

# Faculty Status and Rank at Liberal Arts Colleges: An Investigation into the Correlation among Faculty Status, Professional Rights and Responsibilities, and Overall Institutional Quality

Dorita F. Bolger and Erin T. Smith

This survey of liberal arts colleges sought to determine a correlation between the personnel status of librarians and overall institutional quality. Based on the responses of the 125 colleges that participated in the survey, the higher the tier in which an institution is ranked in the *U.S. News & World Report* annual report on America's colleges, the less likely that librarians will have faculty status or rank, the less likely they will be required to undergo a formal review process, the less likely they will have access to research funds, and the less likely they will be eligible to serve on campuswide faculty committees. Specifically, colleges in the top tier of the *U.S. News and World Report* rankings were almost seven times less likely to afford librarians faculty status and sixteen times less likely to afford faculty rank than those in the fourth tier.



A great deal has been written about the personnel status of academic librarians, ranging from large-scale quantitative surveys designed to ascertain current practices to rhetorical arguments both for and against the increased demands and benefits that accompany faculty status. However, very little has been written about the link between librarian status and the quality of a specific academic institution.

In an attempt to address this issue, a survey of liberal arts colleges was conducted. Using the 217 institutions ranked by *U.S. News & World Report* in its annual report on America's colleges as a sample group, this study sought to determine if there is a correlation between the personnel status of librarians and the overall quality of a college.

Previous studies indicate that the meaning of the phrase "faculty status" varies drastically from institution to institution.

---

*Dorita F. Bolger is a Professor, Reference, ILL, and an Information Literacy Librarian in the McGill Library at Westminster College; e-mail: dbolger@westminster.edu. Erin T. Smith is an Assistant Professor, Electronic Resources, and a Systems and Cataloging Librarian in McGill Library at Westminster College; e-mail: smithet@westminster.edu.*

In fact, one researcher noted: "If one cannot judge a book by its cover, one should also not judge the status of a librarian by his/her title."<sup>1</sup> Therefore, the current study asked questions not only about the titles and types of appointment held by librarians, but also about the individual rights and responsibilities of librarians on liberal arts college campuses. Specifically, information about the more visible signs of faculty status was sought: the existence of a formalized peer review process, eligibility for sabbaticals or other paid professional development leaves, access to research funds comparable to those of other faculty, and eligibility for election to standing and ad hoc faculty committees.

### Selected Relevant Literature

Much of the quantitative data on the issue of faculty status is the result of surveys of large university libraries, such as institutions belonging to the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) or those with a Carnegie Classification of research or doctorate-granting university.<sup>2</sup> Far fewer studies have surveyed a significant number of liberal arts institutions, although liberal arts or four-year colleges have been included in a number of surveys conducted at the state and regional levels.<sup>3</sup>

Two of the studies that surveyed a significant number of liberal arts colleges examined the issue of faculty status for librarians by type of institution. Charles B. Lowry surveyed the library directors of a sample of 500 libraries selected at random from the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, as well as the directors of ARL members.<sup>4</sup> He found that the presence of faculty status for librarians varied by institution type: nearly 57 percent of the eighty-six liberal arts institutions that responded to the survey granted faculty status to librarians, compared to about 54 percent of research/doctoral institutions, 77 percent of comprehensive universities, and 69 percent of two-year institutions.

Betsy Park and Robert Riggs also used the Carnegie Classification as the basis for

their 1993 article that examined tenure and promotion practices by institutional type.<sup>5</sup> However, they found that only 34.1 percent of the 144 liberal arts colleges that responded to their survey afford faculty status to librarians, compared to 20 percent of research institutions, 50 percent of doctorate-granting institutions, and nearly 57 percent of comprehensive institutions. They also found that liberal arts college librarians were less likely to undergo a formal review process or be required to publish than librarians at other types of institutions. They hypothesized that this difference was a result of the liberal arts institutions' emphasis on teaching rather than research and "indicate that expectations for librarians at liberal arts colleges may parallel those for other faculty."<sup>6</sup>

The discrepancy between the numbers of librarians with faculty status reported by Lowry and by Park and Riggs was most likely due to institutional differences in the definition of faculty status. The former simply asked respondents to report whether or not they had faculty status based on their particular institution's definition of the phrase. The latter provided respondents with a strict definition of faculty status, under which librarians must be accorded the same titles as other faculty and be eligible for tenure and promotion.

