This annotated listing of 121 items covering the period from 1974 through 1985 was compiled from a literature search of LISA, ERIC, and "Library Literature." Sources listed are those U.S. and Canadian monographs, articles, and ERIC documents that are directly pertinent to the topic of faculty status and its related subtopics. Primary emphasis is on the United States, but relevant articles on Canadian academic status are included. Coverage is selective rather than comprehensive; sources comprise general or viewpoint pieces on faculty status or an aspect of faculty status, surveys, and case studies. Articles treating the topic peripherally are excluded. Sources are grouped chronologically by year beginning with 1974 and alphabetically within each 1-year section. (KM)
Due to the continued interest in faculty status for academic librarians, the value of an up-to-date, descriptively annotated bibliography is apparent. Nancy Huling's respected bibliography surveys the period from the late nineteenth century up to and including 1973; the following bibliography continues where Huling's ended, covering 1974 through 1985.

The methodology for compilation consisted of a literature search in LISA, ERIC and Library Literature. Sources listed are those U.S. and Canadian monographs, articles, and ERIC documents which are directly pertinent to the topic of faculty status and its related subtopics. Primary emphasis is on United States material, although included are relevant articles on Canadian academic status, the counterpart (with a twist) to U.S. faculty status. Academic status as defined by the Canadian Library Association is "the possession of most, but not necessarily all, of the usual privileges of faculty members, with definite classification as academic, but without faculty rank titles."²

Coverage, unlike Huling's, is selective rather than comprehensive. After a review of the wealth of literature, sources were chosen as determined by relevance and appropriateness for a bibliography of this type, and in terms of their
usefulness to interested librarians. Articles treating the topic peripherally were excluded. For example, many articles on collective bargaining may be found in the literature; however, unless faculty status as it relates to collective bargaining is treated in an article, it was excluded from the bibliography.

In addition, articles concerning professional status or professionalism in the library science and information field are not included here, since this concept is distinct from faculty status.

Primary arrangement is chronological, beginning with 1974; this provides the reader with a perspective on how the faculty status issue has developed and changed over time. Types of sources selected comprise general or viewpoint pieces on faculty status or an aspect of faculty status, surveys, and case studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1974


This article discusses the implications of collective bargaining for academic libraries, for both professional and non-professional staff -- often comparing cases in Canada and the U.S. States that if the ACRL standards are to be used as a basis for negotiations, they should be redefined in terms of librarians' particular circumstances. Other topics discussed include alternative governance structures and benefit plans.


A survey of eleven university library directors in the New Mexico area. Results show that although most librarians have faculty status, they still operate on an eleven- or twelve-month contract. The study also indicates that "academic degrees, experience as a librarian, and rank tend to be major influences on salaries" while raises are influenced by merit and cost of living. Includes salary structure chart for 1974-1975.

Considers faculty status in terms of its impact on library governance. Bureaucratic governance does not allow for the democratic structure essential if librarians are to conduct themselves as faculty. To achieve true faculty status, librarians should emulate teaching departments' collegial fashion of governance and peer review systems. Discusses this process in particular at Rutgers University.


Discusses the nine tests of faculty status for librarians as outlined in the ACRL standards and the ways collective bargaining will support these standards, as well as some of the broader goals of unionized faculty members. "In assessing the contribution of bargaining to these rights, it is important to realize that even where they have not been achieved they are potentially subjects of future negotiations . . . on any non-union campus."


A report on the March 22, 1974 seminar on faculty status at York University in Canada.

Part one of this publication is a history of the issue by Arthur M. McAnally, discussing the benefits of faculty status and providing an overview of the specific themes dominating the controversy, such as the need for innovation in research, rank, contracts, and support staff. The remainder of the book consists of reprints of three policy statements: ACRL's "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians," "Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians" (Drafted by ACRL, AAUP, and the Association of American Colleges), and ACRL's "Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures." These statements have since provided the basis for academic librarians' bargaining positions.


One of the issues addressed in this article is faculty status. States that there is no easy solution to this problem, but that professional status for librarians requires "professionalism to the highest degree." Those librarians opting for other than faculty status must develop their own standards.

Background and current status of the library faculty's contract at West Chester State College. Although librarians had had faculty status for fifty years, it was continuously threatened, and librarians were not truly active members of the faculty. They drafted a contract through their collective bargaining unit that guaranteed them membership in the instructional faculty. Although schedules, length of contract, and governance were addressed in the agreement, tenure requirements and scholarly responsibilities apparently were not.


The author pleads for the pursuit of a "librarian status" unrelated to faculty status, which would represent all members of the profession and not just academic librarians. Suggests that academic librarians are more interested in personal prestige than in truly improving the profession.

