TEMPLE
UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Academic Assembly of Librarians

General Assembly

Agenda

Tuesday, November 10, 2020

2:00 PM

Zoom: https://temple.zoom.us/j/94677937158

Attendees: Steven Bell, Brian Boling, Carla Davis Cunningham, Kristina De Voe, Matt Ducmanas, Lauri Fennell, Erin Finnerty, Leanne Finnigan (Chair), Gabe Galson, Olivia Given Castello, Andrea Goldstein, Justin Hill, Keena Hilliard, Josue Hurtado, Tom Ipri, Latanya Jenkins, Sarah Jones, Noa Kaumeheiwa, Karen Kohn, Rebecca Lloyd, Joe Lucia, Jill Luedke, Jessica Lydon, Greg McKinney, Katy Rawdon, Fred Rowland, Adam Shambaugh, Caitlin Shanley (recording), Jackie Sipes, Margery Sly, Holly Tomren, Emily Toner, Kim Tully, Nancy Turner

I.   Approval of Minutes of the September General Assembly meeting
     A. Approved.
II. New staff introductions
     A. Noa introduced Keena Hilliard, the new Reference and Metadata Librarian at the Law Library who joined Temple in August 2020.
         1. Keena has two dogs and one cat who thinks he is a dog. Archie the pug made an appearance on Zoom.
III. Dean's report (Lucia)
     A. Watching developments at University for spring, in response to the pandemic.
     B. Joe opted to wait until the All Staff Update meeting tomorrow to share detailed updates.
IV. L3 to L4 promotion criteria open discussion (Finnerty/Finnigan)
     A. Erin shared a presentation with summarized survey findings and guiding questions for discussion
     B. There were 14 responses to the survey

C. Question: does specifying "academic librarianship" potentially exclude other relevant experience that a candidate may want to include in their materials?
1. Joe said this was not his intention. It makes sense that a candidate might want to include public librarianship, or other job experience. If AAL membership moves to strike this language, Joe would support that.
2. **The group came to consensus that this language will be removed from the final document.**
D. *Original statement: Three years as L3.* vs. *Admin edit: Five years as a librarian with a rank of L3.*
1. Survey results on this statement were mixed (6 out of 15 agreed, 7 opposed)
2. Joe: historically, L4 was a fairly rare occurrence, most closely aligned with promotion to full professor (which only 20% of faculty ever achieve). Three years is too short to have a national impact. Could we compromise and adjust it to four years? Ambitious staff will leave for other opportunities anyway, so the retention argument is not particularly strong. It might make more sense to add an additional step, which would align L4 with Associate Professor (the most common rank retained by faculty).
3. Several staff in chat noted that unlike L2 and L3, there is no requirement that staff apply for L4 at any given time. Accomplished staff may choose to go up as soon as they are ready, which may be as few as three years, especially if they are an experienced professional. It's possible that waiting just three years to apply for promotion will be appealing to experienced professionals who are new to Temple, and we want to attract experienced professionals to work at Temple.
4. Q: What happens if you apply and aren't granted L4?
   a) **Suggestion: Since this is so rare, maybe PARA can provide candidates with a recommendation of when they should apply again.**
5. Current "years of service" language may already account for what we are describing?
6. **Leanne will save and share the chat file as a supplement to the minutes.**
7. **In the interest of time, we moved on. Leanne suggested that attendees follow up later with additional questions and comments.**
E. *Original statement: Consistently outstanding job performance.* vs. *Admin edit: Consistently outstanding job performance as documented by annual performance reviews and / or a consistent record of merit awards.*
1. Merit is optional, and lack of merit applications does not necessarily reflect on the quality of an individual's work
2. PDPs are used in very different ways by different supervisors
   a) Worth noting that faculty do not do PDPs
3. PARA documentation already specifies that librarians keep detailed documentation of activities (including annual reports)

    4. When annual reports are already required, why is there a need for additional documentation?

    5. Moved on in the interest of time. Further discussion needed.

F. Original statement: *Significant and widely recognized professional activities.* vs. Admin edit: *Significant and widely-recognized professional activities or contributions to the field, as documented by letters of reference from at least three professional colleagues from outside of the university, two of which may be supplied by the applicant for L4 and at least one of will be solicited by library administration from an expert not personally acquainted with the applicant.*

    1. Three survey respondents agreed with this statement, while 11 had significant issues with it.

    2. "regular appointment" vs. tenure vs. L4 - are these being conflated?

    3. Many questions about process

        a) why would admin select the external reviewer, rather than PARA?

        b) Great variation in job titles / duties across libraries (eg, "Electronic Resources Librarian" means vastly different things at different institutions)

        c) How will reviewers know who is and isn't acquainted with the applicant?

        d) Would a faculty librarian understand the differences of working at a non-fac institution?

            (1) external colleagues might not be aware that we don't receive support through sabbaticals, research leave, etc.

    4. current criteria already include getting letters of support, including from colleagues outside the institution

    5. Joe: we already receive questions from the Vice Provost about the rigor of our criteria. If L4 is distinguished, they should be known in the field at the same level as a professor seeking tenure.

    6. Suggestion: the candidate could include a list of names to consider as external reviewers

    7. The external reviewers should not focus on the candidate's day-to-day job, but rather their contributions to scholarship and service in the profession

    8. Joe suggestion: we could specify that reviewers come from a relevant subfield/domain of librarianship

    9. Q: Doesn't the admin suggestion already state that the applicant can provide two names?

        a) Joe: yes, and the others should be blind reviewers

    10. Moved on in the interest of time. Further discussion needed.

G. Original statement: *A successful candidate should be able to include a variety of experiences similar to those recorded below.* vs. Admin edit: *A successful candidate should be able to include a variety of experiences similar to those recorded below. It is expected that a successful candidate for promotion to L4 will demonstrate accomplishments in a number of the areas listed below.*

1. Does saying "number of areas" offer more specificity?
   a) **Joe: yes, this is somewhat redundant**
H. Original statement: *receiving grants or fellowships* vs. Admin edit: *receiving grants or fellowships to pursue projects related to academic librarianship or to a specific disciplinary research topic*
   1. again, question about necessity of including "academic librarianship"
I. Original statement: creating new systems or tools adopted beyond the library vs. Admin edit: creating new systems or tools adopted beyond the local library
   1. Suggestions to change 'local library' to TULUP or Temple Libraries
   2. **Joe approved this change.**
J. Admin addition: serving as a frequent and respected contributor to topical discussion lists related to academic librarianship and its various areas of specialization
   1. Suggestion: say "discussion lists" as an example (ie, "professional discourse such as discussion lists, social media, etc.")
   2. This change would future-proof the criteria to include any forms of communication that may arise
   3. **Consensus that the committee can come up with an agreeable revision.**

V. Old business
   A. None.
VI. New business
   A. Congratulations to Greg on his retirement!

Adjourned 3:15pm.