

RUSS DAVIDSON, CONNIE CAPERS THORSON,  
AND MARGO C. TRUMPETER

## Faculty Status for Librarians in the Rocky Mountain Region: A Review and Analysis

*Responses to a questionnaire from sixty-four four-year colleges and universities in the Rocky Mountain region reveal that sixty-two of the schools grant some of their librarians faculty status and that forty grant faculty status to all librarians. The greatest discrepancy in benefits received by teaching and library faculty arises in length of contract year and publishing responsibilities. The directors of only twelve of the forty libraries note that there is controversy over faculty status for librarians, yet the comments on questionnaires and the results themselves suggest otherwise. In addition, the respondents' uncertainty about their responsibilities and benefits indicates a lack of knowledge of what faculty status should mean to and for them.*

### INTRODUCTION

Since the late 1950s professional library literature has been replete with articles and studies treating the question of faculty status for librarians.<sup>1</sup> This literature reflects a continuing disagreement and confusion underlying the issue of faculty status for librarians. Although the issue has been examined from a variety of perspectives and in a number of regional contexts, there have been no comprehensive studies undertaken for the colleges and universities in the Rocky Mountain region.

In an attempt to examine the issue, a two-part survey was conducted. The results

of the first part of the survey, based on a questionnaire sent to all directors of four-year college and university libraries, are discussed and analyzed below. The purposes of the survey were to ascertain not only how many librarians have been voted or granted faculty status in the various institutions, but also whether or not the issue is a controversial one in the judgment of the chief administrator of those libraries. The study also sought to determine whether the benefits for and responsibilities and obligations of library faculty are the same as those governing the teaching faculty.

### METHODOLOGY

The seven states surveyed in the Rocky Mountain region were New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana. The list of four-year academic institutions was taken from the thirty-second edition of the *American Library Directory* (ALD). Law and medical libraries were excluded when the ALD suggested that they were branches of the main library because it was assumed that the policies governing them would be the same. Questionnaires

---

*Russ Davidson is Ibero-American librarian, Connie Capers Thorson is acting assistant dean for collection development, and Margo C. Trumpeter is assistant to the dean for management, General Library, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.*

*The authors wish to thank Lambert Koopmans, professor of mathematics and statistics at the University of New Mexico, and several of his students for their guidance in performing statistical analyses.*

were sent to the directors of ninety-four libraries. Eighteen of the institutions surveyed were eventually excluded because they were found to be either junior colleges not identified as such by the *ALD* or law school libraries that were indeed part of the larger institution. From the final group of seventy-six, sixty-four responses were received, bringing the response rate to 84 percent.

The questionnaire (see appendix A) was designed to determine whether faculty status had been granted to librarians, how their rank and status were defined, and what benefits and responsibilities they enjoyed. The standards for faculty status for college and university librarians adopted by the membership of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) in 1971 were used as the measure.<sup>2</sup>

The questionnaire was pretested twice on library faculty at the University of New Mexico who had come from other institutions. They were asked to answer it from the perspective of their former experience. Suggestions made for clarifying the questionnaire were incorporated into the final version.

Demographic data about each of the institutions were taken from the thirty-second edition of the *ALD* and the seventeenth edition of *The College Blue Book*. Information such as membership in the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and form of control of the institution was included. Responses to the survey were analyzed by such variables as benefits, responsibilities, and demographic factors.

#### FINDINGS

Sixty-two, or 96 percent, of the sixty-four respondents indicated that some, if not all, of the librarians had faculty status. Since only two responding libraries had no provisions whatsoever for faculty status, it was not possible to compare those schools granting and those withholding faculty status. This study, therefore, addressed the sixty-two libraries having faculty status for all or a portion of their librarians.

In fifteen, or one-fourth, of these sixty-two libraries, it was the director only who enjoyed faculty status. In forty, or nearly two-thirds, all of the librarians had faculty

status, and in slightly more than one-tenth of the institutions, some other combination obtained, for example, only those who also taught or only the library director and assistant director.

The breakdown by states is shown in table 1.