A history of SUNY librarians' efforts to achieve full faculty status which began in 1966. Details recommendations made by the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Libraries (i.e., equivalent salaries to faculty and contract year). After denial of most of the recommendations, except those regarding voting and appointment, a SUNY librarians' association was formed in 1969 to promote them. Hubbard concludes with an update on the position of SUNY librarians in 1974.


The authors (academicians, not librarians) present pros and cons of faculty status for librarians, concluding that "... librarians themselves are not in agreement as to the best method to establish the recognition they deserve, or to the qualifications necessary in order to obtain such recognition."


A document resulting from a study done by the Commission on Librarianship at Stanford which looked at the role and status of librarians at the university. An extensive number of issues are covered, including faculty status and its accoutrements (i.e.,
peer review, professional leave). Contains recommendations by the Commission.


Traces the background of a collective bargaining agreement at Wayne State University in which the librarians' concerns were included with those of the teaching faculty in the negotiations. Concludes that librarians at Wayne State have not benefited fully from the agreement because they are reluctant to use the very privileges for which they bargained, most notably peer review.


Discusses the implications of tenure for library faculty, including both positive and negative aspects. Expresses the need for librarians to set careful guidelines for themselves in order to avoid neglecting the service aspects of their jobs. Also discusses academic freedom and job security. States that "learning how to play this intricate game contributes to new standards of maturity and excellence in librarianship."

Explains the many facets of faculty participation and its relationship to collective bargaining. The implications and problems this issue has for library faculty are also addressed.


Discusses the efforts of librarians at City University of New York to attain faculty status. Cites misunderstanding within the academic community of the real worth and equality with faculty that librarians possess. Recommends that the academic community be better informed concerning the value of librarians, and that librarians accept responsibility as full members of the faculty. States that collective bargaining is essential in that it guarantees equity in salaries, support for research, and fair evaluation programs.

1976


This is a collection of papers and panel discussions presented at a Preconference Institute of the ACRL Academic Status Committee, San Francisco, June 27 & 28, 1975. Topics covered are the nature of collective bargaining, academic librarians' experiences with collective bargaining negotiations.
and agreements, approaches to related issues of governance and status, and strategies for enabling legislation, choosing agents, and writing agreements.


Places the passage of ACRL's standards for faculty status in the context of the revolutionary social movements and economic growth of the late 1960s. The "crisis," due in part to librarians' poor preparation for scholarship, lies in that the identity of the librarian is somewhere between vocational and professional. Discusses three options for solving the problem: working to meet the responsibilities of faculty status, choosing civil service status, or choosing a quasi-professional status.


Asserts that although faculty status may hold many benefits for the individual, it can hinder in some ways the effective management of a library. In particular, the author discusses the imposition of a "collegial body" on the normally bureaucratic library administration, and the numerous demands on professional librarians which take away from supervisory effectiveness.

Relates the experiences of two librarians as part-time teachers of non-library courses at Coe College. Questions raised by the authors relating to their experience's effect on faculty status include: Is the librarian not intellectually credible unless there is involvement in teaching? Does this involvement undermine the work of the non-teaching librarians? Is teaching the only way in which librarians can be accepted as peers of the faculty? The experience is then interpreted using a description of professionalism by William Goode.


Traces the historical development of the academic librarian to 1976. Inherent in this development was the quest for faculty status which surfaced in some institutions as early as the nineteenth century. Downs also discusses faculty status in the present century, as well as basic and advanced library education, research and publication, participation in professional organizations, and the university librarian's changing role.

Summary of the status changes of librarians at Auburn University including the accepted document on appointment, promotion and tenure for librarians, "Proposed Terminology for Library Faculty Ranks."


In order to formulate formal guidelines for academic appointment, tenure, rank, and promotion, Eastern Kentucky University solicited responses to a questionnaire on this topic from universities in Kentucky and the surrounding region. By the authors' own admission the questionnaire is flawed; however, the overall picture of faculty status in the Kentucky region is summarized for the readers.


Explains the establishment of a committee at Ohio State University Libraries which supports the research activities of the library faculty. Its responsibilities include identifying areas of interest, soliciting funds to coordinate research activities, and publicizing research. One outgrowth of the committee's work has been a non-assigned time policy.

A report of the State Universities and Colleges chapter of the California Library Association's June 29, 1975 meeting. Discusses the experiences of librarians at five institutions where librarians have faculty status. Areas of concern are promotion and tenure requirements, working schedules, library services, and job responsibilities. Concludes that faculty status is worth seeking.


Clarifies the role of labor relations boards and the process by which the appropriate bargaining unit for the group (academic librarians) is chosen. Examples of board decisions are provided for Canadian public and academic libraries.


This book is meant as a primer of collective bargaining for library faculty. Chapters discuss compensation, the bargaining unit, terms and conditions of employment, governance, contracts, and prospects. Areas discussed which significantly involve
faculty status for librarians are work week, work year, research funds, promotion and tenure, academic freedom, and governance.

