

Conflict Resolution: A Case Study about Academic Librarians and Faculty Status

Pat Weaver-Meyers

The University of Oklahoma librarians underwent a dramatic challenge to their faculty status in the 1990s. This article chronicles that challenge and documents the events that led to the retention of faculty status by the librarians. The event is analyzed in the context of conflict resolution research. Conclusions suggest that a strong sense of service may help to unify academic librarians in future conflicts about their ambiguous status within the broader academic community. Third-party intervention and alternative options are also strategies discussed.



Conflict in the workplace is always challenging. Constructive conflict associated with technological change may be stimulating and result in workplace innovation, but other conflicts can strain relations among employees, lower morale, contribute to rumor mongering, and generally create a negative climate.¹ Certain activities are especially susceptible to conflict. Evaluation activities, for example, are frequently associated with conflict and can even lead to litigation when employee and supervisor disagree. Academic librarians with peer evaluation traditions of promotion and tenure have a built-in potential for conflict. Academic institutions most likely have policy remedies, such as an appeal system and/or an ombudsperson. However, tenure decisions that end up in appeal are likely to have already done damage to relationships and organizational climate.

Faculty status for academic librarians has a complex history that includes past conflict. Furthermore, this history has never fully resolved the problem of librarians' status in the minds of nonlibrarian faculty.² Even the minds of librarians, as evidenced by a variety of current statuses (professional status, nontenured faculty status, academic status, faculty status without rank, and faculty status with rank) are unsettled. An academic librarian may move from one institution to another and dramatically affect his or her evaluation criteria. The following is a discussion of how some aspects of faculty status among librarians may contribute to potential conflict and how the resultant damage can be minimized. This discussion analyzes the upheaval of faculty status for the University of Oklahoma librarians that occurred in the last decade with the intent of formulating some strategies for coping with similar conflict.

Pat Weaver-Meyers is Director of Information Management and Delivery in the University of Oklahoma Libraries; e-mail: patwm@ou.edu.

Within this case study are two major conflicts. The first is a conflict between the university administration and the librarians. That conflict creates a situation in which subsequent conflict among the librarians themselves becomes unavoidable.

Background

Many authors have studied faculty status among academic librarians. The Academic Status Committee of Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) compiled a resource guide on the issue.

Academic librarians with peer evaluation traditions of promotion and tenure have a built-in potential for conflict.

That guide includes bibliographies revealing a long-standing debate in the profession.³ It seems safe to assume that many academic librarians may retain conflict-generating perspectives related to the inconsistent nature of librarians' status across academic campuses in the United States. This article is not intended to debate the value of faculty status for academic librarians. That has been done with regularity for decades. Although recently quiescent, the debate may have slowed because aging librarians have simply migrated to those institutions with a status they find most accommodating. Consensus is still elusive, though, or librarianship would be a more uniform profession. Rather, because the debate remains unresolved and recruitment of new academic librarians is projected to be difficult due to unfavorable demographics, future conflict is likely inevitable.⁴

The lack of consensus in the profession is clearly demonstrated by Virginia Vesper and Gloria Kelley's study of small and medium-sized academic libraries. That survey revealed significant inconsistency in status among institutions. Only 51 percent of respondents have faculty status, and a smaller percent are actually eligible for tenure. Further, 37 percent of the

group has academic rank, which means that among those with faculty status, that status is inconsistent across institutions. Of those remaining respondents, 29 percent have academic status, 39 percent have administrative status, and 11 percent have staff status.⁵ A recent ACRL study reported by Shannon Cary mentions the lack of a uniform definition and reveals great variety in privileges conferred to library faculty such as tenure, promotion, sabbaticals, and so on.⁶ Clearly, this is muddy water for prospective academic librarians about to be baptized into the profession. It is probable that a new initiate may find it difficult to steer a clear course because he or she may undertake several career moves and find the waters more or less navigable at different institutions. The story of librarians' status at the University of Oklahoma may offer insight for the naïve sailor and reveal some strategies for dealing with conflict.