As table 1 indicates, geographical location appeared to have little bearing on the granting of faculty status. Such status was enjoyed by a high percentage of librarians throughout the region. On the other hand, the type and form of control of the institution did appear to affect the granting of faculty status within libraries (see table 2).

As shown in table 2, 92 percent of the university libraries granted faculty status to all librarians whereas only 50 percent of the liberal arts colleges and 43 percent of the professional schools did the same ( $p < .005$ ).

Table 3, which analyzes the data by the form of control of the institution, shows that "directors only" have faculty status significantly more frequently in private than in public institutions ( $p < .05$ ).

#### BENEFITS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF FACULTY STATUS

A critical point of discussion in the controversy over faculty status has centered on the issue of benefits and whether they are the same for librarians as for teaching faculty. It was intended, when the ACRL standards were first adopted in 1971, that those institutions extending faculty status to librarians would grant them the same benefits and responsibilities enjoyed by the teaching faculty. The remainder of this study deals only with the forty schools granting faculty status to all librarians. Table 4 shows that the results, in these forty schools, have not been entirely successful.

As table 4 makes clear, major discrepancies existed between the library faculty and the teaching faculty. The sharpest difference occurred in the length of the contract year. Ninety-five percent of the librarians in the Rocky Mountain region held twelve-month contracts in contradiction to the relevant ACRL standard, which calls for academic-year appointments. Another point of divergence pertained to faculty rank. Seventy-five percent of the librarians were granted

TABLE 1  
FACULTY STATUS BY STATE

	Total		Director Only		All Librarians		Other	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
New Mexico	10	16.1	1	1.6	8	12.9	1	1.6
Arizona	5	8.0	1	1.6	4	6.4	0	0.0
Colorado	21	33.9	7	11.3	11	17.7	3	4.9
Utah	9	14.5	2	3.2	4	6.4	3	4.9
Wyoming	2	3.2	0	0.0	2	3.2	0	0.0
Idaho	6	9.7	0	0.0	6	9.7	0	0.0
Montana	9	14.5	4	6.5	5	8.0	0	0.0
Total	62	99.9	15	24.2	40	64.3	7	11.4

TABLE 2  
FACULTY STATUS BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Having Faculty Status	Total		Teachers' Colleges		Liberal Arts Colleges		Universities		Professional Schools	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Director only	15	24	1	50	7	32	0	0	7	50
All librarians	40	65	1	50	11	50	22	92	6	43
Other combination	7	11	0	0	4	18	2	8	1	7
Total	62	100	2	100	22	100	24	100	14	100

\*The small number of teachers' colleges precludes making direct reference to them; they are, however, included in the tables.

TABLE 3  
FACULTY STATUS BY POSITION LEVEL AND CONTROL OF INSTITUTION

Having Faculty Status	Total		Public		Private Church-Related		Private Independent	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Director only	15	24	6	15	7	41	2	40
All librarians	40	65	30	75	8	47	2	40
Other combination	7	11	4	10	2	12	1	20
Total	62	100	40	100	17	100	5	100

TABLE 4  
BENEFITS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF LIBRARY AND TEACHING FACULTY

Benefits and Responsibilities	Same for Library and Teaching Faculty		Different for Library and Teaching Faculty		No Response	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Nine-month contract	2	5	38	95	0	0
Institutional committee work	40	100	0	0	0	0
Professional committee work	39	98	1	2	0	0
Identical rank	30	75	10	25	0	0
Identical tenure	32	80	8	20	0	0
Promotion eligibility	33	83	6	15	1	2
Sabbatical eligibility	33	83	5	12	2	5
Research leaves	32	80	3	8	5	12
Research funds	28	70	5	12	7	18
Grievance	40	100	0	0	0	0
Publishing requirements	7	18	32	80	1	2
Academic governance	39	98	0	0	1	2

TABLE 5  
IDENTICAL RANK BY STATE

Identical Rank	New Mexico		Arizona		Colorado		Utah		Wyoming		Idaho		Montana	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	7	88	0	0	10	91	2	50	2	100	4	67	5	100
No	1	12	4	100	1	9	2	50	0	0	2	33	0	0
Total	8	100	4	100	11	100	4	100	2	100	6	100	5	100

