

InULA

Innuendo

Vol. 6, No. 1 • Oct. 1988

Enough is enough!

by Larry W. Griffin

Mon Dieu! N'ai-je pas assez écrit? One more paper on promotion and tenure is all I have in me! I suggested that *Innuendo* seek out those persons who had indicated an interest in specific recommendations of the P&T Review Committee and ask them to comment. They agreed and following my comments are some of our colleagues' different points of view, which may be helpful when discussing the Review Committee's recommendations.

We are librarians in an extremely complex bureaucracy that has allowed considerable campus autonomy and permitted different types of organization within the larger organization. Although this bureaucracy has caused frustration, there has usually been enough ambi-

guity to allow librarians the opportunity to make things happen. This same kind of amalgamation of different policies, procedures, and systems exists for promotion and tenure issues for librarians. Each campus has its own working mission; I mean the one we really function under, not the lofty "service to all" we put in our bulletins! Each campus has a slightly different attitude toward librarians and their status; on some campuses we are more equal than on others. Of the "three components" of the university each has a different type of organization of its librarians; the "smaller campuses" at this point lack the formal organizations of IUB and IUPUI. Each campus has "experts" among its librarians; expertise is not concentrated in Bloomington. I

think that all of these differences and unique situations require us to keep in mind two thoughts when discussing and making decisions about P&T for librarians. First of all, we must learn to live with ambiguity. It may increase our anxiety, but it allows us to maintain a dynamic, responsive organization as opposed to a static bureaucracy. Secondly, we must allow for options where possible. People can be creative and function at a high level of excellence only when they are not forced into the same bureaucratic boxes. We must guard against doing this to ourselves. As Rousseau said, "L'homme est né libre, et partout il est dans les fers."

(Larry W. Griffin is Director, Helmke Library, IUPUI at Fort Wayne)

From the Editor

by Anne McGreer

InULA originated in response to the issue of faculty status for librarians. It seemed fitting that we devote this year's first issue of the *Innuendo* to the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee Report of February, 1988. Larry Griffin, as co-chair of the P&T Review Committee, helped us identify some key issues which arose during the study leading up to this report. His introductory remarks are followed by one or two articles addressing each

of several of these concerns. We appreciate the willingness of our colleagues to put their thoughts in writing for us. Unfortunately, space restrictions forced the committee to cut down on the length of some of these articles. I should also add that we have not necessarily attempted to present a balanced view of each issue. Our intention is to provide a springboard for further discussion of these questions among IU librarians.

Joining me on this year's Publication Committee are Becky Cape, Mary Krutulius, Emily Okada, and Steven Schmidt. We plan to have four issues again this year, and would welcome suggestions of topics for future issues.

(Anne McGreer is Manager, Bibliographic Searching and Exchanges, Monographic Processing Services Department, IU-Bloomington Library)

Notes from InULA

by Kristine Brancolini, President, 1988-89

With the beginning of a new academic year, the InULA Executive Board has begun planning what we hope will be an exciting year for our members. Mary Popp and the 1987-88 Board experienced a productive year and I hope that we can continue to build upon their efforts.

Following a change last spring in the InULA constitution, membership recruitment and retention have become the primary responsibility of the three representatives-at-large. You have all

received a mailing with a membership form, describing the InULA committees. Please join early in the year and be sure to indicate committee preferences. It is imperative that committees be formed soon. All new librarians are entitled to one year free InULA membership, but you must complete and return the membership form. The representatives-at-large have tentatively planned three initiatives designed to improve retention: 1) a survey of all members to gather

your input; 2) a new member packet; and 3) personal contacts with new librarians throughout the system to encourage their active involvement in InULA.

I believe that the primary advantage of membership in a small professional organization like InULA is our ability to respond to your needs. I urge you to send your comments and suggestions to me or any other member of the Executive Board, who are listed on page eight.

Jean Miller has left the IU-Kokomo Library, so she will be unable to serve as Representative-at-large. Marie Wright has enthusiastically

continued on p. 8

Pre-tenure review

Carole Francq / Lynn Hufford

The pre-tenure review process would involve a librarian putting together a mock tenure document based on his/her experience, which is less than required, for a trial run through the tenure committee. I feel anyone considering pre-tenure review should think very carefully before investing time and energy in other than a final product. In my opinion the librarian's resources would be better applied to his/her job description, research and creative endeavors and/or service.

The pre-tenure review adds bulk to the process and sets up a verbal and/or written contract from incomplete information. The results would be directional but through an inefficient means for the person and the university.