1977


A questionnaire sent to libraries in four-year institutions not belonging to ARL measured changes in decision-making bodies, faculty status, unionization, and tenure over a four-year period.


A lively symposium in response to H. William Axford's article on the academic librarian's "identity crisis" in regard to faculty status. Axford proposes three options to resolve this crisis -- submission to academe's rules and regulations for status, admission that librarianship is more honestly a civil service profession, or adoption of academic status as a compromise between the previous options. Nine library administrators react both favorably and unfavorably to Axford's proposals.

Discusses faculty rank, status, and tenure in relation to librarians at the College of Charleston. Bloch begins with a brief historical overview of librarianship and the librarian's eventual assumption of professional responsibilities. Includes ACRL standards for academic status, as well as criteria for evaluation for College of Charleston librarians.


A light piece pondering the appropriateness of increased scholarly requirements at the expense of service to patrons.


In his attempt to define the identity of the academic library, DePriest looks at a report by organization experts who surveyed Pennsylvania state colleges "to determine a personnel program for non-teaching staff, including librarians." This report discusses the librarians' status and role in the academic library. DePriest also examines library and institutional goals
and their implications, including full academic standing for librarians.


The local Clinton, New York chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) conducted a survey of librarian positions at Hamilton and Kirkland Colleges in order to examine the discrepancy between faculty and librarian rights. The questionnaire looked at benefits of librarians such as academic rank and tenure, campus governance responsibilities, and the relationship between benefits and responsibilities in terms of faculty status.


Gaboriault interviewed twelve academic library directors at six public and six private institutions in Massachusetts on their perceptions of collective bargaining. Although this article examines collective bargaining and its components in general, faculty status as it relates to collective bargaining is included in the discussion.

A survey of Louisiana academic librarians to ascertain the degree to which the ACRL standards for faculty status were being met. Jackson summarizes her state findings in the following standards areas: professional responsibilities and self-determination, library governance, college and university governance, compensation, tenure, promotion, leaves, research funds, and academic freedom.


Guidelines ratified in 1976 by the CAUT Council, developed in cooperation with the Canadian Association of College and University Librarians, evoked reactions among librarians, especially on the issue of ranking librarians as teaching faculty are ranked. Pros and cons are listed for both the traditional hierarchical structure in academic libraries and for the new ranked procedure.

This brief report is based on a simple questionnaire sent to directors at seventy-five medium-sized academic libraries. The questions concerned faculty status, length of contract, criteria for promotion and tenure, and fringe benefits. The author concludes that although the majority of librarians have faculty status and responsibilities, not all have the same privileges as teaching faculty — especially in the areas of salary and length of contract.


Watson surveyed ten academic research libraries "to provide some norms of publishing productivity for librarians." Sought relationships of productivity to age, professional maturity, educational background, and position held. Discusses type of publications utilized and staff productivity in sample academic libraries. Watson also covers implications the findings have for librarians with faculty status, noting low publishing productivity figures for professionals with five or fewer years of experience. She states it may be "unreasonable to expect publication for tenure at institutions where librarians have full faculty status." Suggests ways that librarians with faculty status can meet requirements for publication.
Following a general description of the peer evaluation process for academic librarians with faculty status, Yen-Ran Yeh highlights the pros and cons of such a system. On the positive side, peer evaluation provides the librarian with a sense of dignity, aids the library administrator in deciding on personnel matters, enhances library departmental communication, and provides librarians with an evaluation system equivalent to that of teaching faculty, thus increasing morale. On the other hand, peer review may promote "backstabbing," be based on insufficient knowledge of an individual's performance, and be influenced by the friendship, race, or sex of the evaluatee. The author includes surveys on several of these issues.

Faculty status is one issue the authors believe could be affected if reference librarians are undertaking work that is below their intellectual capacity and educational training. Library literature studies estimate that 50% to 80% of questions reference librarians answer are informational or directional.
Other issues relevant to this finding include morale of reference librarians, library cost effectiveness, reference education, and staffing.


An update to a 1973 survey article of law school libraries covering autonomy and faculty status. The present survey devotes a sizeable portion of questions to faculty status for law librarians (the 1973 survey offered data on this topic for head librarians only), including representative comments from respondents and summary analyses.


A study was made to determine whether the presence of a bargaining agent has any effect on the faculty status of academic librarians. A questionnaire sent to librarians at six universities asked about the effectiveness of a bargaining unit on length of contract, salary, level of degree expected, research expected, benefits, criteria for promotion, faculty privileges, library service, librarians' influence, and librarians' satisfaction. Concludes that having a bargaining agent does not change librarians' status, and that librarians who have faculty status are not entirely satisfied.