TABLE 6  
IDENTICAL RANK BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Identical Rank	Teachers' Colleges		Liberal Arts Colleges		Universities		Professional Schools	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	100	8	73	16	73	5	83
No	0	0	3	27	6	27	1	17
Total	1	100	11	100	22	100	6	100

academic rank, 10 percent academic status, 5 percent professional status, and 10 percent something other. This distinction also applied, though not quite as markedly, to the awarding of tenure. This, too, represented a departure from the ACRL norm, which stipulated that tenure provisions should be the same for both library and teaching faculty. A third important difference in responsibilities involved publishing requirements, a point not specifically addressed by the ACRL standards. Only 18 percent of the librarians were required to meet the same publishing standards as the teaching faculty.

At the same time, certain benefits and responsibilities were shared by a large majority. Most prominent in this category were participation in departmental and institutional committee work and access to the same grievance procedures as teaching faculty. One hundred percent of the respondents indicated that these benefits were equal. Assuming that grievance procedures closely approximate the protection of academic freedom called for in the ACRL standards, it would appear that each school has fulfilled this requirement.

In compliance with the ACRL standards, participation in professional (state and national) committee work and in academic or university governance was shared by 98 percent of the respondents. To a lesser, but still important degree, eligibility for promotion and sabbatical leave was shared.

Although sabbatical leaves were obtainable in 83 percent of the institutions responding, research leaves and research funds were available in only 80 percent and 70 percent respectively. It is thus apparent that observance of the ACRL standards on these benefits is incomplete.

#### OTHER BENEFITS AND RESPONSIBILITIES Rank

Analyzing benefits and responsibilities in relation to location, type, and form of control of the institution disclosed significant results (tables 5-7). A statistically significant relationship ( $p < .01$ ) was found between the granting of academic rank and geographic location (table 5). In Arizona none of the schools granted identical rank, and in Utah only 50 percent did. These figures contrasted sharply with those for Wyoming and Montana, where 100 percent of the schools granted identical rank. Falling between were Colorado, with 91 percent, and New Mexico, with 88 percent, granting identical rank.

Examining rank by type of institution

TABLE 7  
IDENTICAL RANK BY CONTROL OF INSTITUTION

Identical Rank	Public		Private	
	#	%	#	%
Yes	23	77	7	70
No	7	23	3	30
Total	30	100	10	100



TABLE 8  
IDENTICAL TENURE BY STATE

Identical Tenure	New Mexico		Arizona		Colorado		Utah		Wyoming		Idaho		Montana	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	5	63	2	50	10	91	3	75	2	100	5	83	5	100
No	2	25	2	50	1	9	1	25	0	0	1	17	0	0
No response	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	8	100	4	100	11	100	4	100	2	100	6	100	5	100

TABLE 9  
IDENTICAL TENURE BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Identical Tenure	Teachers' Colleges		Liberal Arts Colleges		Universities		Professional Schools	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	100	8	73	20	91	3	50
No	0	0	2	18	2	9	3	50
No response	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0
Total	1	100	11	100	22	100	6	100

presented an interesting pattern (table 6). Within the professional schools, librarians were more likely to obtain equal rank than were librarians in either liberal arts colleges or universities.

#### Tenure Provisions

Analyzing tenure provisions on the basis of equality between library and teaching faculty again showed differences both regionally and by type and form of control of the institution. The most noticeable difference, when this question was examined by state (table 8), occurred between Arizona and New Mexico and the other five states. In Arizona only 50 percent and in New Mexico only 63 percent of those schools responding to this question had the same tenure provisions. In Wyoming and Montana, on the other hand, all schools responding had the same tenure provisions.

As with rank, tenure provisions were affected by the type of institution (table 9). Although 83 percent of the librarians in pro-

TABLE 10  
IDENTICAL TENURE BY CONTROL OF INSTITUTION

Identical Tenure	Public		Private	
	#	%	#	%
Yes	26	87	6	60
No	4	13	3	30
No response	0	0	1	10
Total	30	100	10	100

fessional schools were granted rank identical with teaching faculty, only 50 percent of them had identical tenure provisions. In contrast, 73 percent of the universities granted identical rank, but 91 percent of them granted identical tenure.

