

# THE ROAD TO FACULTY STATUS

1968 - 1974

DATE	EVENT	DOCUMENT
January 25, 1968	"Byrnes Report"	<a href="#">Faculty Council Document #12</a>
April 28, 1969	Univ. Library Committee Report	<a href="#">Report on the Status of Librarians Comm. Report</a>
June 3, 1969	BFC Approves ULC Report	<a href="#">IU Interdepart. Communication; June 5, 1969</a>
February 16, 1970	Comm. On Career Status of Library Personnel	<a href="#">InULA Scoop Sheet (8 May 1970), p.2</a>
May 1971	Final Carmony Report	<a href="#">IU Interdepart. Communication-Enclosure; March 24, 1972</a>
February 25, 1972	Board of Trustees Approves Ranks	<a href="#">IU Board of Trustees Minutes</a>
June 30, 1972	Board of Trustees Approves Tenure	<a href="#">IU Board of Trustees Minutes</a>
February 12, 1974	BFC Approves Equal Rights for Librarians and Faculty in Constitution	<a href="#">Daily Herald-Telephone, Bloomington, IN Wed., Feb. 13, 1974, p.5</a>
May 10, 1974	Board of Trustees Approves Ranks and Tenure by Name	<a href="#">Indiana University Faculty Newsletter (Vol. XXIII, No. 10) June 14, 1974, p. [11]-12</a>
July 1, 1974	Effective date of initial rank and tenure appointment for librarians	

## **Report of Section Committee on the University Library**

[Byrnes Report]

A university library is a large and complicated organism which provides a tremendous variety of services to thousands of students and faculty for sixteen hours of the day, more than three hundred and sixty days of the year. It is a living storehouse of the accumulated knowledge and wisdom of the ages, and it is unlike most other organs and institutions in that its value and utility grow with age, provided it receives proper nurture and direction. Above all, a library is the intellectual center of the university, more so than ever during these days of explosions in knowledge and in interest in teaching and learning.

A university is an even larger and more complicated organism than the library. Moreover, it is difficult even for a senior administrator well acquainted with the entire university to place the library and the many other parts of the university in proper focus when making decisions concerning the optimum use of available resources for the university as a whole for the next year or two, and for future generations as well. Difficult or not, strategic decisions of this kind must be made and are made, consciously or not.

The members of this appointed section committee are all members of the university community, committed to the improvements of the university as a whole. We know something about various parts of this university, and we also have some information concerning a number of other universities. We are aware that this university, like all universities, has certain weaknesses, and that it faces more demands upon its resources than it can satisfy. We have studied carefully the entire University Study Committee Report, particularly that section which dealt with the library. We have studied as well numerous other studies made in recent years concerning the library, and we have also considered the host of problems universities, and their libraries as well, will face in the future. We have consulted with numerous colleagues, within the library and beyond it, before making our recommendations. In fact, we believe that our analyses and recommendations reflect the views of many of our colleagues throughout the university who seek true excellence for Indiana and who are convinced that this great goal cannot be achieved unless a great library is at its core.

Supporting evidence and the basic explanations for our recommendations can be found in the University Study Committee Report, Growth and Change at Indiana University, (February, 1966), 267-270, 355, 390-406, which contains an analysis of the Bloomington libraries and of its needs for the following decade, and in Faculty Council Document No. 12., which was discussed briefly in the Council on January 16. Both documents describe the substantial progress which has been made. The second one in particular defines the critical nature of the problems facing the university and suggests a number of steps many believe should be taken at once.

The various recommendations which follow are substantially those made in the original section committee report. However, we have followed the suggestions made in the meeting and have

identified those proposals which should be decisions of the Council and those which should be resolutions. We have also separated the proposals according to the administrator or administrators to whom they should be directed.

Further information supporting these proposals will be presented at the Faculty Council meeting.

We present this report for discussion and for action by the Council, with the Council voting upon the report as a whole, the eight groups of proposals or the individual proposals, as it chooses.

## Recommendations

### I. Resolutions from the Faculty Council to the President and the Board of Trustees.

1. That the transformation of the university library into one of high excellence in book collection and in services be the first priority for the university for the next decade.
  
2. That "the projected doubling of library expenditures by 1974-1975 over 1964-1965 should be regarded as minimal." This is the first and the major recommendation concerning the library by the University Study Committee. (Growth and Change at Indiana University, P. 355.)

The University Study Committee just two years ago recommended the following figures for the purchase of books and periodicals as a minimum requirement to main-tain the library on the Bloomington Campus as an adequate one, but noted that even these "will probably prove to be inadequate if major new areas of study and research are to be developed."

\$1,400,000	1967-1968
1,600,000	1968-1969
1,700,000	1969-1970
1,830,000	1970-1971
1,975,000	1971-1972
2,125,000	1972-1973
2,300,000	1973-1974
2,500,000	1974-1975

This recommendation rested on the assumption that "the library situation at Indiana University is on the whole a satisfactory one," an estimate with which many in the university do not agree. University funds allotted for book purchases for 1967-1968 for the Bloomington campus were \$900,000, or \$500,000 less than the amount recommended as minimal. In short, to reach the minimum figure suggested by the University Study Committee for the library on the Bloomington campus for next year, the university should increase its investment in the book fund from \$900,000 to \$1,600,000.

The magnitude of the increase required supports our proposal that the library be given first priority for the next decade because the increases necessary for the book fund and expanded services cannot be assigned in any other way. Failure to reach the figure suggested by the University Study Committee for a second consecutive year will, of course, only intensify our problems and increase the need to make the library our first priority.

One should not forget that inflation hangs over our heads and will make our library problem ever more serious, particularly if the university should delay assigning it top priority.

