

2002-03 Annual Report: Faculty Standards Committee

Members:

2001-03: Bob Goehlert, Ralph Papakhian

2002-04: Sylvia Turchyn, Marion Frank-Wilson (BLFC liaison), Taemin Park, Julie Bobay (Chair)

Ex-Officio, Yolanda Cooper, Library Human Resources Officer

Charges (2002-03):

1. Review existing guidelines for work responsibilities, privileges and salaries and make recommendations where appropriate.
2. Review existing appointment and promotion and tenure criteria and make recommendations where appropriate.

Action: The FSC discussed the charge and work of the IULFC Promotion and Tenure Review Committee with the chairs of that committee, members of the current P&T Committee, and Yolanda. The FSC agreed that input into the process will be provided by the P&T Committee and BLFC, and that there was no current role for FSC in this review of the P&T process.

3. Review existing methods for evaluating performance and make recommendations where appropriate.
4. Continue to monitor the peer review process and the document "Peer Committee for Annual Merit Review." Identify librarians who are going through the peer review process for the first time and offer advice and assistance.

Action: The FSC led the investigation and implementation of a single merit rating system for Peer Review and Supervisory evaluations. For 2002, Dean Thorin and BLFC agreed that Supervisory ratings would use the Peer Review matrix. FSC worked to develop a proposal for librarian evaluations, discussing progress regularly with BLFC and Dean Thorin. Members of the FSC reviewed the faculty evaluation plans in every department in the College and many of the professional schools, which revealed a very wide range of practices. FSC also gathered informal feedback from librarians at the Annual Review workshops sponsored by the Continuing Ed Committee. In February 2003, we presented a draft document to Dean Thorin and BLFC that replaced the "matrix", reducing the number of merit categories from four to three and articulating minimum requirements for each category. The proposal was endorsed by BLFC, discussed at a special faculty meeting, and voted in to be the system used by both Peer Review and Supervisory review for the 2003 evaluation period.

5. With the Continuing Education Committee, plan training sessions for librarians in relationship to the peer review process including position descriptions, reviews and reports, explanation of achievements, and documentation needed.

Action: FSC worked with CEC and Yolanda to present workshop on preparing Annual Reviews, which were given December 2 and 3, 2002.

6. Serve as an advisory committee for the Library Human Resources Officer.

Action: Committee discussed Libraries HR Report 2001/02 with Yolanda, and had one recommendation from that discussion, regarding the statement, "Individual awards from the Dean presented annually for a singly honor in a field or project that has wide impact. This award is distributed through the annual review process." Yolanda reported that this refers to the ½ merit increase that was given to some librarians in recognition of their contributions during the year of SIRSI implementation. FSC suggested changing wording to reflect that this is not an award but rather an out-of-the-ordinary salary increase.

7. Work with the Promotion and Tenure Committee in developing orientation and training for new librarians in faculty standards issues.

Action: Yolanda shared the Orientation checklist for new librarians, and FSC had no suggestions for changes. Yolanda is now including an FSC session in new librarian's orientation schedule and during 02-03 the chair of FSC met with two new librarians as part of their orientation.

8. Review the existing search and screen process for librarians.

Action: This was a carry-over item from the 2000-01 FSC, which provided initial input, but since the 01-02 FSC did not meet, the 02-03 FSC took it up again. FSC reviewed the 00-01 responses and recommended to Yolanda that the only remaining area of concern was the limitation on the type of recommendations that would be accepted by the Dean. The FSC noted that campus practice allows committees to determine the best way to communicate their advice to the appointing administrator, and that direct communication from the Dean to the committee regarding problematic situations or the outcome of a search would be more effective than limiting the type of information the committee is allowed to communicate.

9. Identify awards for which IUB librarians might be eligible and propose ways the Libraries might develop a process similar to the one in the Chemistry Department (e.g. an awards committee that finds awards and nominates Chemistry faculty). Also consider the venue for the presentation of the Jenkins Award including the possibility of Founders Day or another campus setting with invitations to relevant faculty and administrators to join in the celebration.

Action: Following discussions with Dean of Faculties about possible appropriate campus venues for honoring the Jenkins winner, the FSC recommended that Jenkins Award recipient be recognized at two different events: at the Retirement and Recognition party and at a separate event that recognizes all librarians who have received awards during the year, with special focus on the Jenkins award.

Unfinished Business

Charge #1:

- Librarian/Academic Specialist/Professional/Administrative appointments in academic departments (e.g., Black Film Center Archive). Status: not discussed by 02-03 FSC

Charge #3:

- Guidelines for Supervisors. Status: Yolanda requested FSC input into the proposed Evaluation Guidelines for Supervisors for the administrative review of librarians. FSC began discussions but did not finish or make any recommendations.

- Associate Dean Reviews. Status: BFC policies state that library administrators should be regularly reviewed by unit faculty. After discussion with BLFC and their request that FSC recommend a review process, the 2002-03 FSC investigated practices of other IUB schools and units, but did not make a recommendation on a process for the Libraries.

Charge # 4:

- Advising librarians new to Peer Review Process. Status: Yolanda sent FSC the names of three librarians going through Peer Review process for first time, and the chair contacted them with an offer to provide advice. 2 librarians said yes and one declined. FSC did not meet with the two who said yes.

Charge #9:

- FSC brainstormed possible processes for librarian awards with help from Gary Wiggins, and started work on a professional awards database, which was not completed.

RECOMMENDATIONS for 03-04 FSC Charges:

1. Monitor the impact of the new rating system for annual review.
2. Consider any unfinished business listed above, especially input into the Guidelines for Supervisors.

3. Review the use of position descriptions in annual reviews

The current practice of using the position description as the basis for annual reviews is governed by IULFC as part of the system-wide P&T process. IUB has chosen to use this same document for annual salary setting reviews, which some people believe causes problems in not providing a structure for a clear linking of work activities to library or university goals, and is not consistently prepared and maintained.

4. Review and make recommendations on the role of FSC in orientation of new librarians

Discussion: The role of FSC in orientation of new librarians is not clear to the new librarians who recently went through orientation or to the FSC, especially given the session all new librarians have with the Bloomington members of the P&T Committee and the information shared by the Libraries HR Officer. Some ideas for FSC in orientation of new librarians include sessions that occur after librarians have been here for a year or more, and/or a social role, such as planning social functions or simply inviting new librarians to lunch.

5. Provide clear guidance on priorities for the committee, given the historically large amount of work.