Analysis of tenure provisions by the form of control of the institution displayed a wide variation between publicly supported institutions and private institutions (table 10).

#### Promotion

As with tenure, promotion was affected by geographical location (table 11). In 100

TABLE 11  
PROMOTION ELIGIBILITY BY STATE

Promotion	New Mexico		Arizona		Colorado		Utah		Wyoming		Idaho		Montana	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	7	88	3	75	7	64	3	75	2	100	6	100	5	100
No	0	0	1	25	4	36	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
No response	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	8	100	4	100	11	100	4	100	2	100	6	100	5	100

TABLE 12  
PROMOTION ELIGIBILITY BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Promotion	Teachers' Colleges		Liberal Arts Colleges		Universities		Professional Schools	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	100	8	73	20	91	4	67
No	0	0	2	18	2	9	2	33
No response	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0
Total	1	100	11	100	22	100	6	100

TABLE 13  
PROMOTION ELIGIBILITY BY CONTROL OF INSTITUTION

Promotion	Public		Private	
	#	%	#	%
Yes	28	93	5	50
No	2	7	4	40
No response	0	0	1	10
Total	30	100	10	100

percent of the schools in Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana, librarians were eligible for promotion. In Colorado, by comparison, only 64 percent of the institutions indicated that their librarians had such eligibility. When analyzing promotion by type of institution, the professional schools again stood out. The most likely to grant identical rank, they were the least likely to grant identical promotion benefits (table 12). As table 13 shows, public institutions were much more likely to grant promotional benefits than were private schools ( $p < .005$ ).

### Sabbatical Eligibility

The significant variation in this category (tables 14–16) occurred under type of institution. Table 15 illustrates that university librarians were eligible for sabbaticals more often than expected statistically. In professional schools and teachers' colleges librarians were eligible less often than expected ( $p < .05$ ). Table 16 shows a statistically significant relationship between sabbatical eligibility and the form of control of the institution ( $p < .05$ ).

### Research Funds and Leaves

Seventy percent of the respondents indicated that librarians had the same access to research funds as did teaching faculty (tables 17–19). In light of this average figure, it is interesting to note that 100 percent of Wyoming's schools and only 50 percent of Utah's schools provided equal access to such funds (table 17).

A slightly higher percentage (80 percent)

TABLE 14  
SABBATICAL ELIGIBILITY BY STATE

Sabbatical	New Mexico		Arizona		Colorado		Utah		Wyoming		Idaho		Montana	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	6	75.0	3	75	9	82	3	75	2	100	6	100	4	80
No	1	12.5	1	25	2	18	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
No response	1	12.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	20
Total	8	100.0	4	100	11	100	4	100	2	100	6	100	5	100

TABLE 15  
SABBATICAL ELIGIBILITY BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Sabbatical	Teachers' Colleges		Liberal Arts Colleges		Universities		Professional Schools	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	100	8	73	21	95	3	50
No	0	0	2	18	1	5	2	33
No response	0	0	1	9	0	0	1	17
Total	1	100	11	100	22	100	6	100

TABLE 16  
SABBATICAL ELIGIBILITY BY CONTROL  
OF INSTITUTION

Sabbatical	Public		Private	
	#	%	#	%
Yes	27	90	6	60
No	2	7	3	30
No response	1	3	1	10
Total	30	100	10	100

of the librarians had access to research leaves on the same basis as did teaching faculty (table 20). The greatest discrepancy between access to research leaves and funds occurred in Montana. While only 60 percent had access to funds, 100 percent of librarians had access to leaves. It is especially noteworthy that in New Mexico research funds were more likely to be accessible than research leaves! The opposite was true in every other state.

On the general questions of research funds and leaves, a somewhat higher "no response" rate was noted, indicating a possi-

ble uncertainty on the part of the directors about the actual research benefits of librarians. Access to research funds was more likely to be enjoyed by university librarians than by professional school and liberal arts college librarians (table 18). There was a significant relationship ( $p < .025$ ) between access to research leave and type of institution (table 21).

