University of Arkansas Libraries, Fayetteville, Arkansas
Faculty Monthly Meeting with the Dean
July 30, 2013

Policies Governing Faculty and Non-Classified Service
Addendum 3: Appointing and Assessing the Performance of Non-Tenure Track Faculty

The dean presented a draft of the Libraries’ policy document regarding appointing and assessing the performance of non-tenure track faculty for review and comment. The first page summarizes points made in Academic Policy Series 1405.12. This information is included so that persons reading the Libraries’ guidelines portion will not have to refer back to the campus policy in order to understand them.

The following corrections or suggestions for clarification were made:
- Insert “member” after the phrase “tenured library faculty” on #4.
- Change “research” to “scholarly contribution” on the last line of #5.
- Change “provided” to “required” in the first line of #6.
- Change “peers” to “coworkers or colleagues of the incumbent” in the last line of #6.

The “scholarly contribution” part of #5 is included to ensure that faculty are acknowledged for the work they do whether it is in their duties and responsibilities or not. #6 is meant to indicate that the review of documents by faculty members is not prohibited, but should continue as it presently does, with reviews conducted by request of the faculty member being reviewed.

The procedures outlined in this document are not what the faculty requested. They requested a process that is more open and collegial. This document ignores the input of the faculty and makes them not involved as a body, and leaves the process open to be manipulated, coerced, subject to favoritism, and undermines the role of the faculty as a body. It is detrimental to the atmosphere in the library.

The dean responded that we can’t change the university rules, and these documents came directly from the provost. Faculty do not have the right or authority to change documents regarding hiring; the administration consults them regarding job descriptions and job listings as a courtesy.

This is not the way other academic departments function. The Faculty Concerns Committee prepared their document based on what other colleges and departments are doing.

The dean responded that those faculty who do not want to accept these guidelines should take their concerns to another level, but to be sure to base their requests for exceptions on hard evidence and examples from other colleges, not anecdotal stories.
Department heads in other colleges are different than department heads in the Libraries. In the academic colleges, department heads can function autonomously (largely); whereas, department heads in the library are interdependent and do not work isolated from one another; we all operate together in the Libraries.

The dean responded that department heads do not make decisions for other departments; however, we do work together on decisions that will affect others, and that’s why we have department heads meetings.

**Budget Update**

Judy Ganson noted that although the Libraries’ books closed on June 30, the campus fiscal year does not end until July 31, so everything has not yet been finalized. We do have a carry forward amount in our budget, mostly deposit accounts in OCLC and Horrassowitz. The overall budget is about the same as last year. The collections base is the same, but we did receive an increase in the base for salaries and wages. We have an estimated amount for the student fee, which is not the full amount we asked for. We will also be getting 2% of indirect costs beginning July 1, but probably won’t see proceeds from that until next year’s budget, and we don’t know what that amount might be, if any. The Selectors met to determine priorities for expending funds for the next 2-3 years, including student funds. We intend to be careful stewards of the students’ money and purchase materials for their direct benefit.

Requests for travel exceeded the funds, and Judy will send out more information about travel requests later. Judy and Lora Lennertz-Jetton are reviewing equipment requests, including requests for two KIC and two Bookeye scanners. They are looking carefully at the programs and specific work load issues these equipment requests are expected to fulfill or resolve. They may be talking to individuals for more information on programs that will be impacted by specific equipment purchases.

Will indirect funds collected go to fund materials in the departments that generated the grants?

The dean responded that since we have no history with these funds yet, we really don’t know what the program will look like, so we will have to see how it all falls out. She expects to work closely with the deans and Jim Rankin to figure out how to allocate those funds. Since we have competing priorities, she expects that the funds will be directed toward those areas in the collections of the most critical need, and those that will most positively affect the university as a whole, rather than the department awarded the grant, but she cannot say what will happen until we see what comes to us. She expects the Selectors will allocate the funds with careful analysis and forethought into what are the university’s greatest needs.

Judy requested that those who have not yet done so, please turn in statistics ASAP.

**Revised Annual Report Policy**

Molly Boyd reported that the provost’s office had sent a revised annual report policy, which the faculty had a chance to review before the meeting. She pointed out that there is a new
emphasis on grants, and she may be contacting individual faculty members about grants if that
information was not included in their annual reports. The other change is the reporting period,
changing from the fiscal year to the calendar year, so this year’s report will include items from
July 1 (when our last year’s report ended) to December 31, 2012. No one will be asked to
rewrite their report, but Molly may contact individuals directly for clarification if needed. We
will explain the short reporting period in the overview at the beginning of the report. The
annual statistics is another problem, since we collect those for national reports like ACRL. The
dean advised everyone to collect data as they always have been, because we still need it for the
national reports.

Norma Johnson suggested that we collect the data on a monthly basis, like we used to do years
back, and that we put some mechanism into place to collect the data as it is gathered monthly
to be compiled at the academic calendar period, or whenever else we need it.

The dean agreed that might be a solution; we will need to investigate this issue further and
decide upon a suitable course of action. As we get used to this process, it will even itself out.
As for this year’s report, we intend to work with the numbers that we have and manipulate
them in a different way to get what we need.

The Academic Policy states the annual reports are supposed to be on reserve in the Libraries
until replaced by next year’s; there is nothing on reserve. There are two copies in the
University Archive and Special Collections, which seem to have been all assigned the same call
number, so that year of publication and department or reporting entity is confused. Amy Allen
does not currently put annual reports online, but is making plans to do so in the future; she will
look into the issue.

Remnant Trust Reminder
The dean reminded everyone about the Remnant Trust deadline to order materials for the
spring 2014 semester. She also noted that half of the funds for the exhibit was given by the
Division of Student Affairs.

Reports and Updates
Donna Daniels reported that the search committee for the assistant head of Special Collections
is finishing up their telephone interviews with candidates. They had 42 applicants. They had
trouble using Skype. They expect to interview candidates at the end of August.

Necia Parker-Gibson reported that the search committee for the English and Communications
Librarian had more than 70 applicants, which they had narrowed to about a dozen candidates,
and would begin their Skype interviews shortly.

One Book, One Community titles have not yet been ordered for the Libraries. Martha will send
out an email. After having served on the One Book One Community Advisory Committee since
its inception, Necia Parker-Gibson will be replaced by Sarah Spiegel. As in previous years, the
author will visit, there will be collaboration with FPL; however, this year the Comp courses will
not use the book in their classes. Instead, the title has been suggested to instructors of the Perspectives course.

Kathleen Lehman reported that the University Perspectives course had 90 sections in the fall, and 44 sections in the spring, mostly of Honors College students. There will be an online model and an in class component. A graduate assistant does all of the online components. The provost has emphasized that this is an academic course, so the instructors must engage the students in thinking and learning. The textbook may not be ready until after classes have begun. The College of Engineering and Walton College are both exempt as they both already have a robust freshman program that is producing good results. The course is open to all first time, full time students and is a prerequisite to registering for courses as a sophomore. Transfer students are not required to take it.

Patricia Kirkwood reported that the College of Engineering has developed an 8-week online version of their freshman course, which will be made available free to students, and which may appeal to transfer and non-traditional students.

The University Perspectives course is aimed at retention and improving graduate rates. Information about library resources is included in the week on university resources. There is an application form on the provost’s website for those wishing to teach the course. The dean encouraged faculty to volunteer if possible to teach.

The School of Architecture has student mentors.