

**Librarians Assembly, College of William & Mary**  
**Minutes of General Meeting**  
**May 18, 2006**  
**Earl Gregg Swem Library**

The general meeting was called to order by President Stacy Gould at 10:08 a.m. in the Ford Classroom at Swem Library. 22 librarians were present.

Stacy Gould welcomed the members.

Mary Molineux reminded members that the Swem intranet is located at <http://intranet.swem.wm.edu>. There is a link for the Librarians Assembly on the left side of the main menu. From this link, one can access the list of officers, past meeting minutes, the association bylaws, administrative and professional faculty policies and procedures, committee documents, and responses to surveys. Let Mary know if anything else needs to be added.

Mary Molineux introduced the guest speakers, Earleen O’Roark and Susan Grover, both of whom have expertise with issues relating to administrative and professional faculty. Ms. O’Roark is the director of Human Resources and has been employed in human resources departments in higher education for 27 years. She began her career at William & Mary and returned in 2001.

Ms. Grover is a professor at the Law School. After she received her JD from Georgetown University, she clerked for two judges and practiced privately in Washington DC before joining the Law School faculty in 1988. Since 2002, Ms. Grover has served as the director of the Office of Equal Opportunity at the College.

Earleen O’Roark:

Ms. O’Roark provided a number of handouts to the members (handouts on file with Secretary). She began her presentation by asking how many people understand the distinction between administrative and professional (A/P) faculty. Three members raised their hands.

A document called the Consolidated Salary Authorization (CSA), issued by the Governor’s Office, defines the different faculty and staff divisions. This document addresses librarians, employees at medical schools, student counselors, etc., and establishes guidelines with which the College must comply. For example, salary averages and related data are in compliance with the CSA.

Ms. O’Roark defined administrative and professional faculty as follows:

Administrative Faculty (AF) employees run the business of the College. AF positions have certain educational requirements, which include an advanced

degree (or training and work experience that is equivalent to an advanced degree). AF employees manage and direct the operations of the institution.

Professional Faculty (PF) is a much broader category of employee. Librarians, counselors, coaches, and extension agents fall under this label. In the early 1980s, W&M asked the HR department to create a class that covered certain types of employees that didn't fall into other categories. The PF classification was established to enable flexibility in recruiting and retention through compensation and other benefits such as the Optional Retirement Plan in order to attract professional workers. Requirements for PF include: an advanced degree or appropriate work experience, the regular use of professional judgment, and intellectual/varied work product (not standardized).

AF can not be more than three reporting levels below the President of the College. However, W&M is examining this last requirement and it will be removed as of July 1 as part of the Restructuring Act. Some classified staff will be moved into the A/P Faculty level, which will expand the categories and provide flexibility for the College.

In the past, A/P Faculty were assigned the rank of "administrative faculty" or "professional faculty". This was removed 9 years ago. For reporting purposes, all A/P Faculty today are called "lecturers".

If an employee seeks a rank reassignment, HR will first try to determine whether the employee's role has changed, which is the primary qualification for re-ranking.

Ms. O'Roark briefly discussed the relatively recent decision to replace employment contracts with employment letters. She said that the letters are a more efficient way to send out the documents, and that most institutions are moving to a similar practice. In effect, the letters streamline the reappointment process because the contracts served no real purpose. HR realizes that some people are uncomfortable with the new system. Ms. Grover said that it seems that the contracts offer more security, especially since A/P Faculty lack the protections of the Faculty Handbook or those policies and procedures in place for the classified staff. She suggested that the College should be working to expand protections for the A/P Faculty employees.

When asked about the lack of dates in the employment letters, Ms. O'Roark stated that they run from July 1 – June 30, and that the salaries are effective November 25<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Grover said that the letter should give the exact dates that it covers.

Mary Molineux pointed out that Virginia Tech has a commission on A/P Faculty, and UVA has a general faculty council. Ms. O'Roark responded that there are a number of models of A/P Faculty organizations to choose from, and that Tech's is especially strong. She said that the College, as an institution, needs to do a better job when it comes to A/P Faculty governance.

Ms. O’Roark was asked how the Restructuring Act will affect librarians in terms of rank, benefits, etc. In sum, it will not affect librarians. All faculty ranked employees (which librarians are) are “participating covered” employees. Retirement benefits, health care, and workers compensation are locked in by the Virginia Code. Generally, existing policies and procedures will remain in place.

Ms. O’Roark stated that the College will be looking at A/P Faculty in the next year. A steering committee is being formed in order to determine what the institution’s goals for restructuring are. There will be at least three sub-teams of the steering committee: compensation, performance management, and employee relations.

The supervisors of classified staff will face the biggest impact from restructuring. New employees hired into classified positions on or after July 1, 2006 will be deemed “university employees”. Current classified staff who apply for a transfer within the institution can choose to be re-assigned to university employee status.

With regard to the faculty phased retirement program currently being discussed, Ms. O’Roark indicated that she doesn’t know a lot about it, except that it is only available to teaching faculty because they are not appointed on an annual basis. Stacy Gould pointed out that this type of retirement plan was used at the College in the late 80’s and early 90’s as a way to keep staff but hire retired faculty back at adjunct pay rates.

Susan Grover:

Ms. Grover stated that she is passionate about combating discrimination, but in her position as EEO director, she only has time to address immediate needs. Her focus is divided into three areas: education (how to identify discrimination and harassment, training students and faculty to improve the classroom climate, and making students feel welcome), diversification of faculty and staff through the candidate search process, and the resolution of discrimination and harassment complaints.