The 1999 ACRL survey of academic libraries, which also addressed differences by institution type, attempted to avoid the ambiguity of the phrase "faculty status" by asking questions about the nine components of academic status included in the 1990 version of ACRL Guidelines for Academic Status.<sup>7,8</sup> In each of the nine categories, librarians at institutions granting bachelor of arts degrees were the least likely to be fully afforded the rights and responsibilities outlined in the guidelines. Librarians were eligible for tenure at only 29.6 percent of the bachelor's institutions, compared to 53.5 percent of associate of arts degree institutions, 53.7 percent of master's institutions,

and 46 percent of doctoral institutions. Furthermore, they were less likely to be able to be full members of campuswide bodies of governance, to go through a peer review process for promotion, to be eligible for sabbaticals, and to have access to research funds.<sup>9</sup>

Small- and medium-sized academic libraries were the focus of a survey included in an ACRL Clip Note published in 1997.<sup>10</sup> Fifty-one percent of the respondents reported that librarians had faculty status, but only 36 percent were eligible for tenure, 37 percent had academic rank, and 61 percent were eligible for promotion. In addition, 74 percent of the institutions that grant tenure to librarians used the same criteria for evaluating librarians and other faculty and 41 percent developed library-specific criteria for tenure and promotion decisions.

The only study to examine the broader impact of tenure for librarians on the liberal arts campus as a whole was conducted by Richard W. Meyer in 1999.<sup>11</sup> Specifically, he studied the effect of the presence of tenure for librarians on the teaching quality of the Oberlin Group, an informal organization of private liberal arts colleges, as measured by graduation rate, graduate school attendance by alumni, and cognitive development. He found that faculty status for librarians has a positive impact on liberal arts institutions and support for what he called the “intuitive assertion” that faculty status enables librarians to be full partners with the teaching faculty and more fully contribute to the overall academic experience. These findings were particularly interesting in light of an earlier study in which Meyer reported that faculty status for librarians had a negative impact on ARL institutions; institutions that included librarians as members of the faculty produced about 9 percent less research.<sup>12</sup>

## Methodology

### *The Questionnaire and Survey Population*

Every year, *U.S. News & World Report* publishes an index of the best colleges in

the United States. To be included in the Liberal Arts Colleges–Bachelor’s category of the report, an institution must have the Carnegie designation “Baccalaureate Colleges—Liberal Arts.” Carnegie defines liberal arts colleges as institutions that are “primarily undergraduate colleges with major emphasis on baccalaureate programs...[and award] at least half of their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts fields.”<sup>13</sup> The colleges then are assessed on a variety of established indicators of quality, such as peer assessment, retention, faculty resources, student selectivity, financial resources, graduation rate performance, and alumni giving rate and are assigned a rank and placed in one of four tiers.<sup>14</sup> Although the authors acknowledge that many in the academic community have criticized the *U.S. News* methodology, the publication’s ubiquitous nature made it an appropriate choice as a measurement of a college’s overall educational quality.

The 2004 edition of “America’s Best Colleges” included 214 institutions in the Liberal Arts Colleges—Bachelor’s category.<sup>15</sup> The names and e-mail addresses of the library directors of 212 of these colleges were available via their institutions’ Web sites.<sup>16</sup> In September 2003, a six-item questionnaire was distributed via e-mail to each of the directors who were encouraged to reply to the survey by the end of the month. Two reminder messages were sent out during the month: one at the midpoint and another three days before the survey completion deadline.

The questionnaire was designed to assess the personnel status and rank of librarians at liberal arts institutions, as well as their individual rights and responsibilities on college campuses. To accomplish this goal, directors first were asked to describe the personnel status of librarians at their institution (full faculty status and rank, faculty status only, no faculty designation, or faculty status and/or rank is situational based on the type of position held or time of hire). They then were asked if the librarians at their institutions possessed the more concrete

of the components of faculty status: a peer-review review process, the availability of paid leaves, the availability of research funds, and eligibility for service on campuswide faculty committees.

The data were analyzed according to the *U.S. News & World Report* tier rankings using SPSS to generate frequency counts, as well as Chi Square tests and odds ratios when appropriate and possible.

**Response Rate**

Of the 212 colleges e-mailed a questionnaire, 125 participated in the survey (response rate = 59%). Thirty of the responding colleges (24%) were ranked in *U.S. News & World Report's* top tier, thirty-nine (31.2%) in the second tier, thirty-two (25.6%) in the third tier, and twenty-four (19.2%) in the fourth tier.

**Results**

**Status and Rank**

Of the 125 responding institutions, almost 34 percent appoint librarians as full members of the faculty with status and rank equal to other campus faculty. Nineteen percent reported that librarians have faculty status, but not faculty rank. However, six of these "status-only" institutions indicated that although librarians have the designation, they are distinct from classroom faculty in that they are not eligible for tenure. (See table 1.)