Brief overview of the benefits and responsibilities inherent in faculty status and problems librarians encounter in meeting them, due primarily to lack of intellectual preparation. Concludes that "real dedication and commitment" and a "mature outlook" are needed if librarians are to compete for equal status.


Proposes a two-track system of university status for librarians, one "professorial" and one "non-professorial." If the position requires teaching and publication, it should involve faculty status. If, on the other hand, it requires solving problems directly related to the position and continuing education on practical matters, it should not. If compensation for each is fair, this system will permit both groups to contribute to the university.

Presents the results of a survey of all academic libraries in Texas, in which ACRL standards were compared with the existing conditions. Concludes that Texas librarians do not fare well, as the percentage of libraries meeting any one of the standards varies from 21% to 73%. The authors end by making recommendations for improvement.


Reports the changes anticipated in 1976, when Laurentian University approved faculty status for librarians, and the realities facing the librarians two years later -- especially in that librarians were required to conduct and publish research. Finding time and support equal to that provided to teaching faculty proved difficult. A committee assigned to solve the problems drafted recommendations related to administrative duties, governance, and scheduling problems.


A questionnaire was sent to all academic U.S. members of ACRL concerning only one issue -- whether release time was granted to librarians for research. Although 94% of the libraries surveyed required research for tenure and promotion, only 9% provided release time. The great majority of these librarians worked on
twelve-month contracts, averaging 38.6 hours per week. Conclusion states that although the demands placed on academic librarians are escalating, the opportunities to succeed are not keeping pace. Recommends that librarians implement alternative promotion and tenure models.


Professional development leaves for librarians at Oakland University and their importance and value as a first step toward faculty status.


1979

50. Casellas, Elizabeth. Academic Business Librarians in the United States: Their Faculty Status and its Relationship to the

Based on a survey of chief business librarians from each U.S. university having a business school. Areas covered are publishing and related responsibilities, types of publications, rank, tenure, education, benefits, classroom teaching, and professional memberships. Conclusions are drawn concerning the responsibility of academic business librarians to embrace fully the lifelong pursuit of intellectual growth.


The ALA Conference in Atlantic City, 1969, brought happiness in the form of faculty status to many librarians, but after ten years this happiness may have been diluted. Galloway contends that with faculty status librarians have become better educated, have published more frequently, and have obtained increased salaries. However, many librarian benefits and opportunities are still not commensurate with those of faculty.


An article against faculty status for librarians, based on the premise that what librarians do and what other faculty
members do are fundamentally different. States that faculty status draws librarians away from their real goals, and that librarians should instead seek the power, prestige, and salaries of administrative status. Librarians must value their own contributions and see that others do as well.


This case study outlines a situation brought before the ALA Staff Committee on Mediation, Arbitration and Inquiry (SCMAI) in 1977. The case involved a college librarian who received a salary increase unequal to that of her colleague and her subsequent action to correct the discrepancy. Faculty status was a key issue and conclusions were drawn that may be applicable to other institutions encountering similar circumstances.


Explains the process gone through by Georgia State University librarians in order to make the governance of their library more participative. They established by-laws providing for, among other things, functions and duties of library faculty to be specified, the library faculty to have an administrative council, and permanent standing committees. Offers points to consider for librarians contemplating this step.

Introduces the issue of faculty status with an historical overview succeeded by a rationale for faculty status for academic librarians. Schmidt also discusses its implications and problems, including collective bargaining, academic librarian education, and the special concerns of technical services librarians.


This article, frequently cited in the faculty status literature, defines an organization fiction and its occurrence in librarianship. Wilson explains the type of organization fiction prevalent in libraries and offers three reasons for its existence: to enhance the librarian's self-image, improve his/her status, and convey the librarian's profession to the outside world. In addition, Wilson argues that librarians as teachers is a fiction which is harmful to the library profession. Also addressed are the special implications this issue has for academic librarians concerned with faculty status.

This is a report of recommendations for release time made to the SUNY library faculty by a task force assigned to study the issue. The study consisted of a questionnaire taken among the library faculty measuring work, research, and professional development time utilization. Recommendations are made for support and flexibility to be provided for library faculty by the library administration.

1980


Based on a 1979 survey of all college and university library directors in Ohio, concerning the degree to which librarians have "full" faculty status as defined by the ACRL standards. Findings reveal that very few academic librarians have full faculty status, although those at large public institutions have more of the benefits associated with their status than do those at private colleges. Significant problem areas are inequality of salaries, academic governance, and contract length. "Clearly academic librarians in Ohio have a long way to go before they can claim to have full faculty status."

This kit contains seven examples of contracts and agreements negotiated for librarians by collective bargaining agents. The introduction provides an overview of the effects collective bargaining has on librarians' positions vis-a-vis faculty, as well as the tangible gains it has afforded them.