Ms. Grover said that the faculty enjoy certain protections because they have a powerful lobbying group in which librarians are not invited to participate. There are no protections at all for librarians.

A member asked where the document entitled “Policies for Review of Administrative and Professional Faculty” (on file with Secretary) came from and what its status was. Ms. O’Roark said that the policies were not under review at this time. Ms. Grover added that while they needed to be reviewed, there is no record that they ever have been. The College’s HR office handles all classified staff issues and a lot of other types of matters, but there is no HR department that handles policies like these. Ms. O’Roark suggested that the Librarians Assembly should work with Connie McCarthy to move the process forward. Other types of A/P Faculty at the College are interested in seeing the policies reviewed.

Other Questions:

Q: Can a librarian get onto the restructuring committees?

EO: The committees are really for classified staff, but with the restructuring, there needs to be a group that focuses on A/P Faculty.

Q: The Provost told us 2 years ago that we needed to wait until the Restructuring Act passes before we try to make changes to A/P Faculty procedures and policies. Now that it has, do we want to align ourselves with all other A/P Faculty, including coaches and new college graduates in Admissions? We all have professional degrees.

EO: This is a point for decision. Librarians ARE different. The goal is to get better procedures and policies in place.

SGr: Librarians have a good argument to join the Faculty Assembly.

#### Committee Reports:

**Executive Committee:** Stacy Gould reported that the Executive Committee decided to hold a second general meeting in the fall.

**Salary Committee:** Katherine McKenzie presented the Salary Committee report. All salary information is posted on the Librarians Assembly webpage. As of the July 1, 2005 snapshot of our peer institution salaries, the College librarians' average salary remains at a level which is \$8,500 under the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile. At the upper end, the University of Connecticut is over \$70,000. UVA and VPI are included on the list, and rank above W&M.

The College averages 25.4 years of professional experience. The only library with more is Howard University at 25.8 years.

No faculty salary percentiles are included for this year yet, but they are expected to move to the 30<sup>th</sup> percentile.

Connie McCarthy pointed out that the snapshot lacks the November 2005 market upgrade, and thus is not an accurate picture. Katherine replied that the chart had to be cut off at July 1, 2005 in order to match ARL's reporting. She expects to see the 2006 figures at the end of this year.

**Librarian Ranks and Promotions Committee:** Alan Zoellner presented the Librarian Ranks report. He began by providing a quick review of the committee history.

Spring 2004: The committee, consisting of Katherine McKenzie, Cathy Reed, Pat Van Zandt, and Alan Zoellner, was asked to draw up a proposal for ranks for Swem librarians. The committee had already been working on one for all librarians for the Librarians Assembly.

Summer 2004: The committee submitted its report to the Provost.

August 2004: the Provost replied with a carefully thought out letter that contained questions and comments for the committee.

Spring 2005: The committee revised its proposal and resubmitted it. Swem librarians voted 22-2 in favor of going to the Provost with the document.

Post Spring 2005: no new developments.

Alan feels that the momentum may be lost in restructuring at the moment. He expressed concern about Ms. O’Roark’s remarks because the Provost had asked in his letter how librarians could be given a librarian rank when they’re already “lecturers”. But today, Ms. O’Roark indicated that “lecturer” was just a code.

W&M is the only Virginia school without ranks for its librarians.

Sometime in the last year, Jim Heller (the director of the Law Library) reported that Law did not want to be part of the proposal, but they support Swem. The committee might need to go to VIMS and Richard Bland College for similar decisions and input from those institutions.

The committee proposal is not on the Librarians Assembly website, but should be put there as a “working document”.

**Policy and Organizational Structure Committee (POSC):** Mary Molineux and Carol McAllister reported on POSC’s activities. There is a chart of College committees on the Librarians Assembly website. The chart lists 33 committees, ranked by level of appropriateness for librarian involvement. On the chart, committees labeled “covered” means that there is a librarian on the committee already, and those marked “individual interest” means that they’re not committees that would address the interests of the Librarians Assembly as a whole.

7 librarians are on College committees as of the last year. More librarians are needed. There are many openings where librarians can get involved. Contact Carol or Mary to do so.

Carol and Mary highlighted two committees where they would like to see member involvement. Librarians used to attend Arts and Sciences Faculty meetings, which are held on the 1<sup>st</sup> Tuesday of each month in Millington at 3:30. The Librarians Assembly

webpage has links to the minutes and meeting information. Librarians are welcome to attend the meetings in a non-voting capacity.

The Faculty Assembly for tenured and tenure-eligible faculty meets on the 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday of each month at Blow Hall at 3:30. They will accept observers and comments at the meeting.

POSC has decreased to 2 members. Carol will remain on the committee one more year, and Mary is taking over as President of the Librarians Assembly, so new members are definitely needed.

**Nominating Committee:** Bettina Manzo presented the slate:

Vice President/President-Elect: Hope Yelich, Swem Library  
Secretary: Deb Vroman, Richard Bland College  
Members at Large: Marilyn Lewis, VIMS and Paul Hellyer, Law Library

No nominations were offered from the floor. The slate was accepted unanimously by voice vote.

New Business:

Stacy Gould suggested increasing term lengths for the officers. She mentioned the possibility of moving to 2-year staggered terms for the President, Secretary, and Members at Large.

Bettina Manzo said that the Librarians Assembly needs a committee to examine the bylaws. They state that we are to have 2 meetings each year. Mary Molineux asked if there was interest in meeting 3-4 times, but it was pointed out that this would be a burden on Richard Bland librarians. Suggestions from the floor included:

1. meeting once each semester and once in the summer
2. consider leaving meetings unplanned and only meet as needed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Sekula, Secretary