

Research Notes

The Status of Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A Twenty-year Perspective

Charles B. Lowry

In 1990, data on the employment status of librarians was collected from two groups of academic libraries in higher education—a random sample of all institutions in the United States and all academic members of the Association of Research Libraries. This data provides a twenty-year retrospective of librarians' status and indicates that 67 percent of higher education institutions grant them faculty status. In general, faculty status for librarians has been vigorously expanded during the same period, though the process has slowed in recent years. Understandably, librarians with faculty status evince perquisites similar, but not identical to, teaching faculty. In addition, 7.3 percent of the institutions sampled grant librarians academic status, which carries many characteristics of faculty status. Thus in over 74 percent of the sampled institutions, librarians have a status that conforms closely to the ACRL standard. Among the ARL members, the general condition has changed little since the last major survey in 1982.



For several years, the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) Academic Status Committee discussed the possibility of a general survey of librarians' employment status in higher education similar to that undertaken for the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) by Thomas English and published in *College & Research Libraries* in 1982.¹ At

the ALA Annual Conference in 1989, a number of current or former committee members were brought together by the chair, Larry R. Oberg.* This group determined to undertake a study to investigate the status of faculty status for librarians near the twentieth anniversary of the first publication of the *ACRL-AAUP Joint Statement on Faculty Status*.²

Charles B. Lowry is University Librarian at Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213-3890. The research for this article was conducted while he was Director of Libraries at the University of Texas at Arlington.

* Oberg appointed a committee to undertake the research that led to this paper. The committee included Irene Hoadley of Texas A & M University, Rush Miller of Bowling Green University, Susan Perry of Stanford, Larry Oberg of Willamette University, and the author.

TABLE 1
ALA/MLS CONDITION FOR JOB:
CARNEGIE SAMPLE

	Frequency	%
Always	227	62.0
A few exceptions	103	28.1
Not used	36	9.8
Are ACRL Standards Used?		
	Frequency	%
Explicitly	23	6.5
Reference point	178	50.3
Not used	153	43.2

The Academic Status Committee (ASC) subcommittee ultimately chose not to replicate English's study, although the present effort takes inspiration from the earlier work. It was decided instead to study all types of academic libraries, as well as those that were members of ARL. The study was also inspired by the hope that the results would inform ASC's work of revising the *Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians* for the first time in that document's history. That revision was completed by the committee and approved by the ACRL Executive Board at the 1991 ALA Annual Conference in Atlanta and by the ALA Council at the 1993 Midwinter Meeting. The full results of the study will be presented in a collection being edited by the author, tentatively titled *Faculty Status in Academic Libraries: Empirical Studies of Librarians' Status*. The methodology and survey instrument will be discussed fully therein. Accordingly, in this paper only a few words will be said about the survey instrument, and the sampling and return rates. Instead, emphasis is placed upon the high points of the analysis of the survey results.

The questionnaire is composed of twelve questions with slightly over fifty data elements and was intended to take about twenty minutes to answer. It investigated library staff size, gender distribution, the status of librarians at the responding institution, changes in that status over twenty years, and various perquisites and responsibilities of librarians related to such things as promo-

tions, the review process, and the term of service. The survey was distributed to library directors in two distinct groups of libraries. One is a sample of 500 libraries drawn at random from the Carnegie *Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*. The other is composed of the academic members of the ARL in the United States and Canada.³

The research group had the assistance of the ACRL office and distributed the survey under its auspices. In retrospect, this association seems important because it resulted in 370 respondents to the first sample, a 74 percent return rate, and 89 respondents among ARL libraries, or 74 percent of the academic membership. Coincidentally, this is exactly the same number achieved by English in his study. The high response rate to the Carnegie sample inspired confidence in some of the results that differ from other studies. However, this essay will largely omit reference to earlier works; that will be reserved for the fuller discussion to be published in the monograph.

Some analysis was done with reference to ALA's success in establishing standards for the employment of librarians in academic institutions (see table 1). The survey asked if the ALA-accredited M.L.S. was a condition for employment of professional librarians. It found that in 62 percent of the cases it was always a condition, and that in 28 percent only a few exceptions were made based on specialized job requirements. Thus, only 10 percent of the institutions surveyed failed to adopt the terminal M.L.S. degree as the basic requirement for employment in a professional position. Conversely, the respondents indicate that the ACRL *Standards for Faculty Status of College and University Librarians* and the ACRL/AAUP *Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians* were used explicitly as the basis for defining the status of librarians in only 6 percent of the cases. These standards are a point of reference, but do not explicitly define status in 50 percent of the cases. Clearly, the authority of these two standards has yet to be established in most institutions.