3. That a drive for \$5,000,000 to enable the library to catch up with the university's requirements should be the central part of the Sesquicentennial Capital Drive,
4. That the President and the Trustees should request the President of the Indiana University Foundation to consider establishing an organization called the Friends of the Indiana University Library to increase understanding of and to attract support for our libraries and their services from those friends of the university who might become especially interested. Completion of the new building and the move into it will provide a particularly appropriate time to establish such an association.
5. That the university through its University Relations Office should launch a determined and prolonged campaign to inform the students, parents, alumni, friends, and trustees of the university and the people of the state concerning the nature and needs of the library.

II. Resolutions from the Faculty Council to the Committee on Academic Development.

6. That the Dean for Undergraduate Development, appropriate library officers and the student representatives on the University Library Committee participate in decisions concerning space and facilities for libraries in new residence centers.

III. Resolutions from the Faculty Council to the Dean of Faculties.

7. That no new programs, fields of study, or departments should be established without an appropriate increase in the book fund and in the budget for library staff.
8. That no addition should be made to the faculty without the simultaneous addition of, say, \$3,000 to the permanent book fund of the library.
9. That the university in making its budget for 1969-1971 and thereafter should accept, as a minimum, the book fund figures proposed by the University Study Committee. To assist the university thereafter in reaching the required goals for library expenditure, it should add a formula providing that the funds for the library be increased by \$100,000 annually for every 1,000 undergraduates over 20,000 on the Bloomington campus and by \$100,000 annually for every 500 graduate students in Bloomington and in the Indianapolis professional schools over 7,000. In short, the library budget should rise automatically as the student body grows and changes in character.
10. That the university in its budget for 1969-1971 and thereafter should create and thereafter follow a similar formula for the regional campuses.

IV. Resolution from the Faculty Council to the Dean of Faculties and the Dean of Advanced Studies.

11. That every application from any part of the university to a foundation or government agency for special funds for research or instruction should, whenever possible, include a portion destined for the library and acceptable to the library administration and that a fixed portion (say 15 percent) of the overhead funds of any grant not including funds for the library be allotted to the library.

V. Resolution from the Faculty Council to the Dean of Faculties, the Director of Libraries, and the University Librarian

12. That the numbers and quality of the library staff must continue to rise rapidly. In particular, the status, prestige, position in the university, and salaries of the professional staff must advance significantly. Professional or academic employees should be considered members of the faculty. They should be encouraged to devote every third summer to research and to improve their skills, applying for these opportunities as faculty members do for sabbaticals.
13. That the amount of money available for salary increases for the professional library staff for 1968-1969 and subsequent years be substantially increased until the salary level of the staff shall have reached at least the level of that of other major universities such as Illinois and Toronto. Thus, salaries for the library professional staff should rise more rapidly than those of the faculty, perhaps twice as much in 1968-1969 as those of the faculty, with the decision on each individual naturally based on merit.

VI. Resolution from the Faculty Council to the Director of Libraries and the University Librarian.

14. That the library should create a new unit, staffed by systems personnel, to maintain a constant review of its operations, particularly as they may be affected by new technology, the opportunities offered by the new building, and the evident need for considerably increased and improved services.
15. That the university library administration should appoint a scholar-librarian as assistant director for international programs and should establish central collections of reference works, periodicals, newspapers, and books in the stacks of the new research library for our strongest foreign area study programs.

VII. Decisions by the Faculty Council.

16. The Director of Libraries should be made an ex officio member of the Faculty Council.

17. The Faculty Library Committee should become the University Library Committee. It should advise the Library administration and the university concerning the library's policies, organization, budget, procedures, services, and efforts to improve its resources through inter-institutional cooperation and modern technology.
  - a. The nine faculty members of this body should be elected by the Faculty Council, with three new members elected each year for three-year terms. In the first election, which should be held as soon as administratively possible, those nominees who receive the most votes should serve three years, those who receive the next highest number of votes two years, and the last three one year.
  - b. The Committee should always have at least one member from a regional campus. In the first election, that member of the regional campus faculty group who receives the highest number of votes given to a regional campus faculty member should be one of these serving three years.
  - c. The Student Senate should elect two members, one an undergraduate and one a graduate student, for two-year terms, with the graduate student member elected for the first time serving only one year and one new student member being elected each year thereafter.
  - d. The Director of Libraries, the University Librarian, and the Assistant Director of Libraries in charge of Regional Campus Library Development should be non-voting members of the committee.
  - e. The chairman of the University Library Committee should be elected by its members.
  - f. The chairman should report at least once each year to the Faculty Council.

VIII. Resolutions from the Faculty Council to the University Library Committee.

18. That the University Library Committee as its first step should arrange for a review of the organization, policies, and operations of the library system. The forthcoming move and predicted heavy increase in student and faculty use in the new building suggest that this is a particularly appropriate time for such an analysis.
19. That the University Library Committee appoint a subcommittee to make a thorough review of the regional campus libraries, the regional campus library system, and the position these libraries should occupy in the university and in the university library system. The subcommittee should report its recommendations to the University Library Committee and through it to the Faculty Council.
20. That the University Library Committee consider the following recommendations made by the University Study Committee.
  1. The continuation of branch libraries is highly desirable. (p. 268).

2. If the accepted recommendations for an under-graduate college system are accepted, a substantial effort must be made to provide an adequate general library in each college. (p. 268).
3. Libraries in the halls of residence should not be limited in their finances to profits from vending machines; they should be assisted by increasing general fund appropriations. (p. 268--269).
4. Volumes in special department, school, or independent collections (not private faculty) no matter how they are paid for, should be listed in the main library catalogue. (pp. 269--270).