If a nontenured librarian wants advice, the supervisor is often knowledgeable of the tenure process and probably the most informed about the progress of the candidate. Another alternative for librarians is to seek out a mentor, either through the formal mentor program or informally. Also, the IU Libraries Personnel Librarian makes available to tenure candidates actual dossiers

that are recent and considered exceptionally well done.

Time devoted to an unofficial pre-tenure process could be spent more wisely.

(Carole Francq is Catalog / Acquisitions Librarian, IU School of Medicine Library, Indianapolis)

In a world in which all of us received perfect feedback on our annual evaluations from our supervisors, there would be no need for such an item as "pre-tenure review." It is one of the primary responsibilities of the supervisors to provide such a review to each member of his or her staff on an annual, or as often as needed, basis. However, the quality of annual reviews varies widely through the IU Libraries. The concept of a pre-tenure review was introduced in order to provide for the raising to some minimum standard the type of feedback which a candidate for tenure is entitled to receive.

As outlined in the *P&T Review Committee Report*, the pre-tenure review is an option available to those who desire it. This raises several questions. First, should any indication that this review has taken place appear in the

dossier that is later submitted for tenure? My feeling is that it should not. The compiling and submitting of the necessary documents are decisions left to the individual and all comments should be directed to him or her. If that person wishes to share them with his or her supervisor, that may be done, but I think that if these reviews later become part of the dossiers there might be a tendency for the next P&T Committee to view those dossiers that contain the pre-tenure comments in a different light than those that do not.

Second, who is eligible to have this review done? If it is really a pre-tenure review and is meant to provide information primarily to those who are coming up for tenure, then it has to be done at such a time in the librarian's career that if any changes are recommended they can be taken into account early enough to be useful. This means that it should be submitted at least two full years prior to a librarian's preparing the actual tenure dossier.

Third, who is going to read these documents? In both years that I was a member of the P&T Committee we spent a full week reviewing dossiers. Since there are currently neither any guidelines as to when to submit a pre-tenure dossier nor any limits as to

continued on page 5

Criteria for promotion to associate and full rank

Gloria Westfall / Janet Feldmann

I must admit that I am not an impartial observer in the debate over publishing since I have strongly advocated an active role in research and publishing for librarians from the day faculty status was implemented. I felt at that time and I continue to feel that both the individual librarian and the library profit greatly from these activities. Furthermore, although I would be the first to recognize that publishing is time-consuming and stress-producing, I think the benefits definitely outweigh the costs. For those who are asking themselves whether publishing is really worth the effort, let me state what I perceive to be its rewards.

Let us consider the benefits to the librarian. First of all, there is the intellectual stimulation—the sheer pleasure that accompanies discovering new knowledge, perceiving new relationships, and/or organizing knowledge into meaningful patterns. In addition, the librarian engages in a learning process, for it is only in explaining something to another person, that one is able to clarify one's own ideas. At the same time

engaging in the creative process provides an antidote to the burnout that all too frequently develops when a librarian continues in the same job over a long period of time. Furthermore, the sustained effort required to complete a publishing project develops self-discipline and prepares the librarian for larger and more complicated tasks. Last, but not least, is the sense of personal and professional satisfaction that comes when one receives evidence that others have found one's work useful in furthering their own research or other work.

The library also benefits in several ways. In cases where the publishing is closely related to the librarians' everyday assignment, there is increased expertise on the job. In all cases, the library stands to gain from the enhanced performance resulting from the widening of the librarian's intellectual horizons. The role of research and publishing in reducing burnout mentioned above is as valuable to the library and co-workers as to the librarian. Finally, by actively joining in the pursuit of knowledge, the librarian contributes to the

achievement of one of the most fundamental aspects of the University's mission, a role which the President's Draft Plan calls upon all campuses and all faculties to share in.

I wish to add that these arguments for engaging in research and publishing are in no way to be construed as meaning that I think publishing is the only route to professional development. There are several other avenues that can and should be followed. However, I do feel that publishing is one of the best ways for librarians to further their professional development and that all librarians should consider it seriously rather than reject it out of hand as too difficult.

(Gloria Westfall is Foreign Documents Librarian in the Government Publications Department, IU Library-Bloomington)

We are a single institution with many facets, some unique to one site, some common to all. It is these differences which make it unrealistic to insist on absolute standards such as published articles, additional graduate degrees, or service on a national level. Just as rank, tenure, and individual job responsibilities are campus specific, so should be

some of the criteria for professional development, research, creativity and service. The P&T Committee must, in my opinion, evaluate those activities from the perspective of each campus's or school's mission and the role and character of its library.

