

## MONTHLY STAFF MEETING of March 29

- Agenda:
1. Various aspects of budget decisions concerning serials. Dr. Byrd.
  2. Allocation and distribution of book funds. Dr. Byrd.
  3. Career status of professional librarians. Dr. Flener.
  4. Theft detection devices and Pittsburgh trip. Mr. Souter.
  5. Discussion of bomb threats by Safety. Mr. Owens and Mr. Huntington.

Dr. Byrd stated that there is a general serials fund which is set aside at the beginning of each fiscal year. Such monies are used to purchase serials and to pay for binding. In addition to the general fund, monies are currently being taken from the book budgets of the various departments as they order new serials. The overall situation is that the University Library Committee asked the departments to review their serials and to eliminate those which are no longer necessary. Departments were also asked to make a voluntary 12 percent cutback in order to get monies necessary to cover the rise in costs of subscriptions being received. The question as to what will happen in 1972-1973 is still open as it will depend somewhat on the total number of subscriptions which are expected in the next six years unless the university finances are improved. Mrs. Shepherd stated that the response and results thus far are very good, but many reports are not in. The composite list of serials will be compiled and issued as soon as all lists come in. Copies will go to librarians and department heads. Mr. Baatz said that communications here is very important and questions concerning the list or operational procedures should be directed to Mrs. Shepherd. Mrs. Egan asked when cancellations would actually occur, and Mrs. Shepherd responded that they hope at the end of the 1972 year.

On the subject of allocation and distribution of book funds, Dr. Byrd stated that after a reasonable amount is taken out for serials and binding, what remains is allocated to the separate departments. Departments are asked to submit estimates of their needs and requests are always far above the available funds. When questioned about the librarian's fund, Dr. Byrd said that its purpose is to bail out departments which have emergency needs during the year. The fund is small and is likely to be smaller in succeeding years, but anyone can make a request. Dr. Byrd also commented that retrospective buying might be an item to cut in the future. Some subject specialists are already finding that current materials will soon be able to deplete the budget.

The Library Committee welcomes suggestions about how it should go a-

bout dividing the book fund.

Concerning career status for professional librarians, Miss Flener said that unfortunately the library administration had not received the latest material distributed from Dean Liebenow's office. She understood that there was a meeting scheduled for a discussion of the matter by Dean Liebenow on Thursday, March 30, at 7:30 p.m. She reminded the staff that it was the time of year when many professional meetings were scheduled (see Scoop Sheet, v. 3, no. 3, pp. 8-10).

Mr. Souter then discussed theft detection systems. Presently there are only two systems under consideration. (1) Tattle-Tape (3M) and (2) Checkpoint. Both systems require the use of turnstiles, but the Checkpoint system is recommended for maximum security. All books are treated in the processing center. Regional campuses at the Northwestern campus at Gary and at the Southeastern campus at Jeffersonville are using the Checkpoint system, and Kokomo has received the equipment. All five regional campuses are scheduled to have Checkpoint equipment operational by September. Most of the discussion up to this point has been done on the ~~3M~~ system as the Main Library is used heavily for studying. Libraries using such systems are being visited by Mr. Souter and others. Mr. Souter stated that neither system is guaranteed.

Dr. Studer stated that the Checkpoint system has the greatest market in libraries; he also thought that persons studying the Tattle-Tape system would want to contact representatives of the Checkpoint system. It was then suggested that Mr. Souter arrange to have someone representing the Checkpoint system talk to those persons who anticipate the use of some theft detection system. (The meeting has been scheduled for Monday, April 10, 9:15 a.m.)

To discuss the procedures which should be followed in case of bomb threats, Mr. Baatz introduced Irvin K. Owen, Director of University Safety for all I.U. campuses, and George Huntington, Director of the Safety Department here on the Bloomington campus. Mr. Owen stated that Safety is presently attempting to prepare procedural instructions on what one should do when he receives a harrassing, obscene, or threatening phone call. These will be sent to department chairmen and personnel who answer telephones. He continued that Mr. Baatz had asked him to give the librarians an idea of what they should instruct their personnel to do when emergencies arise. As background information, Mr. Owen stated that Safety was reorganized in May, 1971, and there is a statewide system covering the seven I.U. campuses. All officers have the same police powers as any other law enforcement officers within their area of jurisdiction. Safety has a training program for personnel involved in search-

ing a building for explosives, and an EOR (explosive ordinance reconnaissance) squad is on the Bloomington campus. Demolition is an Army job, and there is an EOD (explosive ordinance demolition) school at Fort Benjamin Harrison. When the EOR squad finds it necessary to have trained EOD personnel, Fort Benjamin Harrison is called and the squad is flown in by helicopter (usually within 45 minutes). Mr. Owen said that Safety advises the following procedure upon receipt of any harrassing, obscene, or threatening phone calls:

Hang up immediately, if you have the presence of mind.

Call Safety at 7 4111 immediately and report the call.

If you didn't hang up immediately and heard the message, answer "I have no way of handling that; call Safety at 7 4111." Then hang up and call Safety. When you report to Safety, be sure to identify yourself, giving the phone number from which you are calling, the building and location within the building, and as nearly as possible the exact words of the caller. Mr. Owen emphasized the fact that the responsibility for all decisions and action belongs to Safety. Do not decide to evacuate the building; Safety will decide. Do not alarm the occupants. When Safety tells you what to do, do it. AVOID CHAOS. This jeopardizes the fewest people and causes the least trouble.

