Libary Faculty Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday February 21, 2006.

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. by Gisele Schierhorst.


Agenda:

Approval of minutes taken on 10/25/05 and 11/2/05 (see library shared file)

Standing Committee Reports (Executive, A&P, Library Services)

Optional oral University Senate Committee Reports--including Library PTC Chair Report and status of Library Personnel Policy Procedure revisions (discussion)

HSC Library Report

Library Director's Report (Chris)

Junior Faculty Sabbaticals--proposal (Jason Torre) (please see memo with this title in the Library Faculty shared file)

Results of vote concerning revisions made to the Library's bylaws (Nathan Baum)

Elections issue (i.e. difficulty in acquiring nominees)

1. Approval of minutes

The minutes of the previous two meetings, on October 25, 2005 and November 2, 2005, were approved by voice vote.

Junior Faculty Research Leaves:

A request was made by Jason Torre to move forward on the agenda the discussion of Library Faculty Research Leave. All were in favor. He pointed out that the precedent for such a leave had been set out in the academic departments in accordance with provision 23.7a of the UUP Union Contract, 2003-2007 as follows:
“§23.7
a. Other Leaves for Academic Employees

1. Approval. The College President may recommend to the Chancellor other leaves of absence for employees at full salary or reduced salary, or may grant employees leaves of absence without salary, for the purpose of professional development, acceptance of assignments of limited duration with other universities and colleges, governmental agencies, foreign nations, private foundations, corporations and similar agencies, as a faculty member, expert, consultant or in a similar capacity, or for other appropriate purposes consistent with the needs and interests of the University. Leaves of absence without salary may also be granted under appropriate circumstances for the purpose of child care. Leaves of absence at full or reduced salary pursuant to provisions of this Section shall be subject to the approval of the Chancellor.

2. Application. Applications for such leaves of absence shall be made to the College President. Each such application shall include a statement of the purpose for which the leave is requested, its anticipated duration and its value to the applicant and the University.

3. Leave Credits. Vacation leave and sick leave credits shall not be accrued or used during a period of leave pursuant to provisions of this Section.

Jason read a proposed statement that had been worked out by the junior faculty during their meetings together and informally with Chris.

The below resolution was submitted for vote to the Library Faculty on February 21, 2006. It read as below:

The Library Faculty resolves to implement section §23.7 a. Other Leaves for Academic Employees and adopt this section of the negotiated SUNY labor contract as part of its overall hiring and mentoring processes, and as such, will allow and support its non-tenured (Jr. Faculty) librarians holding tenure track positions to request a paid leave of absence from their library responsibilities for one (1) semester, scheduled to take place between the faculty member’s promotion to Senior Assistant Librarian and their application for tenure review and in accordance with all University and contractual application procedures, for the purposes of furthering their personal research or scholarship as part of their overall preparation for their final tenure review.

Resolved this day, February 21, 2006, by the Library Faculty of the Stony Brook University Library System(s)
A discussion of various types of leaves ensued. Gisele discussed the leave she had taken and how helpful it had been for her promotion and tenure.

Christian Filstrup stated his support for this “sound proposal”. He stated that the department supervisor involved would have to agree that the department could manage with the person gone.

Alternative methods of coverage and responsibility for departmental work left undone in the faculty member’s absence were discussed. Helene Volat stated that the project should be related to the faculty member’s work. Paul Wiener asked at what point a junior faculty member would be eligible for such a leave.

Janet Clarke stated that a semester leave was standard in other academic departments. There was a discussion of what constitutes a “semester”? Is it an entire academic semester, several months, etc? Elaine Hoffman asked about the practice of stopping the “tenure clock” and whether this would occur? She also questioned whether an entire semester was too long a period.

Sherry Chang proposed that these leaves should only be granted to one junior faculty member at a time. Chris stated that the proposal would need further discussion at Director’s Council. Nathan Baum pointed out that this agreement would have to go through the levels of department heads, Provost and Chancellor. Sherry also pointed out that this provision would not guarantee that such a leave would always be granted.