TABLE 2
LIBRARIANS' STATUS FOR CARNEGIE
INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFICATION AND ARL SAMPLES

Institutional Classification		Faculty Status	Academic Status	Professional Status	Civil Service	Total
Research/ doctoral	Frequency	15	7	6	0	28
	Row%	53.57	25.00	21.43	0.00	7.57%
Comprehensive university	Frequency	65	5	11	3	84
	Row%	77.38	5.95	13.10	3.57	22.70%
Liberal arts	Frequency	49	11	26	0	86
	Row%	56.98	12.79	30.23	0.00	23.24%
Two-year	Frequency	119	4	46	3	172
	Row%	69.19	2.33	26.74	1.74	46.49%
Total Carnegie sample	Frequency	248	27	89	6	370
	Sample %	67.03%	7.30%	24.05%	1.62%	100.00%
ARL member sample	Frequency	41	30	18	0	89
	Sample %	46.07%	33.71%	20.22%	0	100.00%

Note: Association of Research Libraries members form a separate sample group, albeit research/doctoral institutions include some ARL members who were drawn into the random sample of all Carnegie institutions.

LIBRARIAN STATUS—THE NATIONAL CONDITION

One of the major focuses of this research concerns the employment status of librarians. The good news for advocates of the ACRL standards is that a majority of librarians work under employment conditions defined by faculty status. Table 2 indicates that librarians in the Carnegie classification research/doctoral granting institutions have faculty status over 53 percent of the time, in comprehensive universities over 77 percent, in liberal arts colleges nearly 57 percent, and in two-year institutions nearly 70 percent. In the aggregate, academic librarians have faculty status in 67 percent of our institutions of higher education.

These results vary markedly from the results of other surveys. For instance, a 1989 study by Betsy Park and Robert Riggs that sampled the same Carnegie institutions at about the same time as the ASC survey indicates that librarians have faculty status in 41 percent of the sampled four-year institutions.⁴ This is a dramatically lower result than the general sample even though this sample excluded consideration of two-year institutions. Among the four-year liberal arts colleges, the result was 57 percent

(see table 2). This large statistical difference may be explained partially by the difference in definitions of faculty status. On the one hand, the present research assumes that the respondents know best the conditions that characterize faculty status in their own institutions and whether librarians are designated as faculty by that institution's definition. On the other hand, the ARL member sample indicated that slightly more than 46 percent of the institutions responding granted librarians faculty status, a figure that is almost identical to the English study result of 46 percent.⁵

Even when librarians do not have faculty status, survey results indicate that they are frequently given a close parallel academic status. For instance, in the Research/Doctoral category, 25 percent of the libraries grant academic status. This means that nearly 80 percent of the institutions in this group grant faculty status or something very close to it. Results also show that academic librarians are least likely to be classified as civil service personnel, with less than 2 percent in that category. Overall, 74 percent of the Carnegie sample and 80 percent of the ARL sample grant faculty or academic status to librarians.

It is also interesting to note the number of librarians affected by various status

TABLE 3
NUMBER OF LIBRARIANS IN STATUS GROUPS

Institutional Classification		Faculty Status	Academic Status	Professional/ Administrative Status	Civil Service	Total
Research/ doctoral (n=28) [n=35.5]	Frequency	461.8	379.5	152.3	0	993.6
	Row%	46	38	15	0	36.3%
Comprehensive university (n=86) [n=9.3]	Frequency	607.0	67.0	111.7	16.3	802.0
	Row%	76	8	14	2	29.3%
Liberal arts (n=860) [n=4.6]	Frequency	204.2	47.6	142.1	0	393.9
	Row%	52	12	36	0	14.4%
Two-year (n=172) [n=3.2]	Frequency	369.5	15.5	149.6	13.3	547.9
	Row%	67	3	27	2	20%
Total Carnegie Sample (370) [n=7.4]	Frequency	1642.5	509.6	555.7	29.6	2737.4
	Sample %	60%	18.5%	20.3%	1.1%	100%
ARL member sample (n=89) [n=65.9]	Frequency	2171.4	2191.8	1506.0	NA	5869.2
	Sample %	37%	37.3%	25.7%	NA	100%

Note: The number of libraries (n=) is indicated for each institutional classification. For instance, there are 28 research/doctoral libraries. The average number of librarians [n=] per library is also indicated.