Twenty-seven (21.6%) colleges reported that faculty status and rank were situational. Examples of this category include institutions that hire instructional librarians with faculty status and rank, but not catalogers, or institutions at which new appointments have different status from earlier appointments. Fifteen of the colleges in this category reported that only the director of the library has faculty status. Hereafter, this type of status is referred to as situational.

Thirty-two colleges (25.6%) reported that librarians have neither faculty status nor rank but do have professional, administrative, or staff status. Hereafter, this type of status is referred to as professional.

Table 1 also illustrates that an analysis by *U.S. News & World Report* tier designation revealed statistically significant differences among the institutions, according to a Pearson Chi-Square test ( $X^2$  [df = 9, n = 125] = 22.102,  $p < 0.01$ ).<sup>17</sup> Less than 10 percent of the colleges ranked in the top tier reported that all librarians have full faculty status and rank, and almost half reported that librarians have professional status. On the other end of the spectrum, around half of both the Tier Three and Tier Four institutions reported full faculty status and rank and just over 10 percent of schools in these tiers reported that librarians held professional status. Tier Two

**TABLE 1**  
**Librarian Status at Liberal Arts Colleges**

	All Institutions	Tier One	Tier Two	Tier Three	Tier Four
Total respondents	125 100.0%	30 24.0%	39 31.2%	32 25.6%	24 19.2%
Full faculty status and rank	42 33.6%	2 6.7%	13 33.3%	14 43.8%	13 54.2%
Faculty status only	24 19.2%	6 20.0%	9 23.1%	5 15.6%	4 16.7%
Status situational	27 21.6%	8 26.7%	6 15.4%	9 28.1%	4 16.7%
Professional status	32 25.6%	14 46.7%	11 28.2%	4 12.5%	3 12.5%

institutions exhibited a more even distribution, with 33 percent of respondents reporting that librarians have full faculty status and rank and about 28 percent reporting that librarians have professional status.

**Review Process**

Almost 64 percent of the colleges surveyed reported that librarians are required to undergo a formalized review process. (See table 2.) Of those seventy-eight institutions, almost 30 percent reported that librarians undergo the same process as other faculty on campus and about 34 percent reported that librarians undergo a different, library-specific review process.

Not surprisingly, librarians with full faculty status and rank were significantly more likely to undergo the same formalized review process as other faculty. Of these institutions, 71 percent require librarians to undergo the same review process as other faculty. Only a quarter of the colleges that afford librarians faculty status, but not rank, have this requirement. None of the librarians with professional status or at institutions where faculty status and rank are situational

**TABLE 2**  
**Review Process as Compared to Other Faculty on Campus**

	All Institutions (n = 122)			Tier One (n = 30)			Tier Two (n = 36*)			Tier Three (n = 32)			Tier Four (n = 24)		
	Same	Different	None	Same	Different	None	Same	Different	None	Same	Different	None	Same	Different	None
All categories of personnel status	36 29.5%	42 34.4%	44 36.1%	2 6.7%	10 33.3%	18 60.0%	11 30.6%	13 36.1%	12 33.3%	12 37.5%	11 34.4%	9 28.1%	11 45.8%	8 33.3%	5 28.1%
Full faculty status and rank (n = 42)	30 71.4%	10 23.8%	2 4.8%	1 50.0%	1 50.0%	0	8 61.5%	5 38.5%	0	10 71.4%	3 21.4%	1 7.1%	11 84.6%	1 7.7%	1 7.7%
Faculty status only (n = 24)	6 25.0%	12 50.0%	6 25.0%	1 16.7%	3 50.0%	2 33.3%	3 33.3%	5 55.6%	1 11.1%	2 40.0%	1 20.0%	2 40.0%	0	3 75.0%	1 25.0%
Status situational (n = 24*)	0	12 50.0%	12 50.0%	0	1 12.5%	7 87.5%	0	3 100.0%	0	0	6 66.7%	3 33.3%	0	2 50.0%	2 50.0%
Professional status (n = 32)	0	8 25.0%	24 75.0%	0	5 35.7%	9 64.3%	0	0	11 100.0%	0	1 25.0%	3 75.0%	0	2 66.7%	1 33.3%

\*Three of the "status situational" colleges, who were all second-tier institutions, could not be included in this calculation because they did not have a librarywide policy on review (i.e., librarians who have faculty status went through a review process, but librarians who have professional status did not).