Each campus's role in the community should be considered in evaluating service. Only in Bloomington does the University dominate its community. For the rest of us, each of our campuses is only a small part of our community. Our service activities help define our institution's role and image in the community. It may be more important to the university that we sit on local community committees than on national professional committees.

The size of the library faculty is also a critical factor. Within a large faculty, colleagues can help solve shared problems, suggest research activities, bounce ideas off one another, uncover publishing opportunities, and secure appointments on national committees. Those with similar duties can cover for one another in order to provide time and flexibility for other activities.

Faculty size has other implications as well. If the library faculty is small, one librarian may have several

responsibilities which would be divided among several librarians in a large library. Performing each of these multiple roles in an outstanding manner demands extra time in professional reading and preparation which decreases the time available for other activities. Ironically, although we may thus be developing professionally in a greater number of specialties, we cannot count such activities in the Professional Development section of our dossiers because these multiple roles are required by our positions.

Accessibility of professional development opportunities is a significant problem for some of us. Bloomington is the location of many professional development opportunities. Should librarians from distant campuses be penalized because their Bloomington colleagues regularly take advantage of these activities and they do so only occasionally?

Despite these seeming handicaps, being on a small faculty has distinct advantages. Having several major professional roles means having more variety and more opportunities for professional growth. We may have a closer relationship with the teaching faculty than is usual on a large campus. We have more opportunities to join major campus

committees. Should Bloomington librarians be penalized because it is more difficult for them to have such campus-wide responsibilities?

In my opinion, no one should be penalized because of local factors over which one has no control. Instead, it is the responsibility of all of us to recognize those factors and consider them in evaluating each colleague's activities.

(Janet Feldmann is Head, IUPUI-Columbus Library)

Pre-Tenure Review *(continued from page 3)*

who can submit one, the committee could easily find itself spending a *very* large amount of time reviewing these additional documents. For example, if a librarian is hired in at the Affiliate or Assistant rank and takes the full seven years to go up for tenure he or she could, if desired, submit a pre-tenure dossier for five years and the tenure dossier in the sixth.

(Gordon Lynn Hufford is Director, IU-East Library/Learning Resources Center)

"Must exceed the requirements of operational standards . . ."

Tim Sutherland

Two statements in Appendix X, "Criteria for Library Promotions" (p. 47 of the *P&T Review Committee Report*) prompted some discussion by librarians at the I.U. Northwest Campus. The first two sentences on p. 47 under the section "From Assistant Librarian to Associate Librarian" read: "This document is based on continuing improvement in *quality* of performance, professional development, and service. Excellent performance is the primary criterion and must *exceed* the requirements of operational standards." The questions raised are: 1) in a library work environment where services have increased without additional resources can quality be the primary criterion without including quantity as well, and 2) is it wise to set or define criteria/requirements and then state that candidates for promotion must exceed requirements without defining how or to what degree they must exceed those requirements. Speaking from the perspective of a regional campus library where subject or departmental specialization is less important, and the ability to do many varied library services in many sub-

ject areas is important, it would seem that quantity (demonstrating increases in services or duties) could be as strong a measure as quality is in documenting improvement (especially in performance). Also, given "double

jeopardy" and campus missions that differ and may not be understood equally well by library committees and campus faculty committees, it seems unwise to state that a candidate "must exceed the requirements" without specifying by how much or to what degree.

(Tim Sutherland is Reference Librarian, IU-Northwest Library)

Quality vs. quantity

Bob Moran

The discussion of quality vs. quantity of page 2 of the *P&T Review Committee Report* is accurate; quality is a more appropriate measure of excellent performance than quantity. However, in highlighting and stressing the importance of quality, the particular situation within which the librarians on the small campuses operate must not be overlooked. That is, since the library faculties on these campuses are relatively small, and these campuses are primarily teaching campuses, the demands on librarians' time for routine functions like reference, interlibrary loan, and library skills instruction are quite high. Thus, they are forced to spend a great deal of time

doing a lot of things, and have little time left to concentrate on one particular responsibility. As a result, the performance sections of their annual reviews are usually lists of traditional functions accomplished rather than descriptions of innovative projects. In summary, the demand on these librarians' time to perform several traditional functions makes it difficult to concentrate on a few projects which can be developed to a level which would be considered superior, of high quality.