assignments, not just the number of institutions involved. The 370 responding institutions in the large Carnegie sample indicate that they hire over 2,700 librarians. Table 3 shows the number of librarians in the various status groups. The 28 research/doctoral institutions constitute 7 percent of the total sample of libraries but hire 36 percent of the librarians involved. Among the research/doctoral institutions, 53 percent grant faculty status to librarians, but the number of librarians affected is only 46 percent of this institutional category. The conclusion we may draw from this disparity is that major research libraries with larger professional staffs are less likely to grant faculty status. This same conclusion may be inferred from the ARL sample. Over 46 percent of the ARL libraries grant faculty status, but only 37 percent of the librarians in these libraries hold faculty status. Again, the explanation is that the oldest and largest research institutions are less likely to grant faculty status to librarians who represent both a newer profession than established disciplines and may not evince such primary faculty characteristics as regular classroom

teaching and publication. In all, 1,642 librarians, or 60 percent of the total, are employed in institutions that grant faculty status to librarians.

Table 4 illustrates the gender distribution of librarians by their employment status. Female librarians are slightly more likely than their male counterparts to work in libraries where they are granted faculty status. This is true of both the Carnegie and the ARL samples. Yet males in the Carnegie sample libraries are slightly more likely to have academic status. These differences, however, are small. The most important findings illustrated by this table are that gender has no effect on the assignment of status to librarians, and that over 67 percent of all academic librarians are female. The percentage is slightly lower in ARL libraries—65 percent.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS—PERQUISITES AND OBLIGATIONS

The following tables illustrate various conditions for librarian appointments and expectations for promotional considerations. Table 5 indicates the possible

TABLE 4
GENDER DISTRIBUTION AND LIBRARIANS' STATUS

Librarians' Status		Carnegie Sample		ARL Sample	
		Female	Male	Female	Male
Faculty status	Frequency	1194.8	573.4	1466.0	777.5
	Column %	65.7	64.2	39.5	38.7
Academic status	Frequency	290.6	168.3	1380.2	728.0
	Column %	16.0	18.8	37.2	36.2
Professional/ administrative status	Frequency	316.0	143.8	865.5	503.5
	Column %	17.4	16.1	23.3	25.1
Civil service	Frequency	17	8	NA	NA
	Column %	0.9	0.9	NA	NA
Total	Sample Frequency	1818.5	893.5	3711.7	2009.0
	Sample %	67.1%	32.9%	64.9%	35.1%

length of appointments for librarians. Respondents were asked to indicate all possible categories. By and large, no matter what status is assigned to librarians, the prevalent answer was twelve months of service. The last column indicates that in nearly 74 percent of the faculty status libraries this was a condition of appointment, as it was in over 96 percent of the libraries granting academic status, and 84 percent of those granting professional or administrative status. However, it is significant that in cases of faculty status, nine-month appointments are more characteristic. Nearly 32 percent of the faculty status institutions grant this term as an option for librarians, while only 15 percent of those granting academic status offer nine month appointments.

On the one hand, it has long been clear that faculty status for librarians may not be accompanied by the full privileges of the teaching faculty. On the other hand, academic status often reflects some of the characteristics of appointments for teaching faculty. The present research strongly confirms attenuated status. Table 6 makes it obvious that the faculty status for librarians in the Carnegie sample is closely associated with tenure because over 68 percent of the faculty status institutions grant tenure to librarians. Among those same institutions, another 40 percent grant some sort of continuing appointment. Similarly, pro-

motion in faculty rank is granted by over 62 percent of the faculty status institutions, and promotion in nonfaculty rank is granted by another 12 percent of these libraries. Research and sabbatical leaves are also closely affiliated with faculty status. Librarians who receive faculty status appointments enjoy a fuller participation in the characteristic perquisites for teaching faculty than do those receiving other types of appointments.

The question of criteria for achieving tenure or continuing appointment always has been complicated when applied to librarians. Table 7 illustrates that in those Carnegie sample institutions where librarians have faculty status, the criteria are the same as those for teaching faculty in over 60 percent of the cases and are modified faculty criteria in another 31 percent. Yet where librarians have academic status, the criteria are the same as for the teaching faculty in only 14 percent of the cases and are modified faculty criteria in 33 percent. More than half of these Carnegie sample libraries have some sort of professional criteria. This pattern is also true of librarians who receive professional or administrative status appointments. In summary, the criteria for tenure or continuing appointment are much more closely associated with faculty criteria where librarians have faculty status. This conforms to the other characteristics of librarians with faculty status.