**TABLE 3**  
**Research Funds as Compared to Other Faculty on Campus**

	All Institutions (n = 123)			Tier One (n = 29*)			Tier Two (n = 39)			Tier Three (n = 31*)			Tier Four (n = 24)		
	Same	Different	None	Same	Different	None	Same	Different	None	Same	Different	None	Same	Different	None
All categories of personnel status	61 49.6%	22 17.9%	40 32.5%	5 17.2%	7 24.1%	17 58.6%	21 53.8%	8 20.5%	10 25.6%	16 51.6%	6 19.4%	9 29.0%	19 79.2%	1 4.2%	4 16.7%
Full faculty status and rank (n = 41*)	38 92.7%	1 2.4%	2 4.9%	2 100.0%	0	0	12 92.3%	0	1 7.7%	11 84.6%	1 7.7%	1 7.7%	13 100.0%	0	0
Faculty status only (n = 24)	15 62.5%	2 8.3%	7 29.2%	3 50.0%	0	3 50.0%	6 66.7%	2 22.2%	1 11.1%	3 60.0%	0	2 40.0%	3 75.0%	0	1 25.0%
Status situational (n = 27)	6 22.2%	7 25.9%	14 51.9%	0	2 25.0%	6 75.0%	2 33.3%	2 33.3%	2 33.3%	2 22.2%	3 33.3%	4 44.4%	2 50.0%	0	2 50.0%
Professional status (n = 31*)	2 6.5%	12 38.7%	17 54.8%	0	5 38.5%	8 61.5%	1 9.1%	4 36.4%	6 54.5%	0	2 50.0%	2 50.0%	1 33.3%	1 33.3%	1 33.3%

\*Two colleges opted not to respond to this question.

are required to undergo the same process.

Conversely, colleges with professional status were most likely to lack a formalized review process for librarians. Seventy-five percent of the institutions where librarians have professional status and 50 percent of the colleges where status is situational do not require librarians to undergo a formalized review process of any kind. Twenty-five percent of the institutions that afford only faculty status and less than 5 percent of the institutions that afford full status and rank lack this requirement.

Institutions in all status categories reported a formalized review process unique to the library. Fifty percent of both the schools that afford librarians faculty status only and those in which status is situational reported using a separate review process for the evaluation of librarians. Interestingly, around a quarter of both the institutions that afford librarians faculty status and rank and those that give librarians professional status reported using a unique review process.

Analysis by tier revealed statistically significant differences among the institutions ( $\chi^2$  [df = 3, n = 122] = 10.860,  $p < 0.05$ ). Sixty percent of the Tier One schools that responded to the survey do not have a formalized review process for librarians, compared to 33 percent of Tier Two schools, 28 percent of Tier Three schools, and 28 percent of Tier Four schools. On the other hand,



**TABLE 4**  
**Eligibility for Faculty Committees**

	All Institutions (n = 124)		Tier One (n = 29*)		Tier Two (n = 39)		Tier Three (n = 32)		Tier Four (n = 24)	
	Eligible	Ineligible	Eligible	Ineligible	Eligible	Ineligible	Eligible	Ineligible	Eligible	Ineligible
All categories of personnel status	85 68.0%	39 31.2%	11 36.7%	18 60.0%	26 66.7%	13 33.3%	26 81.3%	6 18.7%	22 91.7%	2 8.3%
Full faculty status and rank (n=42)	42 100.0%	0	2 100.0%	0	13 100.0%	0	14 100.0%	0	13 100.0%	0
Faculty status only (n=24)	22 91.7%	2 8.3%	5 83.3%	1 16.7%	8 88.9%	1 11.1%	5 100.0%	0	4 100.0%	0
Status situational (n=26*)	15 57.7%	11 42.3%	2 28.6%	5 71.4%	3 50.0%	3 50.0%	6 66.7%	3 33.3%	4 100.0%	0
Professional status (n=32)	6 18.75%	26 81.25%	2 14.3%	12 85.7%	2 18.2%	9 81.8%	1 25.0%	3 75.0%	1 33.3%	2 66.7%

\*One college opted not to respond to this question.

only about 7 percent of Tier One institutions require librarians to undergo the same review process as other campus faculty, compared to 30 percent of Tier Two institutions, 37 percent of Tier Three institutions, and almost 46 percent of Tier Four institutions.

**Research Funds**

Eighty-three of the 125 (67.5%) responding institutions reported that librarians, regardless of their personnel status, were eligible for research funds. (See table 3.) Librarians and other faculty on campus apply for the same funds at almost 50 percent of the colleges, whereas librarians at nearly 18 percent of the schools apply for funds that are distinct from those for which the other faculty applies. Thirty-two percent of the colleges indicated that librarians were not eligible for research funds of any kind.

A correlation between faculty designation and the availability of research funds was observed. Of the colleges that afford librarians full faculty status and rank, 93 percent reported that librarians were eligible for the same funds as other faculty, compared to 63 percent of the colleges that grant only faculty status, 22 percent of the colleges where status is situational, and 6 percent of colleges where librarians have professional status. Conversely, librarians were ineligible for research funds of any kind at less than 5 percent of the “full” institutions, almost 30 percent of the “status-only” institutions, 52 percent of the “situational” institutions, and nearly 55 percent of the “professional” institutions.