In 1973-74, the Columbia University Libraries instituted a two-track system of professional ranks and position categories. The librarians drafted their own criteria for promotion, believing that adherence to faculty standards would not reflect their functional roles. The system allows for recognition of professional and scholarly contributions as well as for increased managerial responsibilities.


One brief section of this library self-study has to do with the lack of recognition librarians experience on campus, and the absence of stimuli to pursue professional goals, even though
librarians have faculty status. Comparisons are made of librarians to teaching faculty, and a need for an orderly system of evaluation and promotion of library faculty is stated.


   This article discusses the measures attempted by academic librarians to achieve higher status. Discusses the difficulty of acting as professionals in a bureaucratic setting, and the inappropriateness of the faculty model as a means of gaining status and autonomy. Librarians need to pursue self-esteem and status on the basis of good service and to create their own model of professionalism.


   Results of a study of theological librarians at 137 libraries belonging to the American Theological Library Association, noting their status and the percentage of normal faculty characteristics possessed by both head librarians and other librarians. One important finding was that head librarians tend to enjoy many more of the privileges attached to faculty status than do other theological librarians.

A survey of ARL librarians to ascertain the requisites of research and publication and their implications (i.e. release time, tenure). The key finding is that, of those libraries surveyed, 15% require their librarians to publish. The authors note a lack of research in this area and suggest that "a similar study five years hence might produce significantly different results as publication becomes more commonplace for academic librarians."


A call for academic librarians to "... become active and visible members of the community in which they work if they are to continue to demand faculty status." This requires additional professional activities such as committee work, memberships, and institutional and library service which will enhance the effectiveness of the librarian as well as encourage the teaching faculty to accept the librarian as equal. Other considerations related to faculty status raised by Sherby are release time for librarians to engage in additional professional activities and
the dilemma librarians may encounter if they choose not to participate in these activities.


Examination of the peer evaluation process as a requirement for librarians with faculty status. Sherby acknowledges one drawback to this process which is that many academic peer review processes are developed for teaching faculty evaluation. However, she presents examples of the process at Texas A & M, Central Washington State College, Southern Illinois University -- Carbondale, and Rhode Island College, whereby evaluation criteria have been tailored specifically to the individual institution's library faculty. Also, the peer evaluation process is outlined. Inherent in the process is the need for evaluating faculty members to be objective and ethical, and for peer evaluation to be an issue that is addressed in the hiring of new library faculty.


A cogent view of faculty status through discussion of the systemics of professionalism, power as a characteristic within
universities, and collective bargaining. Collegiality and its implications for the library faculty are also discussed.


A survey of all ARL libraries on librarian status. The kit reports statistics of ninety-one responses and includes documents from ARL libraries on appointment, promotion and tenure, internal structure for ranking, and sample library faculty by-laws. Several significant findings: 1) criteria for appointment, promotion and tenure vary from library to library; 2) the most important criterion indicated for librarian review, evaluation, and promotion is professional competence, followed closely by research and scholarly activity; 3) many librarians are still evaluated by the same criteria as teaching faculty; and 4) release time for scholarly research continues to be non-equivalent for librarians and faculty. The introductory overview to this kit also describes implications and needs regarding faculty status.


Included in this paper, which primarily examines library personnel systems and library personnel resources, is a brief general overview of the status of academic librarians.

A brief summary of responses by non-ARL libraries participating in the ACRL 100 Libraries Project (libraries surveyed on key library issues several times a year) on the types of academic status held. Data is compared to ARL library responses on the same topic.


This article is a review of major topics involved in the governance of academic libraries, with a particular view to the broader context of academic governance. Faculty status for librarians is discussed as it relates to governance, with special references to the ACRL standards and to the ambiguous nature of academic library organization.


Presents a history of the faculty/librarian relationship and identifies faculty status as one "source of tension" between the two groups. Biggs also elaborates on the faculty's role in collection development and library operations.

Results of a survey of teaching faculty taken at Southeastern Louisiana University. The survey measured attitudes toward librarians, including questions concerning the type of research they should conduct, whether they are faculty, whether they should have release time for research, and the importance of librarians and collections in research and teaching. It was found that a majority of faculty feel that librarians are professionals and should be granted faculty status, but that they should also work on twelve-month contracts and should not be granted release time.


This survey, conducted at Southern Illinois University -- Carbondale, is one of the few measuring the attitudes of teaching faculty toward faculty status for librarians. In general, their perceptions of librarians are positive and they seem to possess a good understanding of the constraints placed on library services by the emphasis on research required by the university.