TABLE 5
LENGTH OF APPOINTMENT PERIODS FOR LIBRARIANS' STATUS: CARNEGIE SAMPLE

Librarians' Status		9 Months		10 Months		10.5 Months		11 Months		12 Months	
		No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Faculty status	Frequency	169	79	194	54	237	11	214	34	65	183
	Sample %	68.15	31.85	78.23	21.77	95.56	4.44	86.29	13.71	26.21	73.79
Academic status	Frequency	23	4	25	2	27	0	27	0	1	26
	Sample %	85.19	14.81	92.59	7.41	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	3.70	96.30
Professional/ Administrative status	Frequency	81	8	73	16	83	6	77	12	14	75
	Sample %	91.01	8.99	82.02	17.98	93.26	6.74	86.52	13.48	15.73	84.27
Civil service	Frequency	4	2	6	0	6	0	6	0	0	6
	Sample %	66.67	33.33	1.62	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Total	Frequency	277	93	298	72	353	17	324	46	80	290
	Sample %	74.86%	25.14%	80.54%	19.46%	95.41%	4.59%	87.57%	12.43%	21.62%	78.38%

Note: Respondents were asked to check *all* relevant categories. Therefore, total frequency and percentage exceed 370 N and 100 percent and are not summative.

TABLE 6
APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION FOR LIBRARIANS' STATUS: CARNEGIE SAMPLE

Librarians' Status		Tenure	Continuing Appointments	Promotion in Faculty Rank	Promotion in Non-Faculty Rank	Research Leave	Sabbatical Leave	Total
	Row %	68.15	39.92	62.5	12.5	44.76	66.94	67.03%
Academic status	Frequency	3	17	4	11	9	9	27
	Row %	11.11	62.96	14.81	40.74	33.33	33.33	7.30%
Professional/ Administrative status	Frequency	5	40	9	18	17	22	89
	Row %	5.36	44.94	10.11	20.22	19.10	24.72	24.05%
Civil service	Frequency	2	4	1	1	0	1	6
	Row %	33.33	66.67	16.67	16.67	0.00	16.67	1.62%
Total	Frequency	179	160	169	61	137	198	370
	% N	48.38%	43.24%	45.68%	16.49%	37.03%	53.51%	100.00

Note: Respondents were asked to check *all* relevant categories. Therefore, total frequency and percentage exceed 370 N and 100 percent and are not summative.

TABLE 7
TENURE OR CONTINUING APPOINTMENT CRITERIA
FOR LIBRARIANS' STATUS: CARNEGIE SAMPLE

Librarians' Status		Teaching Faculty	Modified Faculty	Professional Criteria	Civil Service	Total
Faculty status	Frequency	137	70	17	1	225
	Row%	60.89	31.11	7.56	0.44	76.27%
Academic status	Frequency	3	7	11	0	21
	Row%	14.29	33.33	52.38	0.00	7.12%
Professional/ administrative status	Frequency	13	6	25	2	46
	Row%	28.26	13.04	54.35	4.35	15.59%
Civil service	Frequency	2	0	0	1	3
	Row%	66.67	0.00	0.00	33.33	1.02%
Total	Frequency	155	83	53	4	295
	Row%	52.54%	28.14%	17.97%	1.36%	100.00%

But librarians must look deeper to understand what that really means. Studies have consistently shown that evaluations for tenure or promotion are based on job performance in over 90 percent of the cases. This research is no different. We asked respondents to "rank in order of importance criterion on which librarians' performance is judged." In over 95 percent of the cases, job performance/effectiveness is ranked as the number one criteria for judging performance. This can only mean that even in those institutions that indicated that librarians are subject to the same criteria as faculty, the position assignment of the individual librarian is viewed as equivalent to teaching.

Librarians who receive faculty status appointments enjoy a fuller participation in the characteristic perquisites for teaching faculty than do those receiving other types of appointments.

In general, this research concludes that application of the criteria for promotion and for tenure of librarians has been realistically adapted to the needs of the library in the academic setting and the kinds of assignments that librarians receive. This does not differ from the flexibility evinced when criteria for promotion are applied to teaching faculty.