Statistically significant differences were found when the availability of research funds

**TABLE 5**  
**Sabbaticals/Paid Professional Leaves**

	All Tiers (n = 59)		Tier One (n = 22)		Tier Two (n = 17)		Tier Three (n = 13)		Tier Four (n = 6)						
	Eligible	Ineligible	N/R	Eligible	Ineligible	N/R	Eligible	Ineligible	N/R	Eligible	Ineligible	N/R			
All non-faculty status institutions	11 18.6%	42 71.2%	6 10.2%	6 27.3%	15 68.2%	1 4.5%	3 17.6%	13 76.5%	1 5.9%	1 7.7%	9 69.2%	3 23.1%	1 16.7%	5 83.3%	1 16.7%
Status situational (n=27)	4 14.8%	18 66.7%	5 18.5%	1 12.5%	7 87.5%	0	1 16.7%	4 66.7%	1 16.7%	1 11.1%	5 55.6%	3 33.3%	1 25.0%	2 50.0%	1 25.0%
Professional status (n=32)	7 21.9%	24 75.0%	1 3.1%	5 35.7%	8 57.1%	1 7.1%	2 18.2%	9 81.8%	0	0	4 100.0%	0	0	3 100.0%	0

\*Note: N/R = No Response

was analyzed by tier ( $X^2$  [df = 3, n = 123] = 12.764,  $p < 0.01$ ). Librarians employed by the top-tier institutions are the least likely to be eligible for research funds. Forty-one percent of colleges in the top tier reported that librarians were eligible for some form of research funds, as did 74 percent of Tier Two schools, 71 percent of Tier Three schools, and 83 percent of Tier Four schools. However, only 17 percent of Tier One schools reported that librarians were eligible for the same funds as other faculty, compared to almost 54 percent of Tier Two schools, almost 52 percent of Tier Three schools, and 79 percent of Tier Four schools.

**Faculty Committees**

Sixty-eight percent of responding institutions reported that librarians were eligible for election to standing and ad hoc faculty committees. (See table 4.) Librarians were eligible to serve on campuswide faculty committees at all the institutions that afford librarians full faculty status and rank and at almost 92 percent of the institutions that afford librarians only faculty status. Librarians are eligible for faculty committees at more than 50 percent of “situational” schools, but at less than 19 percent of colleges where librarians hold professional status.

A Pearson Chi-Square test revealed statistically significant differences among the tiers in terms of committee eligibility ( $X^2$  [df = 3, n = 124] = 21.018,  $p < 0.001$ ). Almost 37 percent of institutions in Tier One reported that librarians were eligible for committees, as opposed to 66.7 percent of Tier Two institutions, 81.3 percent of Tier Three institutions, and 91.7 percent of Tier Four institutions.

**Sabbaticals/Paid Professional Leaves**

Respondents at institutions where librarians do not have full faculty status and rank were asked about the availability of paid professional development leaves similar to sabbaticals. (See table 5.) More than three-quarters of schools where librarians have professional status indi-



cated that librarians were not eligible for paid professional development leaves. Eighty-one percent of the colleges where faculty status and rank are situational reported that librarians did not have the option of applying for this type of leave. Due to the fact that only colleges without faculty status were asked about the availability of sabbaticals, the frequencies were too small to determine if these results are statistically significant. Future studies will ask all respondents about the availability of paid professional development leaves.

### Summary of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities for Librarians

The combination of status, rank, and the individual rights and responsibilities addressed in the survey provides an interesting snapshot of the role of the librarian on liberal arts college campuses, as illustrated in table 6. Only 22.4 percent of the institutions surveyed indicated that librarians have exactly the same rights and responsibilities as the other faculty on their campus; that is, they have faculty status, faculty rank, the same formalized review process, the same research funds, and the same committee eligibility. On the other hand, almost 25 percent of the colleges reported that although librarians do not hold faculty rank, they are functionally the same as other faculty: they undergo a formalized review process, can apply for research funds, are eligible for

some type of paid leave for professional development, and can serve on institutional faculty committees.

Less than 15 percent of the colleges reported that librarians have absolutely none of the rights and responsibilities associated with a faculty appointment. Librarians at these institutions have neither faculty rank nor status, they cannot apply for research funds, they are ineligible for paid professional development leaves, and they cannot serve on faculty committees.

