.

D. Lewis - I will revise the definition of unsatisfactory and send out to the ULFO membership. Let's have a short presentation in May, during Team Week, so that I can verbally present the new draft, and respond to questions, to avoid ambiguity in wording.

We will want to draft the complete document of how we would handle a review no later than September.

M. McCormick - as a clarification, (the start of the last paragraph of the proposed text) let's replace the phrase “Evaluation will be based on” with “Determination of unsatisfactory will be based on”.

D. Lewis - I will add a statement regarding mitigating circumstances at the bottom of the policy to be considered in the determination of satisfactory performance. I will submit the revised definition to Michelle for dissemination to the membership before the May meeting. We need to ensure as large a level of participation as possible.

Future Agenda Items

Discuss the revised definition of unsatisfactory for the University Libraries Post-tenure Review policy.

Election Report: ULFO officers and Primary Peer Review Committee members for the 2000/2001 academic year.

Next Meeting

Wednesday, May 10, 3PM University Library Auditorium

-
Addendum – Revised definition of unsatisfactory

To maintain satisfactory performance librarians are expected to live up to the principles of tenure as stated in the Academic Handbook of Indiana University (June 1997).

"Librarians, on their part, are obligated to maintain high standards of professional service, research and creativity, and performance in the development of library services, and the communication of information and knowledge to others" (page 56).

The determination of unsatisfactory will entail consideration of total librarian activity in the following three areas: (1) performance; (2) professional development, and (3) professional and university service. These areas of performance are defined in the Indiana University Libraries Library Faculty Handbook.

In keeping with the principles of promotion and tenure for librarians, excellence in the area of performance is expected.

The determination of unsatisfactory will be based on, but not limited to, such factors as: (1) fulfilling professional responsibilities as defined in librarian's individual position description; (2) showing a demonstrable effort to continue to develop professional expertise and knowledge; (3) applying professional knowledge and expertise to the community's needs; (4) contributing to the library profession, (5) being an effective academic citizen through contributions to the overall well being of the libraries, the campus, or the university. Consideration will be giving to the effort made by the librarian to meet these standards and mitigating circumstances that might have effected his/her ability to do so.

Minutes submitted by Randall Halverson, ULFO Secretary