ACADEMIC STATUS— THEN AND NOW

The next three data tables address the question of changes in the status of librarian appointments over the last twenty years. In the Carnegie sample of 370 respondents, 341 provided information concerning the timing for changes in librarians' status, while 80 of the 89 ARL sample libraries did so. Table 8 indicates that over 28 percent of the reporting Carnegie sample institutions have the same status today that they did in 1970. Among ARL libraries, over 51 percent have left the status of librarians unchanged for over twenty years. Between 1970 and 1980 another 33 percent of the reporting Carnegie institutions and 36 percent of ARL institutions had assigned librarians the status they carry at the present time. Since 1980, approximately 38 percent of the Carnegie sample and 12 percent of the ARL sample have modified the status of librarians' employment. Of those libraries that grant faculty status, 30 percent of the Carnegie and 49 percent of the ARL libraries did so before 1970. Among Carnegie sample libraries particularly, the bulk of the change every five years has been in the direction of faculty status. The pace of this change may be characterized as slow; that is not to say glacial. Moreover, the general picture is one of some stability. Nonetheless, this

TABLE 8
YEAR LIBRARIANS' STATUS ASSIGNED

Librarians' Status		Pre-1970	1970-74	1975-79	1980-84	1985-89	Total
<i>Carnegie sample</i>							
Faculty status	Frequency	68	33	45	43	35	224N
	Row%	30.36	14.73	20.09	19.20	15.63	65.69%
	Column%	70.10	66.00	72.58	70.49	49.30	
Academic status	Frequency	6	2	6	3	8	25
	Row%	24.00	8.00	24.00	12.00	32.00	7.33%
	Column%	6.19	4.00	9.68	4.92	11.27	
Professional/ administrative status	Frequency	22	14	10	13	27	86
	Row%	25.58	16.28	11.63	15.12	31.40	25.22%
	Column%	22.68	28.00	16.13	21.31	38.03	
Civil service	Frequency	1	1	1	2	1	6
	Row%	16.67	16.67	16.67	33.33	16.67	1.76%
	Column%	1.03	2.00	1.61	3.28	1.41	
Total Carnegie sample	Frequency	97	50	62	61	71	341
	Row%	28.45%	14.66%	18.18%	17.89%	20.82%	100.00%
<i>ARL sample</i>							
Faculty status	Frequency	18	4	8	6	1	37
	Row%	48.65	10.81	21.62	16.22	2.70	
	Column%	43.90	33.33	47.06	85.71	33.33	46.25%
Academic status	Frequency	11	8	5	1	1	26
	Row%	42.31	30.77	19.23	3.85	3.85	
	Column%	26.83	66.67	29.41	14.29	33.33	32.5%
Professional/ administrative status	Frequency	12	0	4	0	1	17
	Row%	70.59	0.00	23.53	0.00	5.88	
	Column%	29.27	0.00	23.53	0.00	33.33	21.25%
Total ARL member sample	Frequency	41	12	17	7	3	80
	Row%	51.25%	15.00%	21.25%	8.75%	3.75%	100.00%

phenomenon of change in status deserves closer examination.

In recent years, there has been an increasing expression of concern that academic status for librarians might be eroding. This concern has been based largely on anecdotal evidence and was tested empirically in this survey. In general, faculty status is holding its own and making small gains. As demonstrated above, this research indicates that more than 67 percent of all categories of academic libraries grant faculty status. This affects the working lives of about 60 percent of all academic librarians. Among the Carnegie respondents, 80 libraries, or 21 percent of the total 370 respondents, indicated a change in the status of librarians since 1970. In general, these changes have favored faculty sta-

tus (see table 9). Fifty-five percent ($n = 44$) of these libraries experienced a change to faculty status. Thirty-six percent ($n = 29$) experienced a loss of faculty status. Among sixteen responding ARL libraries changing status since 1970, 31 percent ($n = 5$) gained and 37 percent ($n = 6$) lost faculty status.

The concern in some quarters that in recent years there has been an acceleration in the number of "attacks" on faculty status led to the analysis shown in table 10, which illustrates changes in status for five-year periods beginning in 1970. The survey provided information on 75 of the 80 Carnegie sample libraries which had indicated such a change, and the resulting pattern is somewhat even. In cases where faculty status was lost, the percentages are not dramatically

TABLE 9
CHANGES IN STATUS CATEGORIES SINCE 1970

Changed From		Changed To				Total
		Academic Faculty Status	Academic Status	Professional Administrative Status	Civil Service	
<i>Carnegie Sample</i>						
Incomplete data	Frequency	3	0	1	0	4
	Row%	75.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	5.00%
Faculty status	Frequency	0	7	19	3	29
	Row%	0.00	24.14	65.52	10.34	36.25%
Academic status	Frequency	8	0	1	0	9
	Row%	88.89	0.00	11.11	0.00	11.25%
Professional/ administrative status	Frequency	29	4	0	0	33
	Row%	87.88	12.12	0.00	0.00	41.25%
Civil service	Frequency	4	0	1	0	5
	Row%	80.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	6.25%
Total Carnegie sample	Frequency	44	11	22	3	80
	Row%	55.00%	13.75%	27.50	3.75%	100.00%
<i>ARL Sample</i>						
Faculty status	Frequency	0	5	1	0	6
	Row%	0.00	83.33	16.67	0.00	37.50%
Professional/ administrative status	Frequency	5	5	0	0	10
	Row%	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	62.50%
Total ARL sample	Frequency	5	10	1	0	16
	Row%	31.25%	62.50%	6.25%	0.00	100.00%