Only one college in the top tier (3.3%) reported that librarians were exactly the same as other faculty, and 10 percent reported that although librarians lacked faculty rank, they were functionally the same as other campus faculty. Almost 13 percent reported that librarians are afforded none of the rights and responsibilities associated with a faculty designation.

About 20 percent of second-tier institutions reported that librarians were exactly the same as other faculty on campus, an additional 20 percent reported that librarians did not have faculty rank but were functionally the same as other faculty, and almost 13 percent reported that librarians had none of the rights and responsibilities associated with faculty status.

A quarter of third-tier institutions reported that librarians were exactly the same as other faculty, almost 19 percent reported that librarians were function-

**TABLE 6**  
**Summary of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities for Librarians**

	All Institutions (n = 125)	Tier One (n = 30)	Tier Two (n = 39)	Tier Three (n = 32)	Tier Four (n = 24)
Librarian is <i>exactly</i> the same as other faculty on campus.	28 22.4%	1 3.3%	8 20.5%	8 25.0%	11 45.8%
Librarian is <i>functionally</i> the same as other faculty on campus.	31 24.8%	3 10.0%	18 20.5%	6 18.7%	4 16.7%
Librarian has <i>none</i> of the rights and responsibilities of faculty.	18 14.4%	9 30.0%	5 12.8%	3 9.4%	1 4.2%

**TABLE 7**  
**Risk Estimates**

	Faculty Status Only	Faculty Status and Faculty Rank	Review Process (Any Formal Process)	Availability of Research Funds (Any Kind)	Committee Eligibility
Odds ratio for tier 1 / tier 2	3.6 [95% CI 1.274, 9.901; p = 0.013; N = 69]	7.0 [95% CI 1.439, 34.483; p = 0.008; N = 69]	3.0 [95% CI 1.096, 8.197; p = 0.030; N = 66]	4.1 [95% CI 1.466, 11.494; p = 0.006; N = 68]	3.3 [95% CI 1.200, 8.929; p = 0.019; N = 68]
Odds ratio for tier 1 / tier 3	4.0 [95% CI 1.374, 11.765; p = 0.009; N = 62]	10.9 [95% CI 2.208, 52.632; p = 0.001; N = 62]	3.8 [95% CI 1.326, 11.111; p = 0.011; N = 62]	3.5 [95% CI 1.186, 10.101; p = 0.021; N = 60]	7.1 [95% CI 2.217, 22.727; p = 0.001; N = 61]
Odds ratio for tier 1 / tier 4	6.7 [95% CI 2.020, 22.222; p = 0.001; N = 54]	16.7 [95% CI 3.195, 83.333; p = 0.000; N = 54]	5.7 [95% CI 1.672, 19.608; p = 0.004; N = 54]	7.1 95% CI 1.923, 26.316; p = 0.002; N = 53]	17.9 [95% CI 3.521, 90.909; p = 0.000; N = 53]

\*Notes: 1. The odds ratios generated by SPSS were inverted for clarity.

2. A risk estimate could not be calculated for sabbatical eligibility due to small cell size.

3. For an explanation of the variance in the above N values, see the preceding tables.

ally the same as other faculty, and less than 10 percent reported that librarians had none of the rights and responsibilities associated with faculty status.

More than 45 percent of fourth-tier institutions reported that librarians were exactly the same as other campus faculty, almost 17 percent reported that librarians were functionally the same as other faculty, and only one (4.2%) reported that librarians did not have any of the rights and responsibilities associated with faculty status.

**Conclusions**

The purpose of this study was twofold: first, it sought information about both the titles and types of appointment held by librarians, as well as the individual rights and responsibilities of librarians on liberal arts college campuses; and second, it was designed to isolate a correlation, if one existed, between those factors and overall institutional quality.

The number of librarians with faculty status reported in previous research was confirmed by the current work. Less than 34 percent of the institutions that responded to the current survey reported that they afford librarians full faculty status and rank, which is exactly the same percentage as reported by Park and Riggs, who employed a very strict definition of faculty status (i.e., faculty status meant that librarians had the same titles and same requirements for tenure and promotion as other faculty on campus).<sup>18</sup> However, an additional 19 percent of the colleges surveyed reported that librarians have faculty status, but not rank, which means that almost 53 percent of institutions

afford librarians faculty status, a figure that corroborates Lowry's finding that 57 percent of liberal arts colleges afford faculty status.<sup>19</sup>

The current study indicates that librarians with faculty status and rank are three times more likely to have exactly the same rights and responsibilities as other faculty on campus (i.e., same review process, same research funds, and same committee eligibility) than librarians who have faculty status only. Therefore, although it has long been known that the individual rights and responsibilities afforded to librarians who have the phrase "faculty status" attached to their position vary widely, faculty rank seems to be a more accurate indicator of faculty rights and responsibilities.

