

Faculty meeting April 13, 2010, 9:30am  
Chaired by Beth Black  
In attendance: 51

The following committees submitted reports via email prior to the meeting: Risk Management; Assessment; Staff Advisory. There was no discussion on the reports.

**Director's Report: Carol Diedrichs**

Carol discussed strategic planning themes and briefly spoke about the review of the library's organizational structure. The review of the organization will conclude by the end of May and a decision will be made about the future organizational structure of the libraries. Everyone is invited to participate in the survey, focus groups, and proposal of models. [A longer version of this port

There will be budget reductions in the library's budget for fiscal years 2010, 2011 and 2012. Reductions will equal 1% of the budget each year equal to \$312,735 (FY10), \$308,003 (FY11), and \$307,125 (FY12). The reductions are made in anticipation of reductions of state funding in FY12. If the reductions are less, the university will decide whether to return the funds.

For FY11 half of the reduction will come from materials and half from personnel expenses. It is possible that the library will be affected by a decrease in the funding of work-study students.

The library was invited to make a proposal for an increase in its materials budget for FY11. A proposal was made for an increase of \$1 million. Also a proposal was made to establish a new model for funding acquisitions. There continues to be discussion regarding the future of the POM for the libraries but no new information is available now.

Carol spoke about the libraries' future approach towards print retention due to the lack of additional space to store print, the influence of the internet and purchased digital resources, and the recognition that changes going on in academic libraries regionally and nationally regarding required copies to have available for library users. Emphasis must be placed on consultation with the university faculty but not on a title by title basis. This presentation on print retention was presented to CoLit and it will be presented to the Council of Deans.

The Ohiolink Depository program of consolidation of all depositories in the OL system will alter its proposed course and will focus in the near future on journal duplication. Even so the new depository catalog will not be public, OSU Libraries resources will not transfer to Ohiolink control, OSU Libraries catalog records for items in the depository will remain in the OSU Libraries catalog, and OSU holdings for depositories items shown in OCLC will not be remain in the OCLC database.

In response to a question about the Elsevier journal backfile Carol said that she would like Ohiolink to purchase the backfile but this may not happen. OSU must decide about purchasing the backfile as a couple of other OL members already did.

Regarding library facilities, Carol said that multiple library locations will continue in the future. The libraries will consider different models for physical facilities to meet the needs of the colleges. We will develop a plan for our facilities

[The longer presentation by Carol Diedrichs at the general staff meeting that touches on these topics and others is available at [http://library.osu.edu/sites/staff/minutes/All\\_staff\\_Apr10\\_Diedrichs.pdf](http://library.osu.edu/sites/staff/minutes/All_staff_Apr10_Diedrichs.pdf) .]

### **POA Review Process: Beth Black**

Prior to the meeting the review process outline was sent to all faculty. Beth encouraged faculty to bring review issues to the Planning and Policy Committee. Using the clickers it was determined that a majority of faculty at the meeting agree with the review process as outlined. Ground rules for POA review process: listen, limit “wordsmithing,” don’t waste time with endless discussion, be civil, respect, make decisions in timely fashion.

Proposal for timing of election to Appointment, Promotion & Tenure Committee: Eric Schnell

Eric explained the proposal that was sent to all faculty and that he showed on the overhead. After minor editing the faculty agreed to a vote which by rule will be conducted via email.

### **Hiring with tenure: Eric Schnell**

The faculty received the relevant part of the POA rules. This part of the meeting was only for clarification and discussion. No rule changes were proposed. The point here is that the rules allow for the hiring of faculty at the associate and professor ranks with tenure. It should be an exception that must be defended if an appointment at one of these ranks is NOT with tenure.

### **Who should participate in voting on promotion/tenure cases: Jose Diaz**

Jose led a discussion about the possibility of changing the current rules which place sole responsibility on the AP&T committee to serve as the faculty’s body making recommendations to the director for promotion/tenure cases excluding promotions to professor. Promotions to professor are done by all professors in the library. For tenure and promotion to associate professor, should all eligible faculty in the library participate? Although the library faculty are dispersed, a stronger community will result from the total participation of the faculty in this work. Is it important to follow the majority practice of faculty in the university? Is it bad for library faculty to follow a different procedure?

Issue raised in the discussion:

- fear of voters who don’t have information about candidates
- vote usually takes place at a meeting where all can vote
- how can we ensure that faculty take the process seriously and act fairly?
- Can we approach this by splitting the library into departments which would vote on candidates in their department?
- there are colleges to vote as a whole
- Why change what has been working?
- Does the current system work?
- Some people do not want to participate but it would be best for everyone to participate
- It is a faculty obligation to participate in promotion/tenure decisions

**Degree Requirements proposal: Beth Black**

The faculty received the proposal to alter the degree requirements section of the POA:

What weight will faculty opinions have when asked by the director to consider degrees not named in the POA rules?

There was discussion about types of positions that the new language might effect.  
Can the broader degree proposal be abused in the future even if there is no problem in the next several years?

Several faculty spoke up in favor of a more diversified faculty.  
A clicker vote indicated that 59% of the faculty present had a favorable attitude toward the specific proposal.

There was discussion about the specific language proposed. Marsha Hamilton proposed a motion to refer the proposal to the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee for consideration regarding its language and implications in the future. AP&T will return the issue to the faculty at a future meeting. Alan Green seconded the motion and it was approved by the faculty.

No new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:30am.