- Robert F. Byrnes (Chairman)
- Miguel Enguidanos
- Ann F. Painter

Faculty Council  
Circular #86  
April 28, 1969

## REPORT ON THE STATUS OF LIBRARIANS

[University Library Committee Report]

### Summary of Recommendations

The University Library Committee recommends that:

1. Professional librarians be accorded full faculty status;
2. A special committee be established to formulate principles and procedures for determining faculty rank of librarians and to revise where necessary the language of the Faculty Handbook to reflect the proposed change.

### Terms of Reference

A study of the status of librarians in Indiana University was included in the University Library Committee's terms of reference specified in the May 1968 report of the Byrnes committee and adopted by the Faculty Council. The report provided (para. 12):

That the numbers and quality of the library staff must continue to rise rapidly. In particular, the status, prestige, position in the University, and salaries of the professional staff must advance significantly. Professional or academic employees should be considered members of the faculty. They should be encouraged to devote every third summer to research and to improve their skills, applying for these opportunities as faculty members do for sabbaticals. It is not quite clear that the Byrnes Committee was hereby specifically recommending that professional librarians be accorded full faculty status; it is even less clear that the Faculty Council adopted the Committee's report with the understanding that it was so recommending. Arguments for either of these positions can be made but, since the matter is important enough to warrant detailed discussion, the University Library Committee in making its recommendations to the Faculty Council has decided to treat the topic de novo.

During the current academic year an ad hoc committee of professional librarians was formed which studied the matter at length and concluded that librarians should have full faculty status. This committee met with individual members of the University Library Committee and was invited to several of its sessions. The members of the ad hoc committee also prepared reports on various aspects of the problem (the development of faculty status for librarians, role of the librarian in the modern university, a profile of the librarians at Indiana University, the application of the criteria for faculty rank to librarians). The comments and reports of the ad hoc committee of librarians were of great help to the University Library Committee.

## Earlier Consideration of the Matter

The most recent official study of the topic at hand at I.U. was conducted in 1950, when a committee, appointed by the Faculty Council and chaired by Professor Edward H. Buehrig, reported on a "request of professional librarians for faculty status." The committee recommended that professional librarians be placed under the administrative control of the Dean of Faculties, that they be made eligible for participation in the TIAA retirement plan, they be granted parking privileges and be included in faculty mailing lists. Its recommendations were accepted by the Faculty Council and largely implemented by the University so that in these respects librarians are today in a position quite similar to, although not fully identical with, that of faculty members. The 1950 committee, however, rejected the suggestion that librarians should be given full faculty status, chiefly on the ground "that academic title should be accorded only to individuals doing teaching and/or research as a part of their regularly constituted duties." The committee explained that it had "proceeded on the principle that different professions should have separate identities," and that, while recognizing "the close association between the functions of the librarian and those of the teacher," it felt that "to lump both together is illogical and confusing." For these reasons it recommended that the Faculty Council not act favorably on the librarians' request with respect to sabbatical leaves, academic tenure and equality of salaries, pointing out, with respect to the first two, that "the suppositions of research and academic freedom which respectively underlie these practices do not seem to be applicable to the profession of librarian," and with respect to the last, that "there is no convenient or satisfactory basis for equating salaries in the absence of academic title for librarians and also the twelve-months contract under which librarians are employed is a factor which makes comparison difficult." The Faculty Council accepted the recommendations of the committee.

## Consequences of the Change in Status

Admission of professional librarians to faculty status entails a number of consequences or "benefits". These may be conveniently listed as follows:

- a. Prestige and dignity of the academic title;
- b. Participation in university governance, including voting for and membership in the Faculty Council, membership in university committees and other bodies, etc.;
- c. Application of strict academic criteria for promotion in rank;
- d. Eligibility for conferral of tenure, when meeting the appropriate academic standards;
- e. Eligibility for sabbatical leave for research and study;
- f. Inclusion in various plans and benefits available to faculty (retirement, parking, etc.).

The benefits in category (f) appear to be already substantially granted to librarians at I.U., so that the change in status entails no serious budgetary consequences in this respect. Of the other benefits, only the eligibility for sabbatical leave might raise minor budgetary problems. The Library administration expects the expenditure for sabbaticals in the next few years to amount to no more than twenty to thirty thousand dollars (\$20,000 - \$30,000) per year. All in all, no serious budgetary problems appear to arise.

## The Case Against Faculty Status

The report of the 1950 Buehrig Committee was quoted at some length above because it states succinctly and accurately the argumentation against conferral of faculty status. It may be too blunt but not unfair to say that the argument essentially involves a denial of sufficient similarity between librarians and faculty members in a university, on the related grounds that, first, librarians are not involved in teaching, and second, their work is not in itself scholarly but is rather a species of skilled clerical work. The conclusion drawn from this basic dissimilarity is that there is neither need nor justification for granting to librarians the specific kind of treatment granted to faculty members.

## The Case for Faculty Status

It is not necessary to consider the validity of such arguments in the past. Whatever the situation at the time the 1950 committee presented its report to the Faculty Council, the university, the university atmosphere and the function and attitudes of librarians have evolved considerably since then.

Today, the basic argument in favor of full faculty status is that librarians are and should be professional scholars and therefore should be recognized and treated as such. Their work is essentially scholarly in nature, more nearly comparable to the work of faculty members than to that of administrators or clerical personnel.