Mr. Huntington re-emphasized points made by Mr. Owen. Then Mr. Beatz asked for comments on what actually happened during the bomb scares at Chemistry and Swain Hall. In those incidents, no set procedures were followed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Notes by Clara McLeod

With regard to the dissolution of the Steering Committee—

Perhaps the move to dissolve the Steering Committee was a bit drastic, but we, the members of that committee, felt unanimously that better representation of the clerical staff could be gained by the establishment of a new committee of para-professionals which could work in conjunction with InULA towards full representation of all library staff. We believed (and still do) that the Steering Committee as it exists today has become obsolete and should be replaced by a committee composed solely of non-professional members. We moved, therefore, to dissolve now so that another committee would be formed. The vote will be counted Monday, April 10, and the results distributed to all staff members.

George C. Hart

Announcing an InULA meeting

A report of the results of the studies conducted by students in the Graduate School of Business on the subject of library employees' motivations and attitudes

by

Ray Smead, Peter Michna, R.J.M. Schady, Jim Foggin, and Tom Michalak

in

The Staff Lounge, 3rd floor, Library East Tower

on

at

Tuesday, April 25, 1972

7:30 P.M.

Information: Tom Michalak or Jean Taylor.

CAREER STATUS OF I.U. LIBRARIANS

In a talk before the professional librarians on March 30, J. Gus Liebenow, Acting Vice President and Dean for Academic Affairs, and Professor Donald Carmony presented proposals for librarian status. They traced the history of the movement for faculty/career status from the 1950's, when a proposal to rank librarians was rejected, through the Byrnes report and the Carmony committee report, which are now being acted upon. The movement has been away from faculty status within the university community to career status within the library system. The Board of Trustees is now implementing many of the recommendations of the Carmony committee.

On February 20, 1972, the Board of Trustees approved the system of ranking librarians. The four suggested titles of rank are: affiliate librarian, assistant librarian, associate librarian, and librarian. There was much discussion about the first title, affiliate librarian. The second, third, and fourth titles are meant to correspond to assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Although there seems to be much dissatisfaction with the first term, no one has yet suggested a better term to be equated with the faculty rank of instructor.

The review procedures for ranking (promoting) librarians would involve the new director of libraries in both the initial (within the library) and final (university review group) stages. It is the feeling of those university officials now reviewing and implementing the procedures of career status ranking that the final review stage or stages must be by



university departments—branch librarians. for example—be members of those departments as well as members of the library staff.

Two problems yet to be resolved are: review of TIAA provisions presently requiring librarians to wait three years to become members, and matters of tenure.

Liebenow hopes to get all these proposals on paper before too long to give librarians the preliminary choice of opting to stay on the current system or to participate in the new. If a large majority prefer to maintain the present system, the new one will presumably not go into effect. It is, however, presumed that, since a representative committee of librarians originally requested the change, the majority will opt for the new system.

The procedures for establishing criteria for ranking on an all-university level will have to be set up. It would also be necessary to revise the faculty handbook on all provisions pertaining to librarians.

Carmony emphasized that librarians should realize that the university administration has given much serious consideration to the career status recommendations, and that such change takes a considerable length of time for implementation. One major obstacle to overcome is the fact that the faculty is very jealous of its rank and is not willing to share it unwisely. Another point that has been argued concerns where to draw the line on assigning rank. If librarians are ranked, for example, why not accounting personnel?

Questions asked of Carmony and Liebenow:

(1) If librarians are eligible for TIAA on the same basis as faculty members, will benefits be retroactive for those who have been on the staff over three years. The answer would appear to be No.

(2) How could the Carmony committee on faculty status change its recommendations from faculty status to career status if it was originally charged to consider faculty status only? The charge to the committee was three-fold: from the Faculty Council, the librarians, and the university administration. Many points of view both from within and without the committee were brought to bear. One reason for going ahead along career status lines was that fringe benefits could be considered and implemented without bringing librarians into faculty ranks. Another was the probability that the committee would be able to effect little if it held out for faculty status on an all-or-nothing basis. After many meetings and much controversy, the committee met and decided to reconsider its approach. There was a general meeting in April, 1971, to inform all librarians and request their permission to drop the matter en-

tirely or to go for career status; the majority voted to go for career status. The Carmony committee then presented its recommendations to the Office of Vice President and Dean of Academic Affairs, and that office is now working on the implementation of career status for librarians.

Liebenow emphasized that librarians should consider the politics of presenting a package demand without being willing to accept modifications; the probable outcome would be that they would receive nothing at all. He cited the necessity for having this "package" politically feasible not only on campus but around the state also. Carmony added that the Committee on Faculty Status for Librarians was appointed with three members each from the faculty, library, and university administration, and that this committee was to make its report to the Vice President and Dean for Academic Affairs.

(3) When would librarians have to make their final decision as to whether or not to opt for the new system? Liebenow feels that this decision would have to come after the ranks have been established; persons who have made a preliminary decision to go along with the new system will actually have a chance to see what their rank will be.

Liebenow closed with a few comments stressing the future role of the library. President Ryan ultimately wants a university library system with each campus library serving its immediate users; but, in addition, there should be an over-all coordinating administration concerned with special services throughout the entire university library system with over-all library budgeting. Another question posed is whether or not all library services now housed on the various campuses should stay on those campuses or be made part of the central system for more co-ordinated service.

Notes by Ruth Davison

#### ERRATA

The April 1 issue of Scoop Sheet contained the following errors:

Page 5, 8th line from the bottom... "If you with..." should read: "If you wish..."

Page 7, 2nd paragraph, between lines 3 and 4, insert: "...semester, 'We' also includes everyone in the xerox (photoreproduction)..."

Page 8, 4th paragraph, 2nd sentence should read: "Books can also be charged out for overnight use beginning at 10:30 P.M. and are due at 9:30 the following morning (12:30 on Sunday)."

Page 10, 1st line... "with them of..." should read: "with theme of..."