There was discernible distinction between public and private schools in the granting of research leave and research funds (tables 19 and 22).

#### ARL Members

Seven of the libraries within the region are members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). Responses to the questionnaire were received from all seven. ARL membership correlated highly with the benefits and responsibilities stipulated in the previously cited ACRL *Standards*. Librarians in ARL libraries are universally accorded all benefits and responsibilities ex-

TABLE 17  
ACCESS TO RESEARCH FUNDS BY STATE

Research Funds	New Mexico		Arizona		Colorado		Utah		Wyoming		Idaho		Montana	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	7	88	3	75	7	64	2	50	2	100	4	67	3	60
No	0	0	1	25	2	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	40
No response	1	12	0	0	2	18	2	50	0	0	2	33	0	0
Total	8	100	4	100	11	100	4	100	2	100	6	100	5	100

TABLE 18  
ACCESS TO RESEARCH FUNDS BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Research Funds	Teachers' Colleges		Liberal Arts Colleges		Universities		Professional Schools	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	100	6	55	18	82	3	50
No	0	0	1	9	2	9	2	33
No response	0	0	4	36	2	9	1	17
Total	1	100	11	100	22	100	6	100

TABLE 19  
ACCESS TO RESEARCH FUNDS BY  
CONTROL OF INSTITUTION

Research Funds	Public		Private	
	#	%	#	%
Yes	22	73	6	60
No	3	10	2	20
No response	5	17	2	20
Total	30	100	10	100

cept equivalent rank and publication requirements. The publishing requirement must be met in the three libraries providing equivalent rank. Interestingly, the value for librarians of ARL membership, in relation to meeting the ACRL standards, is decidedly greater in the Rocky Mountain region than in the country as a whole, as is evident from the 1979 survey of all ARL libraries on

TABLE 20  
ACCESS TO RESEARCH LEAVE BY STATE

Research Leave	New Mexico		Arizona		Colorado		Utah		Wyoming		Idaho		Montana	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	6	75	3	75	8	73	3	75	2	100	5	83	5	100
No	0	0	1	25	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	17	0	0
No response	2	25	0	0	2	18	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	8	100	4	100	11	100	4	100	2	100	6	100	5	100

TABLE 21  
ACCESS TO RESEARCH LEAVE BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Research Leave	Teachers' Colleges		Liberal Arts Colleges		Universities		Professional Schools	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	100	6	55	21	95	4	67.0
No	0	0	2	18	0	0	1	16.5
No response	0	0	3	27	1	5	1	16.5
Total	1	100	11	100	22	100	6	100.0

TABLE 22  
ACCESS TO RESEARCH LEAVE BY CONTROL OF INSTITUTION

Research Leave	Public		Private	
	#	%	#	%
Yes	25	83	7	70
No	2	7	1	10
No response	3	10	2	20
Total	30	100	10	100

the status of librarians.<sup>3</sup>

Table 23 compares benefits and responsibilities of librarians in the Rocky Mountain region ARL members with those of the general membership of the association.

### *The Library Directors Speak*

Each respondent to the questionnaire was encouraged to add comments that might shed further light on faculty status. From the many such comments, one recurrent theme emerged: equivalence between library faculty and teaching faculty is more often theoretical than real.

This finding was supported by the uncertainty characterizing the directors' responses to specific questions. Considerable ambiguity existed as to whether or not librarians actually possessed the benefits they were supposed to have under the terms of faculty status. For example, one respondent commented that while librarians were eligible for research leave, none had ever been

granted. The same director commented that only one sabbatical had been granted to a librarian in thirty-one years. Confusion also attended the question of promotion. One director indicated that he did not know how people received promotion; another responded that while eligibility for promotion existed, "the possibility of promotion is almost nil." Further typifying some directors' uncertainty were such frequent responses as "don't know," "never tried," "unclear," "?" to questions pertaining to librarians' benefits. This ambiguity, it should be noted, was not specific to any single type or size of institution.