75. Davidson, Russ, Connie Capers Thorson, and Margo C. Trumpeter. "Faculty Status for Librarians in the Rocky Mountain
A survey of Rocky Mountain institutions sought to determine the number of librarians granted faculty status as well as the compatibility between the duties and benefits of the teaching faculty and those of the library faculty. Davidson et al. indicate publishing requirements and contract year as key discrepancies between the two groups. The survey also included library directors' opinions which confirmed ambiguity as the major characteristic surrounding the issue of faculty status for librarians.


This paper briefly discusses trends in California since the 1960s concerning faculty status for librarians. Several individual colleges and universities are profiled. It is concluded that progress toward equal status is continuing and will continue to improve.

Discusses the issue of acceptability of publications unrelated to librarianship for promotion and tenure of librarians. At Purdue University, a related policy was adopted to reflect an interest on the part of some librarians in broadening the scope of library science, allowing a more interdisciplinary definition. Authors conducted a survey of ACRL libraries to measure similar flexibility, concluding that requiring librarians to publish only in library science is not a trend.


Describes how librarians with faculty status at Southern Illinois University -- Carbondale have dealt with increasing pressure to conduct and publish research for promotion and tenure. Authors detail the history and activities of the Faculty Development Committee and its ensuing extension, the Research Interest Group. Explains the impact the group has had in aiding librarians in the research process.


Meyer summarizes his arguments against faculty status as proposed in an earlier paper, adds new arguments and states results from a survey which measured librarians' change on the issue of faculty status over a five-year period. He found that
faculty status is still favored by the majority of academic librarians; however, this majority has declined over five years so that at the time of the report a sizeable minority (31%) considered faculty status a worthless pursuit. Instead of faculty status, Meyer supports other alternatives such as the development by librarians of their own knowledge base (as professors have done) and asserting this convincingly to the public.


An overview of faculty status and its unique applications/problems for college librarians. Includes a survey of library directors and their definitions of faculty status for librarians at their institutions. From this survey, Miller concludes that "college librarians, taken as a group, do not presently have faculty status despite their varying degrees of belief that they do." Pros and cons of faculty status are also treated as are alternatives to faculty status.


A survey of academic librarians in the Southern tri-state -- Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi -- who responded to
demographic, educational, and occupational questions and provided opinions on length of contract, faculty status, and a comparable system. Sharma emphasized the necessity for clarification of publication requirements as they relate to promotion and tenure in the tri-state.


Report of a survey conducted among all academic library directors in Mississippi, measuring compliance with ACRL standards, in which it was found that although 68% of directors claimed faculty status for librarians at their institutions, no one institution offered all of the ACRL criteria comprising full faculty status. Salaries, library governance, self-determination, and tenure were the most significant areas in which the ACRL standards were ignored.


Reports on a collective bargaining agreement at Laurentian University, in which the recommendations of a committee clarifying the rights and responsibilities of library faculty were adopted with positive results.

Written as a reaction to Richard Meyer's essay, "Library Professionalism and the Democratic Way," this article questions the appropriateness of academic librarians adopting either a completely bureaucratic or a totally democratic organizational model.


Asserts that librarians have a teaching function and discusses the aspects of the profession which support that statement. Concerning faculty status, the author states that most librarians are willing to take on all of the responsibilities implied therein. Librarians do not "cease to be librarians" if they teach, research, and publish.

Two groups of academic librarians -- authors and non-authors -- were surveyed to identify factors motivating them to publish. An interesting finding is that, although a contract leading to tenure motivates librarians to publish, other forms of institutional encouragement (release time, for example) do not. Concludes with further questions which need to be addressed in the 1980s.


A case study of the Dickinson College (Carlisle, PA) library staff and its organizational evolution from a hierarchical structure to a collegial department.


Addresses techniques by which the administration of a library can establish participative management to help create a "true sense of academic governance" for librarians with faculty status. The techniques include peer selection, travel benefits,
and eligibility for tenure. Other practical plans concern service areas, budget preparation, publications, and planning.


A unique approach to cooperation and collegiality between library faculty and teaching faculty is practiced at Evergreen State College. Librarians and teaching faculty may choose to rotate for one quarter, the teacher becoming a reference or collection development librarian, and the librarian teaching full-time. This approach has generated much enthusiasm and support among students and among teaching faculty. Library faculty enjoy salaries and work years equal to those of teaching faculty.

A call for librarians to gain expertise and competence in a subject field as a necessity in holding full faculty status. Kaiser describes attributes of the scholar-librarian and emphasizes the importance of a librarian's aligning her/himself with a faculty member in a shared subject area for publishing purposes and professional accountability.


As a librarian at Southern Oregon State College, Kibbey applauds the contributions of her colleagues, as well as the professional opportunities available which have resulted from holding full academic rank. She explains the librarians' duties/activities and includes pros and cons of academic rank.


Traces the history of the SUNY libraries' movement for faculty status. Discusses in detail the progress and pitfalls experienced by SUNY librarians during contract negotiations. As of 1982, the major issues of equal salaries and academic-year contracts were not yet resolved.