That the function and position of librarians are not identical to those of the traditional liberal arts teacher seems evident on its face. It should be remembered, however, that the present-day university includes a variety of departments and faculties the function and position of the members of which differ considerably from those of the traditional liberal arts teacher. Possession of academic graduate degrees, particularly the Ph.D., is not required in several schools, professional or near-professional in character: Music, Fine Arts, Law, Optometry, Medicine. The distinction between teaching and research is not always easy to make in some of the natural sciences. Involvement in social service to a given "clientele" is part of the university training in medicine, social service and other disciplines, including now law.

Although many librarians are engaged in regular or occasional teaching, more or less in the traditional manner, it is their role within the library that justifies principally their academic status. The university library is an integral part of the university; discovery of the library and utilization of its resources are essential learning experiences for students, undergraduate and graduate. Today's curriculum tends increasingly toward reliance on independent study; it is not therefore an exaggeration to say that for many purposes the teaching function is transferred from the classroom to the library. As specialists in research methods and procedures, librarians are thus involved in the teaching process within the university as intimately as other faculty members.

It follows that librarians are as much in need of protection for the free expression of their ideas and opinions as any other faculty member. Differences of opinion among librarians, as among other faculty members, often reflect differing conceptions of their task and their scholarly subject

matter. To the extent, therefore, that the various perquisites of faculty status are designed to protect academic freedom, librarians need that status as much as the other members of the university community.

With respect to the other accepted facets of a faculty member's activity, comparison is much easier. Librarians engage in research and publication, essentially similar to that of teaching faculty members. Research activities within the library extend from bibliographic research to substantive research on particular subjects to the production and interpretation of one of the finest research tools in existence, the library catalog. Mastery of scholarly methods, familiarity with foreign languages, and in-depth knowledge of subject fields are required of any good librarian; it may be said, indeed, that because of continued demands from all sides librarians are required to remain up to date in their disciplines and constantly to practice their scholarship more than many faculty members.

With respect to the third facet of a faculty member's activity, professional service, the position of librarians is indistinguishable from that of other faculty members. Librarians are called upon to participate in professional activities relating to library research and study as well as to specific subject disciplines. Librarians have considerably enhanced the reputation of many institutions through their professional pursuits, which include presentation of papers at professional meetings, consultations within or outside the university, publication of scholarly work, etc.

Another important, although by itself not controlling, argument in favor of full faculty status for librarians is the existence today in American universities of a definite trend toward recognition of faculty status. This trend has gained such momentum over several decades that currently those institutions which do not provide such status are at a marked disadvantage in recruiting and retaining well-qualified librarians. Over half of the colleges and universities in the country have granted full faculty status or its equivalent to their professional librarians. The Midwest has pioneered in such recognition. Illinois and Ohio State have accorded full status and rank to professional librarians. Minnesota and Wisconsin are divided, with over half of their librarians holding faculty status and rank and the other under civil service. Michigan State and Iowa have accorded faculty status with equivalent ranks. In Indiana itself, Purdue, Indiana State and Ball State provide full faculty status and rank to their professional librarians.

All the above considerations militate in favor of the present proposal. The possible argument that, once faculty status is extended to librarians, other groups will seek similar status, is in no way persuasive. The accepted tests for faculty status remain valid and are not weakened by recognition of the fact that librarians do meet them. Any other group claiming faculty status will have to make its case, as the librarians have done, and will be judged on its own merits. It is both inaccurate and unfair to compare the rational processes of faculty action in such matters to the mechanical operation of floodgates which, once opened, cannot be closed.

### The Responsibilities of Faculty Status

In proposing this change of status for professional librarians, the University Library Committee perceives it as involving both recognition of the present role of librarians in the university and encouragement and inducement for further development of librarians along these lines. While it

is useful to consider faculty status in terms of its privileges and benefits, the responsibilities that it entails are more important. These include, a professional scholarly attitude; participation in academic decisions through service on university committees, councils and other bodies; active participation in professional-campus, regional and national-organizations; engaging in research and publication; in sum, a commitment and dedication to the educational process within the university. Clearly, librarians have already assumed several of these responsibilities; the change in status would encourage them to do so with even greater zeal and would thereby greatly promote the interests of the university community.

It is thus misleading to consider the proposed conferral of faculty status as a mere benefit magnanimously to be granted by the university to the librarians. In terms of conditions of employment, indeed, it is doubtful that they would gain by such a change in status; sabbaticals would be available to them, but they would now be subject to strict academic criteria for promotions in rank and salary increases and to the potentially harsh consequences of tenure decisions. The Committee's proposals therefore should be understood and judged with reference to the interest and benefit of the university and the university community.

#### Implementation of the Change in Status

In conferring faculty status upon librarians universities have generally chosen between two courses of action. Some universities have granted full faculty status, with academic rank and titles identical to those of other faculty members (instructor assistant professor, associate professor, professor). Others have formally recognized librarians as members of the faculty but have devised corresponding equivalent ranks and titles (e.g., assistant librarian, senior assistant librarian, associate librarian, librarian). In the Committee's opinion, no useful purpose would be served by such differentiation in title. Establishment of a cumbersome parallel hierarchy (if titles can only be defended on the ground of significant need and no need has been shown to exist. Insistence on semantic differentiation may even be seen as contradicting the very equality of academic status which this proposal seeks to establish. The purpose of the proposed change in status is to signify the academic role of the librarian as scholar and as valuable member of the university faculty. Since the normal title for faculty members is the professorial one, the Committee recommends that the librarians' ranks and titles should be identical to those of other faculty members.

Implementation of the proposed change in status will require amendment of the Faculty Handbook, whenever it expresses differentiation between faculty members and librarians. In some cases, for instance, with respect to promotion and tenure and the criteria therefore, no actual change in the language now used may be necessary, but the existing understanding as to its interpretation (e.g., as to external evidence of performance) will have to be made to fit the situation of librarians. The ad hoc committee of librarians has formulated certain valuable suggestions in this respect; their report entitled "Application of Faculty Status to Librarians," is appended.