This survey also found that the tier in which a liberal arts college is ranked by *U.S. News and World Report* is an indicator of both the personnel status of librarians and their individual rights and responsibilities. However, unlike earlier findings reported by Meyer that found that faculty status, and tenure in particular, was a positive indicator of the institutional success or quality of a liberal arts college, this survey indicates an inverse relationship between librarians with faculty status and overall institutional quality.<sup>20</sup>

Based on the institutions that responded to this survey, the best colleges—that is, those in the top tier of the *U.S. News and World Report* rankings—were almost seven times less likely to afford librarians faculty status and sixteen times less likely to afford faculty rank than those in the bottom tier. Top-tier colleges were about four times less likely to afford librarians faculty status than colleges in both the second and third tiers, and were seven times less likely to afford librarians faculty rank than Tier Two colleges and approximately eleven times less likely than Tier Three colleges. These findings contradict earlier work by Meyer, who reported that faculty status, and tenure in particular, was an indicator of the in-

stitutional success or quality of a liberal arts college.<sup>21</sup> The odds ratios for Tier One colleges against the other three tiers are presented in table 7.

Colleges in the top tier also were the least likely to afford librarians the individual rights and responsibilities normally associated with faculty status, with the exception of the availability of paid research leaves. Librarians employed by Tier One colleges were the least likely to go through a formal review process, to have access to research funds, and to be eligible for election to standing and ad hoc faculty committees, whereas librarians at Tier Four colleges were the most likely to have these rights and responsibilities. On the other hand, top-tier institutions were the most likely to provide paid research leaves similar to sabbaticals for librarians with professional status, whereas fourth-tier colleges were the least likely to provide this option.<sup>22</sup>

In summary, this survey indicates that the higher the tier (i.e., the better the overall quality of the liberal arts college as determined by *U.S. News & World Report*), the less likely librarians will have faculty status or rank, the less likely they will be required to undergo a formal review process (one that is either the same as faculty or unique to the library), the less likely they will have access to research funds (either the same funds for which other faculty on campus apply or different funds), and the less likely they will be eligible to serve on standing or ad hoc faculty committees.

It is beyond the scope of this research to speculate on the causes or the larger meaning of this correlation, and the authors would like to echo Meyer's concluding remark that "no statistical study ever provides incontrovertible proof of an assertion."<sup>23</sup> However, the authors hope that these results encourage more research into the issue of the personnel status of librarians on liberal arts college campuses and how status and the presence (and absence) of the individual rights and responsibilities normally as-

sociated with faculty status affect both the efficacy of individual librarians in their positions and their ability to advocate the

importance of the library and its staff to the overarching educational goals of the college campus.

---

### Notes

1. Virginia Vesper and Gloria Kelley, comps., *Criteria for Promotion and Tenure for Academic Librarians*: Clip Note no. 26. (Chicago: ALA, 1997), 2.

2. See Ronald Rayman and Frank Wm. Goudy, "Research and Publication Requirements in University Libraries," *College & Research Libraries* 41 (Jan. 1980): 43–48; Thomas G. English, "Librarian Status in the Eighty-nine U.S. Academic Institutions of the Association of Research Libraries: 1982," *College & Research Libraries* 44 (May 1983): 199–208; Joyce Payne and Janet Wagner, "Librarians, Publication, and Tenure," *College & Research Libraries* 45 (Mar. 1984): 133–39; W. Bede Mitchell and L. Stanislava Swieszkowski, "Publication Requirements and Tenure Approval Rates: An Issue for Academic Librarians," *College & Research Libraries* 46 (May 1985): 249–55; Janet Krompart and Clara DiFelice, "A Review of Faculty Status Surveys, 1971–1984," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 13 (Mar. 1987): 14–18; Joan M. Leysen and William K. Black, "Peer Review in Carnegie Research Libraries," *College & Research Libraries* 59 (Nov. 1998): 512–22; W. Bede Mitchell and Mary Reichel, "Publish or Perish: A Dilemma for Academic Librarians?" *College & Research Libraries* 60 (May 1999): 232–43.

3. See Krompart and DiFelice, "A Review of Faculty Status Surveys, 1971–1984"; Janet Krompart, "Researching Faculty Status: A Selected Annotated Bibliography," *College & Research Libraries* 53 (Sept. 1992): 439–49; and Vesper and Kelley, *Criteria for Promotion and Tenure for Academic Librarians*.

4. Charles B. Lowry, "The Status of Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A Twenty-year Perspective," *College & Research Libraries* 54 (Mar. 1993): 163–72.

5. Betsy Park and Robert Riggs, "Tenure and Promotion: A Study of Practices by Institutional Type," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 19 (May 1993): 72–77.

