Library Council
Minutes
December 19, 2002
Library West Conference Room

Members in Attendance: Shelley Arlen, Dale Canelas, Gary Cornwell, Michele Crump, Lori Driscoll, Carol Drum, Martha Hruska, John Ingram, Cathy Mook, Jan Swanbeck, Carol Turner, and Steve Shorb

1. Approve Minutes

- The minutes for the November 2002 Library Council meeting were approved.

2. Interim Report: Faculty Evaluation Committee. Carol Drum and committee members

- The Faculty Evaluation Committee reviewed the supporting information for faculty evaluations, which included Chapter Three and Appendices 11 and 12 of the Career Development Handbook (CDH), The Faculty Handbook and the Union Contract. The following was reported:

  o The committee found that the Career Review and Evaluation section of Chapter 3 contained a lot of material related to career review and evaluation but that the material was not actual guidelines for career reviews and evaluations. However, the information was important therefore the committee felt like it should be located in a separate section of Chapter 3 or perhaps elsewhere in the CDH. As a result of their findings the committee rewrote Chapter 3, Career Review and Evaluation.
  o The committee found that several documents are used in evaluation process. The annual assignment, annual activity report, semester assignment, and tenure and promotion paperwork. An attempt has been made to consolidate some of these documents.
  o Appendix 11, Annual Assignment and Appendix 12, Goals and Objectives were reviewed. The committee recommended that Appendix 12 be eliminated and that goals be included in Appendix 11, Annual Assignment.
  o Some committee members felt that goals and objectives should be evaluated on an annual basis and some felt they should be evaluated on a semester basis. The committee decided it should be a local option and therefore developed two options for annual assignments and also drafted a sample evaluation letter for tenure. An outline was created at the beginning of the annual assignment
that lists the job summary and areas of specialization and also assigned activities. The assigned activities are on the semester assignment that have to be completed and are also reported at tenure time. The committee thought if it were done on a semester basis then we would have this information when it was most needed.

- **Annual Assignment – Option One**
  - List basic job and is then divided into three sections with the goals being placed under the appropriate section:
    - Performance of professional responsibilities
    - Professional Development and Scholarship
    - Professional Service Activities

- **Annual Assignment – Option Two**
  - List basic job and is then divided into three sections with goals listed on a separate sheet and divided into summer, fall, spring activities:
    - Performance of professional responsibilities
    - Professional Development and Scholarship
    - Professional Service Activities

- **Sample Evaluation Letter**
  - The committee recommends that there be a paragraph or two describing accomplishments for each section:
    - Professional Responsibility
    - Professional Development and Scholarship
    - Professional Service Activities
  and at the end of each section it should read “In the first criterion for tenure, I rate your performance as consistently exceeding, meeting or falling below expectations on the Assistant University Librarian level. The expectations are related back to Chapter 2 where the expectations are outlined for each rank. Exceeds, meets or falls below needs to be defined in Chapter six.

- The Library Council agreed that this type of evaluation is an improvement, however it was suggested that additional samples of non-tenure evaluation letters be drafted.
- The description for each rank falls in Chapter 2, Appointment, Promotion and Tenure. The committee believes this section should have a different title.
- Appendix 6, Librarian Annual Evaluation and Policy Procedures will be folded into Chapter 3.
- The following still needs to be worked on:
  - Three-year tenure review procedures
• Chapter 3 Review Document
  o The committee tried to make a short statement that could be read through. The only thing that was covered in this chapter was annual reviews but the committee thought that tenure and promotion should be acknowledged.
  o Dale would like our review process to fit into the tenure and promotion process. Carol Drum will check on rules about when tenure years are decided.
    ▪ Sample evaluation letter for promotion
    ▪ Sample evaluation letter for employees not meeting expectations
    ▪ Appendix 6 revision
    ▪ Appendix 7 Activity report revision.
  o The work in progress should be finished by February.
  o Recommended additions to the CDH.
    ▪ The committee found that a lot of information about what new faculty need to know was scattered throughout the CDH. The committee recommended that a document devoted to this topic be developed.
    ▪ “Procedures for Emeritus Status”
  o Other Recommendations
    ▪ Other sections of the CDH be reviewed for simplification, content, consistency, and clarity. Carol Drum and Michele Crump believe the Faculty Evaluation Committee would be willing work on revising the CDH.
  o Dale commended the committee for such a good job.
  o Dale will call a meeting of the satellite directors and she will discuss the changes we are instituting.