More difficult problems may arise with respect to the assignment of faculty rank and titles to the persons already serving at the Indiana University Library. The Committee is anxious that their

interests be respected in all regards and that the change in status not have any adverse effects on them.

The University Library Committee recommends therefore that a special committee be established to guide and supervise the process of implementation of status change. Reflecting the interests involved, this committee should be composed of persons representing the administration, the faculty at large and the professional librarians. Its task will be temporary in character and will have been discharged when the move of librarians to full faculty status will have been completed.

#### Recommendations

The University Library Committee recommends that:

1. Professional librarians be accorded full faculty status effective September 1, 1969;
2. A special committee be established, composed of three (3) administrative officials (including members of the library administration), appointed by the Dean of Faculties, three (3) professional librarians, elected by the university's professional librarians, and three (3) non-library faculty members, elected by the Faculty Council, (a) to formulate principles and procedures for determining the faculty rank of individual librarians and (b) to revise where necessary the language of the Faculty Handbook (on promotion and tenure, retirement plans, and other matters) to reflect the proposed change in the librarians' status.

Submitted by the University Library Committee  
April 28, 1969

- A. A. Fatouros
- V. J. Shiner
- Philip Headings
- Quentin Hope
- J. Gus Liebenow
- Ann Painter
- William Studer
- Cecil Byrd
- R.A. Miller
- J. Albert Robbins

# INDIANA UNIVERSITY

## INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

TO: All Librarians

FROM: Committee on Academic Status

DEPT.

DEPT.

SUBJECT: Faculty Status

DATE: June 5, 1969

At its meeting of June 3, 1969, the Faculty Council unanimously approved the following Recommendations submitted to it by the University Library Committee:

1. That professional librarians be accorded full faculty status effective September 1, 1969;
2. That a special committee be established, composed of three (3) administrative officials (including members of the library administration) appointed by the Dean of Faculties, three (3) professional librarians elected by the university's professional librarians, and three (3) non-library faculty members, elected by the Faculty Council, (a) to formulate principles and procedures for determining the faculty rank of individual librarians and (b) to revise where necessary the language of the Faculty Handbook (on promotion and tenure, retirement plans, and other matters) to reflect the proposed change in the librarians' status .

While this is a significant milestone on the way to achieving full faculty status, the University administration and the Board of Trustees must still approve the Faculty Council's recommendations. We are hopeful that their favorable decision will be forthcoming early next Fall, if not earlier.

We owe a strong vote of thanks to Professor Vernon L. Shiner, Chairman of the Faculty Library Committee, and other members of his committee, for their unstinting efforts on our behalf. Without their strong recommendation and their effort to get the issue before the Faculty Council this term, we would not have achieved this major success. The Committee on Academic Status will send a letter of appreciation to Professor Shiner and the Faculty Library Committee, and we hope that those of you who know members of the Library Committee will extend to them your thanks.

# **Report of the Committee on the Career Status Of Library Personnel**

**InULA Scoop Sheet (8 May 1970), p. 2**

On February 16, 1970 Joseph Hartley, Vice-President and Dean for Academic Affairs formalized the appointment of a nine-member Committee on the Career Status of Library Person The members elected by the librarians are Margaret Coolman (RCL), Thomas Michalak (formerly of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Status), and Alan Taylor (representing Bloomington librarians). The members elected by the Faculty Council are Jared Curtis (English), Donald Carmony (History), and Donald Richards (Fort Wayne). In addition, Vice-President Hartley appointed Dean Roger Buck, Vice-Chancellor John Buhner (I.U.-P.U.I.) and Dean Rufus Reiberg (Regional Campuses) as regular members, and Jane Flener and Dean Bernard Fry as consultants to the Committee. Professor Carmony was designated Chairman; Terry Olsen was elected to serve as Secretary.

The Committee is meeting on alternate Tuesdays. The first two meetings were largely concerned with educating the non-librarians about the nature of academic librarianship and with describing the internal structures of the various library systems throughout the whole University.

At the request of the Chairman the librarian members prepared three circulars outlining the direction which they believed the Committee should pursue in making its recommendations. The circulars reflected the following broad points of view:

- a. that the University Libraries should be treated like a school within the University and
- b. that the Library faculty should be integrated with the regular teaching faculty and
- c. that librarians currently on the staff should be given the option of remaining on the staff under present conditions, or of adopting faculty status with all the responsibilities as well as the privileges implicit in the change of status.

The librarians believe that the system employed at the University of Oregon presented a viable model and attempted to construct suitable analogs whereby all librarians currently on academic appointment could, if they so desired, transfer smoothly to faculty status.

This plan did not meet with the approval of some committee members who foresaw some serious disadvantages to librarians. The Chairman established a sub-committee to explore other possibilities, one of which seemed to resemble the Purdue model, and this is currently under investigation by both the Chairman's and librarians' sub-committees.

What progress has been made so far is entirely of an intangible nature. The faculty members are beginning to grasp the diversity of roles and tasks performed by librarians, and to understand the importance of library experience in molding the competent librarian. At the same time the library members are gaining a fuller understanding of the complexity and the flexibility -- not to say inconsistency -- with which Indiana University has developed its faculties in Bloomington Indianapolis and the five regional campuses.