There was further discussion and then a call for a vote was made by Daniel Kinney and seconded by Janet. The following amended text was voted and unanimously (?) agreed upon by the Library Faculty:

Amended
Library Faculty Resolution
February 21, 2006
Jr. Faculty Research Leave

The Library Faculty resolves to implement section §23.7 a. Other Leaves for Academic Employees and adopt this section of the negotiated SUNY labor contract as part of its overall hiring and mentoring processes, and as such, will allow and support its non-tenured (Jr. Faculty) librarians holding tenure track positions to request a paid leave of absence from their library responsibilities for up to six months, scheduled to take place between the faculty member’s promotion to Senior Assistant Librarian and their application for tenure review and in accordance with all University and contractual application procedures, for the purposes of furthering their personal research or scholarship as part of their overall preparation for their final tenure review.
Resolved this day, February 21, 2006, by the Library Faculty of the Stony Brook University Library System(s)

2. Standing Committee Reports

Executive Committee (Gisele Schierhorst) Gisele reported on our letter to the Chair of the Senate Faculty’s Executive Committee, Brent Lindquist. He had replied that although he was concerned about the library’s monographic budget, the Executive Committee said it was inappropriate for them to write to the Provost about this matter. He proposed taking it up with CAPRA and Gisele had not yet heard back from him.

Gisele reminded the Library Faculty that the deadline for nominations to campus committees was March 3, 2006. She also reported on the situation with the Health Sciences Faculty vis a vis the bylaw amendments.

Appointments and Promotion Committee (Dennis Andersen). Dennis, co-chair of the committee with Helene Volat (on sabbatical) reported that the committee was still concerned about the inequality of librarian salaries and the merit process.

The A & P Committee had participated in interviews with 4 library faculty search candidates. Three of these positions were filled and one was declined by the candidate.

Library Services Committee (Dana Antonucci-Durgan). In Dana’s absences Kyungmi Lee (Mimi) reported on the committee’s activities. They had arranged for Dan’s talk and concert based on his sabbatical project and a talk about Google Scholar given by John Rigattzi from LIU. Plans are underway for more speakers and another travel report. Details will be posted in the library share folders.

3. University Senate Committee Reports

Library PTC: Gisele reported on the standing of our situation with the Health Sciences Library Faculty concerning the revisions of library bylaws. The PTC, which has to pass the revisions, wants us to have collaborative efforts with HSC. Jeri Schoof confirmed that anyone hired in 1991 or later would have a choice as to which version of the bylaws would apply in their case. We received a report that the Health Sciences faculty are working on their own appendix to the bylaws. After further discussion Chris offered to speak directly to Spencer Marsh, director of the Health Sciences Library, to try to resolve these issues.

University Senate: There was a discussion about how senators are elected to both the University Senate and the Arts and Sciences Senate. The terms are
for 3 years and the person elected serves on both senates. The library’s senators (2) are considered “at large”; they attend meetings but do not vote.

4. Director’s Report: (Chris Filstrup) Chris reported on the latest situation concerning the monograph budget. He had met with Dan, Germaine and the Provost and reported that we would not be getting any inflation money for this fiscal year because with all the hiring we did the money for monographs is very low. The Provost has reallocated any of our unspent funds from the library monographic budget to pay library bills. Chris was optimistic that we might still receive some additional monies this year.

Chris then reported on the pending deal for Stony Brook to purchase the Southampton campus, as reported recently in the New York Times. He is not sure yet what will happen with their library and unfinished “information commons”. In response to Jason’s question about what future planning we should be doing for the Southampton library Chris said that he didn’t know yet if we would be running their library. Chris also reported that Stony Brook has hired 2 of Southampton’s writing professors and intends to continue the popular summertime Southampton Graduate Campus Writers Conference. The university does not expect to run a full program academic program at Southampton this coming fall.

We have been contacted by the Pollock Collection people about transferring their library to us (?).

5. Amendments to the By-Laws (Nathan Baum) Nathan quickly covered 7 remaining questions and issues related to the bylaw revisions.
   a. Question of Visiting Librarians
   b. Article 3, Sect. 2e—do we want to continue with Robert’s Rules of Order? Do we need a parliamentarian?
   c. Vacancies on library committees
   d. Section III-3-i Amendment of number of committee members.
   e. Section III-sec 3q. Annual report to library faculty.
   f. Section IV-sec. 2—1 week restriction
   g. Section IV + V: Need to be made consistent.

Nathan will send around a paper ballot to confirm the above changes.

Library Faculty decided against a suggestion to change our meeting time to every 2 months, which would require an amendment to our bylaws.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Elaine Hoffman
6. Release time for Librarians

7. Other business

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 AM

Respectfully submitted by