The meeting came to order in room 472B.

The task force

- Discussed the wording of a proposed revision of section 2.2.2. of the companion Search Manual, which deals with the makeup of search committees, suggesting the insertion of “primarily” after the words, “The committee consists of . . . makes a stronger case for a committee numerically dominated by library faculty who are in the affected department or who otherwise have relevant subject expertise.”

- Discussed the proper placement of the section on criteria for promotion and tenure vis-à-vis the section on appointment of library faculty.

- Inserted a “collegiality clause” among the criteria for tenure and promotion.

- Discussed whether or not we needed language covering situations where a librarian applied for promotion without also applying for tenure and whether the rarity of this occurrence justified covering it in the document.

- Discussed the challenges of assigning rank to a newly appointed librarian when the person has a thin record of scholarship and service, not uncommon when the candidate hails from outside academe. It was agreed that the candidate would be expected to have a record of service in a professional organization (ideally national or international) for a rank above assistant librarian.

- Reviewed language that external letters of support of candidates for tenure and promotion must come from colleagues at universities that are part of our official comparison group (e.g., the SEC) or better in the national rankings (i.e., peers or aspirant peers).

- Reviewed the criteria for judging when a body of completed scholarly work or artistic work would qualify as satisfactory. It was decided that the greatest weight should be placed on original research in books, book chapters, articles in professional journals, and the like, and that a dossier with fewer than two peer-reviewed items would suggest prima facie an insufficient quantity of research, unless that one work (e.g. a book) was very substantial, published by an outstanding press, and had received multiple positive reviews.
• Assigned ourselves the work of drafting language governing the title of Distinguished Professor, writing the final draft of the search committee portion of the document, and several other areas discussed but not yet finalized.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30

Tony Stankus, Secretary