(Bob Moran is Director, IU-Northwest Library)

Revision of the routing procedures

Julie Nilson

The P&T Review Committee has proposed changes in the routing procedures for all library faculty dossiers with the exception of those from the Bloomington system libraries. The most significant change is the one proposed for the dossiers of library faculty on the East, Fort Wayne, Kokomo, Northwest, South Bend, and Southeast campuses. For these campuses, it is recommended that the Dean of University Libraries review would occur after the IUL P&T Committee and before the Campus P&T Committee. The Review Committee's rationale is that the Dean's recommendation would carry added weight with the campus committee and academic deans and before the campus Chancellor. In addition, the current procedure has a step which mandates a conference between the Dean of University Libraries and the campus Chancellor, particularly for those cases with mixed recommendations. In the past, this conference has been instrumental in obtaining positive promotion and tenure decisions when the campus committee has forwarded

a negative recommendation. The most notable cases have been those where the campus committee has not understood or recognized the separate criteria used for library faculty. There are, in fact, library faculty on the campuses who have been promoted or tenured as a direct result of negotiation between the Dean of Libraries and the campus Chancellor. In the proposed routing, it is not clear if the added weight of an early recommendation will offset the loss of the opportunity for a conference/discussion with the Chancellor. It is clearly a risk that campus library faculty need to evaluate before rushing to support this change. Further, it may not be necessary for all campuses to follow identical routing procedures. The changes in routing dossiers for the IUPUI University Libraries, Indianapolis schools of Dentistry, Law, and Medicine, and the Bloomington extra-systems libraries focus on the addition of the library administrators and review committees and correcting the hierarchy of the process. It is important that these changes

are written into our procedures. It is, however, regrettable that the P&T Review Committee edited out the conference opportunities that had been documented in our present routing. Those were created to add substance to the concept of a library faculty and to forestall an academic dean from systematically overturning positive recommendations advanced from the libraries. They also served to advance the case for librarians as members of the university with a claim to faculty status.

(Julie Nilson is Head, Monographic Processing Services Department, IU-Bloomington Library)

The InULA Innuendo is a publication of the Indiana University Librarians' Association. • InULA Publications Committee: Rebecca Cape, Mary Krutulis, Anne McGreer, Emily Okada, Steven Schmidt. • Image Setting prepared by Don Nissen, graphic designer. • Photoreproduction by Courthouse Square Quickprint, Bloomington, IN. • Letters and comments should be addressed to Anne McGreer, Monographic Processing Services, Library E350, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405, or VAX GOLD::LIBACQ.

Notes from InULA

(cont. from page 2)

agreed to serve the remainder of Jean's term.

Lend your support in making InULA a vital organization. Join today!

(Kristine Brancolini is Head, Media Services Department, IU-Bloomington)

1988-89 Executive Board

- **President**—**Kristine Brancolini**, Media Services Department, Library W121, Bloomington (855-1650)
- **Vice President**—**Sylvia Burbach**, Cataloging Department, Library E350, Bloomington (855-7511)
- **Secretary**—**Maudine Williams**, Herron School of Art Library, Indianapolis (923-3651)
- **Treasurer**—**Mary Krutulis**, School of Library and Information Science, Library 011c, Bloomington (855-2018)

Representatives-at-Large:

- **Wendell Johnting**, Law Library, Indianapolis (274-1930)
- **Mary Popp**, Undergraduate Library Services, Library W121, Bloomington (855-9857)
- **Marie Wright**, Government Documents/Microforms, University Library 002, Indianapolis (274-8337)

You are invited . . . to join the Indiana University Librarian's Association (InULA)

Your membership supports the following activities:
Programs and workshops • *Innuendo* newsletter • National Library Week Book Sale • Scholarship for SLIS student • Research and incentive grants • Social events

Regular membership is available to any person who holds an appointment as a library faculty member on any IU campus. One year free membership is offered to all new library faculty appointed after May 1.

Associate membership is available to all other librarians, retired library faculty and SLIS faculty.

Friends membership is available to all others who would like to support InULA and its purposes.

Mail check and completed form to: Mary Krutulis, InULA Treasurer, SLIS, Library 011, Bloomington

Type of membership:

Regular, \$10 Associate, \$6 Friend, \$3

Committee Interests (open to all members):

Constitution Continuing Education
 Book Sale National Library
 Program and Social Week Special Events
 Ad Hoc Publications

I would be interested in chairing
an InULA committee (regular members only)

Name: _____

Library Address: _____

Telephone (indicate office or home) _____

Status (library faculty, support staff member,
SLIS student, etc.): _____