The library director at Southern Oregon State College details the organization and responsibilities of his library staff, indicating that problems and perqs exist for those librarians with full academic rank.


Savage states that academic status for Canadian librarians has progressed considerably over the years and credits the alliance of CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers) and CACUL (Canadian Association of College and University Libraries) as a central factor in this progress. However, Savage also addresses problematic issues surrounding faculty status -- release time, recognition of academic status, and the evaluation process and criteria.


Describes the policy adopted at UNM Library providing release time for research to its librarians. The policy involves monitoring of research projects by a committee of library faculty and administrators. Librarians' research activity has increased since implementation of this policy, and librarians' workloads are now perceived as being comparable to those of teaching faculty.

In large part due to faculty status standards, research by librarians is required for promotion and tenure, yet librarians frequently find themselves unable to undertake research projects. Traister explores this topic and also provides a personal survey of attitudes librarians hold toward research. Concludes that institutional support for research is beneficial from a service perspective.


In a study based on the examination of academic library job advertisements, the author follows changes in requirements and benefits. The study was conducted in order to determine whether, considering the growing professional demands placed on librarians, they are offered more in compensation. Concludes that although librarians were expected to steadily bring more to jobs, salaries in real dollars showed no significant increase.

The author uses statistics compiled by the American Association of University Professors to compare the salaries of academic librarians to those of instructional faculty. Although the ACRL standards call for salaries equal to those of teaching faculty, the data show that librarians are in fact paid less than instructional faculty with the same ranks in all types of institutions. No mention is made of possible causes for this discrepancy.

1983


A survey conducted among academic librarians in New York measured their status based on ACRL standards, finding that librarians have more of the responsibilities than the rights and benefits of teaching faculty. This does not include salary, which was left out of the survey.

Reports the results of a survey, taken among librarians in the Rocky Mountain region, to assess their views on the subject of faculty status. This survey was also compared to an earlier survey taken of library directors in the same region. Concludes that controversy exists among these librarians and also that the views of directors differ sharply from those of librarians concerning the benefits enjoyed by library faculty.


Traces the recent history of faculty status and implementation of the ACRL standards since 1973. Studies show that libraries which have "implemented" these standards have made progress, but with significant exceptions in the areas of tenure, length of appointment, rank, and leaves. ACRL has not carried out its own sanctions against non-complying libraries. Suggests changes in the ACRL standards to reflect the contributions librarians make on their own merits, stating that librarians who wear the labels of another profession "undermine the integrity of their own profession, and in a real sense deny it."

Because of work schedules, variety in the subject areas with which they work, lack of a high terminal degree (and thus preparation), nature of the work environment, and the fact that the work they do is more technical than scholarly, librarians are inhibited from producing research equal to that of teaching faculty. Librarians' research has not proven to be particularly notable. Libraries should either lower expectations related to research or allow more time, funding, and counseling support for library research.


This survey reflects the current trend away from faculty status for academic librarians and toward alternative ranks or criteria for performance. Interesting comparisons are drawn between state and private institutions. Areas covered are types of appointment, tenure, rank, benefits, and criteria for performance. Two important conclusions are that 1) librarians with faculty status are required to meet two separate sets of criteria, and 2) the few recent changes in status have been toward non-faculty or modified faculty status.

Results of a survey conducted in 1982 among 100 university libraries in the Southeast, seventy-five with faculty status and twenty-five without. Measured were differences in tenure, benefits, contract year, work schedules, publication, and teaching. Concludes that "ACRL's standards for faculty status have not yet been met by many institutions that state they have faculty status for librarians," especially in the area of contract year. Also concludes that the advantage of faculty status (other than prestige) was not evident in any benefits except professional development leaves.


The once insurmountable task of attaining faculty status has now been replaced with what to do with it now that many librarians have it. Isaac examines three concepts inherent in this predicament -- research and publication in librarianship, research and publication in outside disciplines, and the unwilling researcher and publisher. The author also raises questions in regard to librarians' professional education as well as faculty status requirements as they affect job performance within the library.

A practical approach to the realities of faculty status. The author proposes a scheme whereby the librarian evaluates an employer's capability and commitment to create favorable conditions for the librarian to develop professionally within the framework of faculty status. Eight steps are enumerated in the evaluation process which include, among others, the librarian's appraisal of his/her career goals, an analysis of the institution's capacity to meet these goals, the institution's potential for research, and the opportunities for further graduate work.


A survey of New Jersey academic library directors to determine whether New Jersey librarians meet faculty status standards as set down by ACRL. Findings similar to those from Ohio and New York surveys are reported, specifically that an academic year contract for librarians was a standard most difficult to obtain and eligibility to serve on campus governance committees was a standard most easily obtained. The most common standard achieved by New Jersey librarians was eligibility for release time with pay. The authors also discuss compensation, tenure, and sabbaticals.