3. Report of the Professional Development Travel Committee. Gary Cornwell and committee members

• The committee was charged with reviewing current and past allocation strategies for Professional Development; recommending any new allocation strategies or processes that will make PD travel better support library goals; and to recommend a specific methodology, with implementation details, for allocating funds available beginning with the next fiscal year.
• Through review of current practices, the committee felt it essential to preserve the discretion of the Department Chair and Division Director in allocating travel funds. They also felt it was important to develop a formula that could be applied equitably throughout the Libraries. Toward
that end, the committee proposes a three-tiered system that allows the Department Chair in consultation with their Division Director to assign each “out-of-state” travel request to one of three categories. It is assumed that most staff members are active members of their appropriate organizations, i.e., serving on committees, presenting poster sessions, etc. and they will receive the base funding amount, labeled Category 1. Staff members who are chairing national or organization-wide committees or who are presenting at the national or organizational level, or recently hired untenured librarians would fall into Category 2 and would receive base funding plus 25 percent. Staff who do not hold committee membership, but are attending conferences solely to attend programs or exhibits would fall into Category 3 and receive base funding minus 25 percent. Travel for “in-state” meetings, such as FLA or NEFLIN, would be funded at up to 20% of the base allocation.

- Each year by August 15th, each staff member would submit their travel requests for the coming year to their Department Chair. Using a Travel Request Authorization Form, the request would include the category of funding the staff member is seeking and the justification for that funding. The Department Chair, in consultation with the Division Director, would then assign each request to one of the above categories and submit them to Business Services. At this point, Business Service staff would simply plug the numbers into a formula that will automatically determine the funding level for each category based on the total travel allocation. Through their Department Chair, all employees will be notified of their level of funding by September 15th. Trip reports must be submitted to the Department Chair within two weeks of travel.

- In order to ensure the system is working as proposed, the Professional Development Travel Allocation Committee has volunteered to serve for an additional year to conduct quarterly reviews of the process.

- It was noted that the trip report should include more detail than in the past and that they be made available to staff through the Staff Development web page.

- Trudi DiTrollo will put procedures, travel request form on the web, and example of trip reports that would be considered category 1, category 2 or category 3.

- It was suggested that elected officers be added to Category 2 funding, so that the example now reads:
  - Committee Chairs or elected officers at the National, Association, or Divisional level

- The Library Council approved the new travel allocation process.

4. Payroll Administration: Proposed Changes. Steve Shorb

- Staff Salary Issues
Changes need to occur to handle the extreme low range of salaries of USPS, non-exempt employees in LTA, Senior LTA, and LTA Supervisor positions.

Analyzed first two grades for LTA compensation
- Results indicated we need to look at salary administration
- Recommendation was made and approved to increase all regular employees to a minimum of $20,000 or the annualized equivalent.
- All new hires will start at a minimum of $20,000 or the annualized equivalent.
- Affected employees will be personally notified by their department chair with an official letter to follow from personnel.

Recommendation was made and approved for a “service stipend” for employees that work night and weekend hours.
- 5% for hours ending at 8:30p or later or weekend day.
- 10% for hours ending at 11:30p or later
- Conditions that apply –
  - non exempt employees only
  - hours due to needs of library, not preference of employee
  - employee permanently assigned to the irregular shift
- Affected employees will be personally notified by their department chair with an official letter to follow from personnel.

General Salary Administration
- There are five levels for non-exempt grades
  - LTA
  - Senior LTA
  - LTA Supervisor
  - Archivist
  - Senior Archivist
- From an administrative perspective we have several overlaps with grades and a few outliers.
- Analysis of LTA range provides pretty clear results however analysis of AP range provides some cloudy results.
- The AP coordinators have a salary range from barely over $20,000 to approximately $55,000. There is not really any correspondence between the job duties for employees in the lower part of the range and employees in the upper part of the range. Steve believes this is one of the Libraries’ largest salary administration issues.
- It may be necessary to have 3 or 4 grades in LTA line.
Any decisions will have to wait until the University makes clear what it intends to do with exempt and non-exempt status.

- Overall Structure of Staff Salary Rate Ranges

5. **Update on budget freeze. Dale Canelas**
   - From everything that Dale has heard there will not be a call back this fiscal year.
   - Dale has approved some vacant positions to be filled.
   - Dale anticipates a call back next year.

6. **FCLA Funding. Martha Hruska**
   - Jim Corey has released $333,000 that we should receive by January. These funds will be enough to complete the staff training room in MSL, to continue updating workstations, and to replace outdated equipment.

7. **Update on Building. Steve Shorb**
   - Slides representing different building options that the architects shared at the last meeting were presented.
   - There are committee meetings in January.
   - The architects will be getting back to us with their response to changes that have been requested.
   - Plans are still dependent on UF receiving the DOT building to use for storage.
   - Groundbreaking will possibly occur late summer or fall of next year.

8. **Library Fundraising**
   - The Library received a $100,000 endowment for Special Collections and received the first $10,000 check for a $20,000 endowment for African Studies.
   - Dale commended Sandy Melching, Director of Development for her hard work and credited her for bringing in the above endowments.

9. **Other Business**
   - The state librarian resigned effective January 6, 2002.