- Alan Taylor
- Margaret Coolman

# COMMITTEE ON THE CAREER STATUS OF LIBRARY PERSONNEL

[Carmony Committee - Final Report]

[March 1972]

We, the undersigned members of the Committee on the Career Status of Personnel, recommend that:

1. The term librarian in these recommendations be applied to those individuals on academic appointment who hold the master's degree in library science or the equivalent, and who have been appointed as Librarians in one of the Library systems of Indiana University.
2. A structure of ranks analogous to those of the teaching faculty be established for Librarians.
  - a. The ranks for Librarians shall be: Assistant Librarian, Senior Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, Librarian. (Qualifications and general criteria for these ranks are set out in Appendix I).
  - b. Advancement within the library ranks shall be by promotion, independent of promotion in administrative rank, after evaluation of the Librarian by a Librarians Promotions (or Promotions and Tenure) Committee. The Head of each library system shall forward the Committee's recommendations, together with his own recommendations, to the appropriate administrative officers of the University.
3. The Librarians, through the Promotions (or Promotions and Tenure) Committee, shall establish criteria for promotion and tenure based on the suggested criteria as set out in Appendix I.
4. Subject to the provisions which follow, a person appointed as a Librarian to one of the Indiana University Library systems, shall have tenure after a probationary period of seven years.
  1. In general the same procedures which govern tenure determinations (i.e. probationary period, termination of probationary service, non-reappointment, appeal procedures, etc.) for members of the teaching faculty shall be applicable to Librarians.
  2. A Librarians Tenure Committee (or Promotions and Tenure Committee) shall make recommendations concerning tenure to the administrative head of each library system, who shall forward them, together with his own recommendations, to the appropriate university administrative officers.
  3. Librarian whose initial appointment is to one of the upper three ranks may be granted a shorter probationary period towards tenure, the period to be mutually agreed upon and indicated in writing at the time of appointment.
5. In recognition of the importance of the role and contribution of Librarians to the University, the salaries of Librarians should be raised to levels which reflect their responsibilities, experience, and expertise.
6. Librarians be eligible for university grants, fellowships, and research funds.

7. The rules governing retirement and disability which are applicable to members of the teaching faculty be applied to Librarians.
8. For the purposes of applying the rules governing TIAA and other fringe benefits the library ranks Assistant Librarian, Senior Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian and Librarian be regarded as equivalent to Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor.
9. \* Librarians be eligible to vote for members of the All-University Faculty Council, and for members of the faculty governing bodies on their respective campuses.
10. \* Librarians be eligible to make nominations for, and to serve on, the All-University Faculty Council and the faculty governing bodies on their respective campuses.
11. Librarians be eligible to serve on Faculty Council committees, on administrative and other committees of the particular campuses, and on All- University committees.
12. Librarians be eligible for leaves with pay where the objectives are to improve professional competence in the following manner:
  - a. One semester at full pay every seven years, or
  - b. Two semesters at half pay every seven years, or
  - c. Every third regular Summer Session at full pay.

Each library system shall establish a Committee on Leaves representing both administrative and non-administrative members of the Libraries' staff to consider and approve, modify, or reject Librarians' proposals for leave. The head of each library system shall forward the committee's recommendations, together with his own recommendations, to the appropriate university administrative officers.

13. Librarians be encouraged to undertake programs of study and/or research which will lead to the improvement of professional competence. Towards that end we recommend:
  - a. greater flexibility in scheduling, and
  - b. leaves without pay, particularly in the summer

for those Librarians requesting time for professional development, subject to the Libraries' needs to maintain services at an appropriate level.

14. That those Librarians who already hold faculty rank and title in the University or in one of its departments or schools continue to do so in addition to holding library rank and tenure in the appropriate library system.

\* All members of the committee agree that Librarians should be represented on such bodies as the All-University Faculty Council and the faculty governing body for each campus. Most members of the committee believe that Librarians should vote for and be eligible to serve on such bodies in the same manner as do members of the faculty. Two members, however, Dean Buck and Professor Carmony, believe that it is more appropriate for Librarians to vote as a separate group and have separate representation.

NOTE: It is recommended and deemed essential that all individuals holding regular academic appointments as a librarian anywhere within the University be included in and covered by the substance and intent of the policies and practices set forth in this report. Under existing administrative structure of the University, it is presumed that the vast majority of librarians will be embraced within one of the three following units for administration of such policies and practices: Bloomington campus; Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis; Regional campuses (including personnel at Bloomington attached there to). For librarians in particular departments, schools, or other units not included within the major systems noted above, it is recommended that the policies and practices here set forth be administered under the direction and subject to the review of the Director of University Libraries and other appropriate University officials.

# Indiana University Board of Trustees Action - February 25, 1972

## Career Status - Professional Librarians

4.N. Approval of the Board was requested of the following recommendations concerning the career status of professional librarians in the library system of Indiana University:

1. A progression of ranks shall be established for Librarians as follows: Affiliate Librarian, Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, Librarian.
2. Advancement within the library ranks shall be by promotion. Recommendations for promotion in rank shall be processed as follows:
  - a. recommendation prepared by supervisor of person under consideration and forwarded to the head of the appropriate library division for action;
  - b. recommendations of the head of each library division are forwarded to the appropriate chancellor for review and recommended action;
  - c. Chancellors' recommendations are forwarded to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs for review by an all-university librarians promotions committee appointed by the President in consultation with the Director of Libraries;
  - d. recommendations of the all-university librarians promotions committee are transmitted to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs for review by the Director of Libraries and for presentation to the Board of Trustees.
3. A leave program shall be established for librarians which will be administered as part of the faculty sabbatical leave program. The same policies and criteria applied to faculty applications for leave shall be applied to requests from librarians.
4. The rules governing retirement for reason of disability which are applicable to members of the teaching faculty shall be applied to Librarians.