Discusses the appropriateness of faculty status for librarians and presents the methods by which the University of Illinois at Urbana -- Champaign library has implemented this successfully. Particular issues raised are librarians as teachers, collegiality, faculty vs. administrative control, criteria for evaluation, and work schedules. Innovations in use at UIUC are proposed for other university libraries.

1984


The author discusses practices at various academic libraries concerning release time for research, noting that time off is more frequently provided for continuing education than for scholarly publishing pursuits. Some basic conflicts hindering release time are discussed, and examples are given of other activities which support library research. Concludes that the amount of release time librarians receive for research has not increased over the last twenty years.
The results of a survey conducted among forty-seven non-library university administrators supported the author's supposition that academic institutions lack a clear rationale for granting faculty status to librarians. Significant findings were that administrators believe 1) that granting faculty status to librarians does not engender significant advantages for the university, 2) that faculty appointments are unsuitable for librarians because of the nature of their work, and 3) that librarians would be unable to meet tenure requirements if they were as stringently applied as they are for teaching faculty.

Horn concisely discusses peer review as a common evaluation method in many academic libraries and provides a history and definition of the process. Also included are the results and analysis of a questionnaire on the utilization of peer review in ARL libraries. Two noteworthy results of the survey are: 1) peer review of some type is used in 67% of ARL libraries and 2) peer review is more common at state institutions and among institutions which have faculty status.

Authors undertook a survey, designed after an earlier survey by Rayman and Goudy, to be conducted among non-ARL academic libraries. Measured were the importance of publication for promotion and tenure and level of support for librarians' research. Other subjects measured were the type of publication most acceptable, work week and contract year, and educational requirements.


Peele proffers original ideas on the issue of librarians as teachers, an argument often used to justify faculty status. Views aired include: technical services librarians as teachers, librarians as responding agents, not originating agents, and reasons that librarians desire the title of "teacher" in the first place.


This essay describes documents from library literature which argue in favor of faculty status for librarians, using the concept of academic freedom as a basis for their arguments. The
thirteen items date from 1956-1975. Concludes with a discussion of the meaning of academic freedom for librarians.


A survey of tenured librarians at ARL libraries to determine whether or not ACRL standards for faculty status in regard to peer review are being met. The authors sought the correlation between the peer review process and research/publication requirements. They found that the peer review process has continued to increase in university libraries and has had a substantial effect on research and publication.


This survey was conducted among thirty-three large university libraries and was designed to gather data on the characteristics and accomplishments of tenured librarians. In terms of criteria for promotion and tenure, emphasis had shifted so that research and publication requirements were greater in 1979 than at the time most librarians surveyed had acquired tenure. The overall scholarly output of tenured librarians was low when compared to that of teaching faculty.

This article concerns the situation regarding faculty status among ten Louisiana and thirty-eight other southeastern universities. One of the points made regarding the research and publication issue is that it is impossible for many library administrations to make provisions for release time for all of their librarians -- at least to the extent that all might be able to achieve notable publications. Therefore, rather than require research from their librarians, libraries should establish policies reflecting librarians' unique situation. Cites such policies from four major universities. Concludes that although there has been progress in faculty status, it remains a "myth" if administrators do not provide adequate schedules and salaries.

1985


Presents a solution to the faculty status dilemma in practice at Dickinson College, where the category "academic professionals" includes librarians, the media center director, some computer center personnel, several half-time teachers and administrators, and others. They are those responsible for supporting the
academic program by providing skills or services that are essential. Faculty status is reserved for full-time teachers. This has improved campus-wide understanding of and deeper appreciation for the contributions of non-faculty professionals.


Reports the results of a survey designed to test the hypothesis that for those librarians denied tenure, an inadequate research and publication record would be the most frequent cause. The study found that librarians have a high tenure rate, but that for those denied tenure, the authors' hypothesis is valid. An interesting finding of this study was that of the libraries changing their librarians' status during the last ten years, sixteen out of thirty-seven institutions have moved to nontenure-track status, and twelve have changed to tenure-track without publication requirements.


A brief, but necessary, update on the increase of unionization in academic libraries. Presents several university library cases and their success (or problems) with unionization, for example, the library at Curry College has had tremendous
success in attaining faculty-like benefits and privileges as a result of unionization.


Argues that the "frequently large and growing" disparity in salaries between librarians and their teaching colleagues is not due entirely to glut in the market, unfavorable stereotyping, or historically low wages. Instead, the ambiguity of librarians' role and status vis-a-vis teaching faculty detracts from their value on campus. States that librarians will be misunderstood and undervalued until they are recognized for what they really do, which is provide access to the most valuable commodity on campus -- information.