Degree requirements were also uncertain. Although 90 percent of the schools indicated that a second master's degree was not formally required for tenure and promotion, several indicated that it was difficult to be promoted without a second master's degree. One director commented that while a second master's was not required, the library would "prefer" some reference librarians have this degree.

Among the most interesting responses were those made to the questions "Must teaching faculty publish to be granted promotion and tenure?" and "Must librarians publish to be granted promotion and tenure?" Forty percent of the respondents indicated that the teaching faculty must publish, while only 18 percent indicated



TABLE 23  
BENEFITS AND RESPONSIBILITIES BY ARL LIBRARIES

Benefits and Responsibilities	ARL Libraries, Rocky Mountain Region (7)				ARL Libraries, National Survey (91)			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Rank	3	43	4	57	27	30	64	70
Tenure	6	86	1	14	40	44	40	44
Promotion	7	100	0	0	40	44	34	37
Sabbatical	7	100	0	0	40	44	37	41
Research leaves	7	100	0	0	67	74	15	16
Research funds	7	100	0	0	50	55	30	33
Grievance	7	100	0	0	69	76	10	11
Publishing*	3	43	4	57	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Faculty organization	6	86	1	14	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Academic senate	7	100	0	0	45	49	36	40

\*Further figures about publishing are available in Ronald Rayman and Frank Wm. Goudy, "Research and Publication Requirements in University Libraries," *College & Research Libraries* 41:43-48 (Jan. 1980)

that librarians faced the same obligation. At least one director commented that the teaching faculty, although not required to publish, would probably never be promoted to the rank of full professor without publishing. He did not make the same comment about librarians. Another director indicated that while teaching faculty were evaluated for tenure on the basis of publications, librarians were evaluated not on this ground but, rather, on such other criteria as "job performance, campus and community service, professional activity, etc."

The role of librarians in academic governance may afford still another example of theoretical, rather than actual, rights and responsibilities. The survey results showed that 98 percent of library faculty members were eligible for membership in the academic senate or equivalent faculty body. Yet, eligibility may not itself guarantee the library faculty representation. In fact, one director commented that no librarian had ever been elected to the faculty governing body of his institution, although all were eligible. The possible exclusion of librarians from academic governance may stem in part from the absence of a tradition among them of collegial decision making. As many as 40 percent of the library faculties involved in this survey have yet to organize themselves into a collegial body.

Clearly, the inconsistent application of standards to library faculty on the one hand and to teaching faculty on the other has helped create and reinforce a continuing

controversy. In the words of one director, "Every time tenure and promotion for library faculty reach the university tenure and promotion committee, *someone* questions it!" Thus, it is surprising that the directors in only twelve libraries acknowledged that there was controversy about the issue. Two directors who reported that there was no controversy had, in fact, recently witnessed the divestiture of faculty status from some of their librarians. It may be deduced from this that some directors may have obscured the reality of the situation.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS

It is quite apparent that, while many librarians in the Rocky Mountain region have been granted faculty status by their institutions, they are in reality not enjoying certain of the benefits and responsibilities central to such status, notably, the benefit of the nine-month contract and the responsibility of publishing. The ACRL *Standards* published in 1972 envisioned that librarians "... be recognized as equal partners in the academic enterprise."

Since the *Standards* also proposed a three- to five-year implementation period for "college and university libraries which do not currently conform to any or all of these standards," the time is right for the directors and librarians to work toward full compliance. When the standards have been implemented and accepted by the entire university community, an equal partnership will be realized.