TABLE 10
LIBRARIANS' STATUS CHANGES, FIVE-YEAR CYCLES,
1970-1990: CARNEGIE SAMPLE

Status Change		Year				Totals
		1970-74	1975-79	1980-84	1985-89	
Faculty status lost	Frequency	3	4	7	12	26
	Column%	33.33	25.00	33.33	41.38	34.67%
Faculty status gained	Frequency	6	11	13	14	44
	Column%	66.67	68.75	61.90	48.28	58.67%
Other status change	Frequency	0	1	1	3	5
	Column%	0	6.25	4.76	10.35	6.66%
Total	Frequency	9	16	21	29	75
	Column%	12%	21.33%	28.00%	38.67%	100.00%

higher in the most recent five years than in the earliest period. From 1970 to 1974, 33 percent of the changes were cases of the loss of faculty status, and from 1985 to 1989, 41 percent of the change was a loss of faculty status. Yet librarians were also steadily gaining faculty status in

other institutions. From 1970 to 1974, over 66 percent of the change was in the direction of faculty status. This trend continued for nearly fifteen years. In the most recent five years 1985 to 1989 the percentage of libraries changing to faculty status has dropped to about 48 percent of

the total change. That, however, should not be viewed with dismay, given the increasing reluctance of administrations and governing boards to add new categories of employees wholesale to the ranks of tenured faculty. Under the present circumstances, any gains may be viewed as positive.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this survey indicate that faculty status for librarians has continued to make gains in institutions of all types since the joint ACRL/AAUP statement twenty years ago. On the one hand, faculty status for librarians is so well established that confidence in its continued growth should be high. On the other hand, any erosion in faculty status for librarians is dismaying to its proponents. Advocates may then question how both the ACRL and the AAUP can assist libraries in protecting the employment rights of their librarians if preferred rights fall below the status represented as the standard.

If academic librarians believe that faculty status is vital to fulfilling the mission of the libraries within the academy, then they must emphasize the specialized teaching role of librarians, their contribution to scholarship and knowledge, and their service to the academy. Gov-

erning boards and administrations should be reminded that the gender distribution among librarians is such that granting them faculty status will improve the overall performance of higher education toward increasing the ratio of females among tenure track faculty, a position supported by ACRL and AAUP. However, as with colleagues in various disciplines, these expectations of librarians must be germane to the mission of the library. During the next twenty years, academic libraries will be transformed as they have not been since the turn of the century. The mission of the library is being adapted to a new paradigm characterized by access in addition to collection-centered services and mediated by the presence of information technology. The impact of information technology on teaching and scholarship will be equally profound. This change may raise anew objections to librarians as faculty, but it will also offer new opportunities for librarians to integrate themselves into teaching and scholarship through collaboration with faculty colleagues in other disciplines. If closer affinity with classroom teaching and with research are logical outcomes of the new paradigm, then the case for faculty status during the next twenty years will be a persuasive one.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Thomas G. English, "Librarian Status in Eighty-nine U.S. Academic Institutions of the Association of Research Libraries: 1982," *College & Research Libraries*, 44, no. 3 (May 1983): 199-211.
2. American Library Association, Association of College and Research Libraries, Association of American Colleges, Association of American University Professors, "Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians," *College & Research Libraries News* 35 (Feb. 1974): 26. See also American Library Association, Association of Libraries, Academic Status Committee, "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians; a Proposal," *College & Research Libraries News* 31 (Oct. 1970): 271-72; and "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians; Revision," *College & Research Libraries News* 32 (Feb. 1971): 36-37.
3. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Pr., 1987).
4. Betsy Park and Robert Riggs, "Status of the Profession: A 1989 National Survey of Tenure and Promotion Policies," *College & Research Libraries* 52 (May 1991): 279.
5. English, "Librarian Status in Eighty-nine U.S. Academic Institutions of the Association of Research Libraries," 207.