The above personnel matters were unanimously approved, on motion duly made and seconded.

# Indiana University Board of Trustees Action - June 30, 1972

## Library Tenure for Professional Librarians

4.K. It was recommended that subject to the provisions which follow, a person appointed as a professional librarian in the Indiana University Library system shall have Library tenure after the same probationary period that is applicable to the faculty:

- A. In general the same procedures which govern faculty tenure determinations (i.e., probationary period, termination of probationary service, non-reappointment, appeal procedures, etc.) for members of the teaching faculty shall be applicable to professional librarians.
- B. Recommendations for tenure shall be processed as follows:
  - 1. Recommendations prepared by supervisor of person under consideration and forwarded to the head of the appropriate library division for action;
  - 2. Recommendations of the head of each library division are forwarded to the appropriate chancellor for review and recommended action;
  - 3. Chancellors' recommendations are forwarded to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs for review by an all-University librarians tenure committee appointed by the President in consultation with the Director of Libraries;
  - 4. Recommendations of the all-University librarians tenure committee are transmitted to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs for review by the Director of Libraries and for presentation to the Board of Trustees.
- C. The above tenure provisions would apply to all professional librarians presently employed in the University Library System who elect to be assigned one of the library ranks approve by the Board of Trustees on February 25, 1972. Tenure status or years of credit towards tenure of professional librarians presently employed would be determined by the procedures outlined above.
- D. The provisions of sections A and B above would automatically apply to all newly appointed professional librarians.
- E. A Librarian whose initial appointment is to one of the upper three ranks may be granted a shorter probationary period towards library tenure, the period to be mutually agreed upon and indicated in writing at the time of appointment.

# Daily Herald-Telephone, Bloomington, Indiana

Wednesday, February 13, 1974, page 5

Librarians gain faculty rights in proposed IU constitution

By John Fancher

H-T Civic Affairs Editor

Professional librarians on the Bloomington campus were embraced as part of the Indiana University community Tuesday afternoon with "all the privileges and rights vested in the faculty" as outlined in the proposed Bloomington faculty constitution.

The proposed constitution was one of the topics of debate during a meeting of the IU-Bloomington Faculty Council. Also approved during the session was an interim report on tenure submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee.

By a voice vote the council approved the first of 26 sections contained in the proposed constitution, which reads: "The faculty shall consist of the Bloomington Chancellor and all professors and instructors with tenure-related appointments at the Bloomington campus. Professional librarians at Bloomington with tenure-related appointments shall have all the privileges and rights vested in the faculty by this constitution."

The council also approved by voice vote 14 different motions concerning such matters as curriculum, promotion and discipline in which the faculty "has authority."

During a discussion of the interim tenure report, the faculty council finally approved a motion stating:

"The Bloomington Campus Tenure Advisory Committee shall be comprised of no more than 10 members (excluding administrators and departmental chairmen) with at least four from the College of Arts and Sciences appointed by the Dean of Faculties for a term of two years. In order to assure continuity, in the first year the appointments are made, half the members of the committee shall be appointed for a term of three years."

The tenure advisory committee is to function when there is a lack of agreement among the tenure recommendations to the Dean of Faculties.

Dr. Harry Yamaguchi pointed out during the discussion a difference exists between procedure and merit in the tenure process.

He said the "best jury for merit" lies with the faculty member's own colleagues and that "the promotion to tenure decision ought to be made in the speciality."

Procedural matters can be handled by those outside the speciality area, said Yamaguchi, citing as an example whether due process has been observed in determining tenure.

This has been a matter at the university, and at least one case is now in appeal. Some at IU believe those involved in decision making from the College of Arts and Sciences might put more stress on publication than would a faculty member's colleagues within one of the professional schools.

Tenure is based on the faculty member's record as to teaching, service and scholarship. In some schools, such as music and health, physical education and recreation, the emphasis might be placed more on teaching than on publication. The faculty member must be "outstanding" in two of the three categories to receive tenure.

## Indiana University Library System

### Recommendations for rank, tenure

In accord with actions taken by the Board of Trustees on February 25, 1972 (4.N.) and June 30, 1972 (4.K.) which authorizes ranks and tenure for professional librarians at Indiana University, the following recommendations for the initial rank and tenure of librarians were approved by the Board of Trustees on May 10, 1974.

Each recommendation has been reviewed by procedures specified by the Board of Trustees. The assignment of ranks and titles as librarians is in addition to ranks which some of these persons hold in the traditional faculties.

#### Key

- (R)--Regional Campus
- (B)--Bloomington Campus
- (I)--IUPUI
- (U)--University System

---

I. With Tenure: the following librarians are recommended for rank as indicated, with tenure. Tenure is specific to the unit indicated.

#### Librarian, Effective July 1, 1974

NAME	UNIT
Baatz, Wilmer H.	(U)
Cagle, William R.	(U)
Craig, Everett L.	(U)
Egan, Elizabeth	(U)
Freeman, Ellen L.	(U)
Knego, John	(U)
Parrish, Michael	(U)
Pollock, James W.	(U)

Raber, Nevin W.	(U)
Randall, David A.	(U)
Shipps, Anthony W.	(U)
Simonson, Emma S.	(U)
Stanger, Mary H.	(U)
Studer, William J.	(U & R)
Turchyn, Andrew	(U)
Gillis, Frank J.	(B)
Campbell, Helen W.	(I)
Campbell, Nina S.	(I)
Laatz, Mary J.	(I)
Hunsberger, Willard D.	(R)