## REFERENCES

1. Among the more frequently cited works and anthologies are: Lewis C. Branscomb, ed., *The Case for Faculty Status for Academic Librarians* (ACRL Monograph, no.33 [Chicago: American Library Assn., 1970]); Robert B. Downs, ed., *The Status of American College and University Librarians* (ACRL Monograph, no.22 [Chicago: American Library Assn., 1958]); Virgil F. Massman, *Faculty Status for Librarians* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1972); Perry D. Morrison, *The Career of the Academic Librarian: A Study of the Social Origins, Educational Attainments, Vocational Experience, and Personality Characteristics of a Group of American Academic Librarians* (ACRL Monograph, no.29 [Chicago: American Library Assn., 1969]); and Anita R. Schiller, *Characteristics of Professional Personnel in College and University Libraries* (Research Series, no.16 [Springfield, Ill.: Illinois State Library, 1969]). For additional citations see Nancy Huling, "Faculty Status—a Comprehensive Bibliography," *College & Research Libraries* 34:440-62 (Nov. 1973).
2. "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians," *College & Research Libraries News* 8:210-12 (Sept. 1972).
3. *The Status of Librarians: An Overview* (ARL SPEC Kit 61 [Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, Feb. 1980]).

## APPENDIX A

We are interested in knowing the benefits for and expectations of academic librarians, whether or not they have faculty status. Please respond to the following questions and feel free to make comments on any of them. Thank you.

1. Is there controversy in your institution or library about faculty status for librarians?  yes  no
2. If the librarians at your institution do not currently have faculty status, is there any movement afoot to grant such status?  yes  no  n/a
3. How many librarians are employed at your library? \_\_\_\_\_
4. Have any of them been granted faculty status?  yes  no
5. If yes, which?  director only  all  none  only librarians who also teach  
 director and assistant director(s) only  other  n/a

Please answer the following questions about the majority of librarians in your institution whether or not they have faculty status.

6. Do librarians at your institution usually hold contracts of:  
 nine months  ten months  twelve months
7. If the librarians hold nine- or ten-month contracts, is summer work paid for at rates comparable to those of teaching faculty?  yes  no  n/a
8. If the librarians usually hold twelve-month contracts, are nine- or ten-month contracts possible for librarians?  yes  no  n/a
9. Is the librarian's scheduled work week:  30 hours  35 hours  37 hours  40 hours  other
10. Does the normal work load of librarians include time for other professional activities such as committee work?  yes  no
11. Are librarians at your institution encouraged to serve on library and/or school committees?  yes  no
12. Are librarians at your institution encouraged to serve on professional committees at the state, regional, and/or national level?  yes  no
13. Are librarians at your institution granted rank identical to that of the teaching faculty?  yes  no
14. If not identical, is librarian status:  
 academic  professional  other  n/a
15. Are librarians at your institution covered by tenure provisions identical to those of the teaching faculty?  yes  no
16. If #15 is no, is there an equivalent provision made?  yes  no  n/a
17. Are recommendations for tenure, or its equivalent, based on a peer review system?  yes  no
18. Are librarians at your institution eligible for promotion?  yes  no
19. Are recommendations for promotion based on a peer review system?  yes  no

20. Are librarians at your institution eligible for sabbatical leaves on the same basis as teaching faculty?  yes  no
21. Are librarians at your institution eligible for research leaves with or without pay?  yes  no
22. Do librarians at your institution have access to the same research funds accessible to faculty?  yes  no
23. Do librarians at your institution have access to grievance, appeal, and review procedures available to other faculty?  yes  no
24. Must teaching faculty publish to be granted promotion and tenure?  yes  no
25. Must librarians publish to be granted promotion and tenure, or its equivalent?  yes  no
26. Is the master's in library science from an ALA-accredited library school considered the beginning degree for appointment as a librarian in your institution?  yes  no
27. Is a second master's degree for librarians required for:  
 appointment  tenure (or its equivalent)  promotion  none of the above
28. How many librarians in your institution have Ph.D. degrees in any subject?  
 none  1-3  4-6  7 or more
29. Has a library faculty been formally organized and/or constituted?  yes  no
30. Are librarians in your institution eligible for membership in the academic senate or equivalent faculty body?  yes  no
31. Are librarians in your institution unionized?  yes  no
32. If librarians are unionized, is the bargaining agent the:  AAUP  AFT  other  n/a
33. Are new librarians recommended by:  a college-wide search committee  
 a library search committee  the library director  other
34. Is the library director recommended by:  a college-wide search committee  a library search committee  election  other
35. Is the library director considered a:  department head  chairperson  dean  other
36. The library director is appointed for:  1-3 years  4-6 years  indefinitely