6. *Ibid.*, 76.

7. ACRL, "Faculty Rank, Status, and Tenure for Librarians," 1999 Statistical Summaries for Academic Libraries. Available online from <http://www.virginia.edu/surveys/ACRL/1999/trends.html>. [Accessed 18 January 2005].

8. "Guidelines for Academic Status for College and University Librarians," *College & Research Libraries News* 51 (Mar. 1990): 245–46.

9. For a summary of the results, see Shannon Cary, "Faculty Rank, Status, and Tenure for Librarians," *College & Research Libraries News* 62 (May 1990): 510–11, 520.

10. Vesper and Kelley, *Criteria for Promotion and Tenure for Academic Librarians*.

11. Richard W. Meyer, "A Measure of the Impact of Tenure," *College & Research Libraries* 60 (Mar. 1999): 110–19.

12. ———, "Earnings Gains through the Institutionalized Standard of Faculty Status," *Library Administration and Management* 4 (Fall 1990): 184–93.

13. The Carnegie Foundation, "Category Definitions," The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Classification Home (2000). Available online from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/Classification/CIHE2000/defNotes/Definitions.htm>. [Accessed 21 January 2005].

14. "Using the Rankings," *U.S. News & World Report* (Aug. 22, 2003). Available online from [http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/college/rankings/about/04rank\\_brief.php](http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/college/rankings/about/04rank_brief.php). [Accessed 14 April 2004].

15. America's Best Colleges 2004. *U.S. News & World Report* (Aug. 22, 2003). Available online from [http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/college/rankings/ranklibartco\\_brief.php](http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/college/rankings/ranklibartco_brief.php). [Accessed 14 April 2004]. The Web site indicates that the ranking includes 217 Liberal Arts—Bachelor's institutions, but only lists the names of 214 colleges.

16. The e-mail addresses of library personnel at Thomas Aquinas College and at Fisk University could not be obtained online. In addition, some of the colleges shared library resources: Morehouse College and Spelman College are both served by Robert W. Woodruff Library; St. John's University and the College of Saint Benedict are served by two separate libraries, but by the same library staff; and Pitzer College, Scripps College, Harvey Mudd College, Claremont McKenna College, and Pomona College are all served by the Libraries of The Claremont Colleges.

17. This difference is significant according to a chi-square test. The expected value for Tier Four institutions that afford librarians faculty status only was 4.6; however, because the table is

larger than 3 x 3 and all the other expected frequencies were greater than 5, chi square is still a good "approximation." For more on the minimum frequency thresholds of the chi-square test, see Jeff Connor-Linton, "Chi Square Tutorial," Georgetown Linguistics (Mar. 22, 2003). Available online from [http://www.georgetown.edu/faculty/ballc/webtools/web\\_chi\\_tut.html](http://www.georgetown.edu/faculty/ballc/webtools/web_chi_tut.html).

18. Park and Riggs, "Tenure and Promotion," 73.

19. Lowry, "The Status of Faculty Status for Academic Librarians," 165.

20. Meyer, "A Measure of the Impact of Tenure," 118.

21. Ibid.

22. The frequencies for this question were much smaller than the others (n = 54) due to the fact that only institutions that do not afford librarians faculty status answered it; therefore, the statistical significance of this data point could not be determined.

23. Meyer, "A Measure of the Impact of Tenure," 118.

## Applications/Nominations Invited for C&RL Editor

Applications and nominations are invited for the position of editor of *College & Research Libraries (C&RL)*, the bimonthly, scholarly research journal of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). The editor is appointed for a three-year term, which may be renewed for an additional three years. Applicants must be a member of ALA and ACRL. Qualifications include professional experience in academic libraries, a record of scholarly publication, editing experience, an ability to meet publication deadlines, an understanding of the scholarly communication process, and a broad knowledge of the issues confronting academic libraries.

Some funding for editorial assistance and travel to relevant conferences is available, and there is a small honorarium for the editor.

Appointment will be made by the ACRL Board of Directors at the 2007 Annual Conference upon the recommendation of the search committee and of the ACRL Publications Coordinating Committee. The incoming editor will serve for at least one year as editor-designate, working with the current editor, before assuming full responsibility for *C&RL* in July 2008.

Nominations or resumes and letters of application, including the names of three references, should be sent to:

C&RL Search Committee  
c/o Dawn Mueller  
ACRL Production Editor  
50 East Huron Street  
Chicago, IL 60611  
e-mail: [dmueller@ala.org](mailto:dmueller@ala.org)



*The deadline for receipt of applications is December 4, 2006. Finalists will be interviewed at the Midwinter Meeting in January 2007.*