---

**Associate Librarian (Effective July 1, 1974)**

NAME	UNIT
Baker, Mary	(U)
Bennett, Josiah Q.	(U)
Bingham, Gertrude	(U)
Cridland, Nancy C.	(U)
Crippen, Alice C.	(U)
Davison, Ruth M.	(U)
deLerma, Dominique-Rene	(U)
Glastras, Thomas	(U)
Grimshaw, Polly S.	(U)

Halporn, Barbara	(U)
Haverdroeze, Frederik J.	(U)
Heiser, Lois	(U)
Jarboe, Betty J.	(U)
Joachim, Martin D.	(U)
Karic, Seid	(U)
Krawczuk, Nikolaus	(U)
Kudryk, Oleg	(U)
Kunoff, Hugo	(U)
Lehman, Lois J.	(U)
Liu, Helen G.	(U)
Mauck, Virginia L.	(U)
McLeod, Clara P.	(U)
Michalak, Thomas J.	(U)
Nilson, Julieann V.	(U)
Rudolph, L.C.	(U)
Shaaban, Marian T.	(U)
Shepherd, Odette F.	(U)
Sinclair, Sabina W.	(U)
Snyder, Carolyn A.	(U)
Souter, Thomas A.	(U)
Swaim, Glendora	(U)
Tullis, Carol L.	(U)
Velten, Ruth E.	(U)
Walker, Mary A.	(U)

Warner, Geneva	(U)
Wickizer, Alice	(U)
Pratt, Barbara	(B)
Brey, Francis L.	(I)
Connell, Alma B.	(I)
Fischler, Barbara A.	(I)
Mueller, Jeanne G.	(I)
Whitinger, Elaine H.	(I)
Zinn, Eleanore K.	(I)
Ardrey, Richard L.	(R)
Harlan, Donna B.	(R)
Hays, Carl H.	(R)
Reich, Richard	(R)

---

**Associate Librarian (Effective July 1, 1975)**

NAME	UNIT
Fenske, David	(U)
Irvine, Betty Jo	(U)
VanCamp, Ann J.	(I)
Henn, Barbara	(R)

---

**Assistant Librarian (Effective July 1, 1974)**

NAME	UNIT
Blakely, Rosanna L.	(U)

Boyko, Max	(U)
Kirkpatrick, Meredith K.	(U)
Niekamp, Dorothy	(U)
Oinas, Lisbet	(U)
Underwood, Barbara	(U)
Crowell, Villa B.	(B)
Matthew, Jeannette	(I)

---

**Assistant Librarian (Effective July 1, 1975)**

NAME	UNIT
Cuthbertson, Ann	(U)

---

II. Without Tenure: the following librarians are recommended for rank as indicated, but without tenure. Credit toward tenure is being earned in the unit indicated.

**Associate Librarian**

NAME	UNIT
Matsuda, Shizue	(U)
Miller, Roger	(R)

**Assistant Librarian**

NAME	UNIT
Armstrong, Ann L.	(U)
Balam, Marilyn K.	(U)
Caldwell, Jill M.	(U)
Davis, Joy V.	(U)

Day, Mark T.	(U)
Greaves, James E.	(U)
Green, Margaret E.	(U)
Grise, Gail	(U)
Hulbert, Doris J.	(U)
Jizba, Laurel	(U)
Johnson, Janice F.	(U)
Lawlis, Naomi	(U)
Lichtenberg, Rita	(U)
Luquire, Wilson C.	(U)
Maxwell, Monty M.	(U)
Miller, Herbert A.	(U)
Okim, Victor E.	(U)
Ost, Nina W.	(U)
Rasmussen, Lane D.	(U)
Rudolph, Ellen T.	(U)
Russell, Susan	(U)
Spulber, Pauline	(U)
Tadros, Fawzi	(U)
Westfall, Gloria	(U)
Westover, Keith R.	(U)
Spear, Louise S.	(B)
Allen, Evelyn	(I)
Humnick, Virginia A.	(I)
Kersey, Ethel M.	(I)

Kralicek, Mary F.	(I)
Lewis, David V.	(I)
Shaffer, Harold A.	(I)
Shaffer, Katherine M.	(I)
Stevens, Christine L.	(I)
Williams, Maudine B.	(I)
Wright, Jill D.	(I)
Crowe, William J.	(R)
Farquhar, Pauline J.	(R)
Garvey, Robert E.	(R)
Harrod, Ruth	(R)
Kerns, Ruth B.	(R)
Kort, Richard L.	(R)
Large, Kathryn M.	(R)
McDowell, Mary Y.	(R)
Nelson, Nancy Thomas	(R)
Ralstin, Susan I.	(R)
Self, James R.	(R)
Thompson, Susan J.	(R)

**Affiliate Librarian**

NAME	UNIT
Goodman, Edward J.	(I)
Taylor, Susan D.	(I)

III. Not Eligible for Tenure: the following librarians are recommended for rank as indicated:

**Adjunct Associate Librarian**

NAME	UNIT
Beasley, Ruth Ann	(U)
Dixon, Rebecca D.	(U)
Vossmeyer, Nancy R.	(R)

---

**Adjunct Assistant Librarian**

NAME	UNIT
Baxter, Cynthia	(U)
Bonham, Miriam D.	(B)
McCune, Lois	(U)
Skirvin, Charr L.	(U)
Brewer, Joan S.	(U)
Brooks, JoAnn B.	(U)
Hoff, Marjorie R.	(B)
Matusak, Susan G.	(U)
Moser, Grace A.	(U)
Gnat, Jean M.	(I)
Rainwater, Barbara	(I)
Yegerlehner, Shirley E.	(I)
Fortado, Larry A.	(R)

**Adjunct Affiliate Librarian**

Watson, Linda A.

(U)