Case Study: A History

The University of Oklahoma Libraries has a rich and long tradition of faculty status for librarians. Faculty status began under the leadership of Arthur McAnally, director of University of Oklahoma Libraries, who, along with Robert Downs from the University of Illinois Libraries, was a groundbreaking, nationally recognized proponent of faculty status for librarians as early as the 1950s. McAnally originally tried to get the University of Oklahoma's Faculty Senate to support faculty status for his librarians but was denied in 1956.⁷ In 1967, he achieved his goal when faculty status was awarded through the University Board of Regents, some of whom were close personal acquaintances.⁸ After he achieved his objective, he devoted himself to mentoring his librarians to aspire fully to that status. His strategy was wily, but his vision of the importance of faculty status was unshakable, and he proceeded to steer his librarians on toward meeting the challenges this new status demanded. McAnally built a high level of enthusiasm among his librarians, who realized that the change in sta-

tus afforded them benefits, such as sabbaticals, previously unavailable. Not until 1970 did McAnally finally gain the support of the Faculty Senate.⁹ It was then that librarians and other nondepartmental faculty were given representation.¹⁰

By the 1980s, it was still not clear among the nonlibrarian faculty that librarians were faculty, as evidenced by the quizzical look many displayed when the issue arose. However, nonlibrarian faculty had their own identity problems due to increasing pressures to publish or perish. Departmental criteria for tenure and promotion were toughening. No longer could a faculty member hope to gain tenure without an established record of publication. Unfortunately, librarians lagged in their research productivity compared with other departments, perhaps because Arthur McAnally was gone and the stimulus to publish was less intense. The librarians were comparable to library peers in publishing productivity, but that proved inadequate when two librarians' dossiers were reviewed by the campuswide tenure committee in 1986. Rather than ruling on the dossiers, as was its charge, the committee recommended that the provost review University Libraries' promotion and tenure criteria. Ultimately, the provost granted tenure to one librarian and offered the other librarian professional status. Yes, that is right. In a unilateral decision, taken without consultation, an uncomfortable dual status was begun. It suggested that librarians could successfully perform their duties without faculty status. This ruling, humane in some ways, turned up the heat on a pot that would eventually boil over university-wide.

In 1990, the librarians' status again came under assault, as another campus committee turned a critical light on the question. Led by faculty from a department served by the newly established professional librarian position, the University Program Review Committee, charged with regular examination of departments across campus, produced a report stating that tenure was inappropriate for library positions. In November of

that same year, with faculty status now under serious fire, the University Libraries dean in conjunction with a committee from the libraries attempted to defend faculty status. Their response analyzed peer institutions, the majority of which did have faculty status for librarians, and stated the advantages of that status to the university. The report suggested that the librarians were being targeted because of gender discrimination:

We include this statement of the value of faculty status for librarians to emphasize our commitment to the professional-ization of our field. The professions generally defined as "women's fields" are often subjected to repeated challenges because of unconscious and insidious discrimination against minorities and women. We know that the program review committee shares our concern and is committed to affirm the fair review of all minority-dominated fields throughout the university. It is significant to note in pursuit of this aim that the FY89/90 faculty figures for OU show that female UOL faculty represent approximately 10% of the tenured and tenure track women faculty at the University of Oklahoma.¹¹

Although believed to be a powerful volley against the onslaught, the battle continued primarily because it was now clear that the university president, Richard Van Horn, supported the change. A new book, *Primer for University Presidents* by Peter T. Flawn, an acquaintance of President Van Horn, was an influential work of the period. In it, faculty status for librarians was classified as "wholly self-serving" and likely to diminish presidential authority.¹²

Discussions on the issue with the administration stressed that an alternative clinical faculty status should be considered if a change was inevitable. Unable to derail the president's resolve, a few months later, in May 1991, the libraries' dean was

charged by the provost to develop a plan "in consultation with appropriate library faculty and staff that accomplishes or takes into account the following: ...a classification that would be designated as clinical faculty appointments...not tenured."¹³ The charge also stated that new recruits would be hired as nontenured or professional staff, existing faculty could remain tenured or tenure track, change to professional or to nontenure track. The plan had to be completed by July 15, 1991.

If the library faculty had been shaken before, they were now totally fractured. Distinct groups appeared made up of those who staunchly supported tenure-track faculty status (most of whom were already tenured, although one tenured faculty member did not agree); those who preferred the new clinical faculty status without tenure (including at least one tenured faculty member and some tenure-track faculty who distrusted the fairness of the campuswide tenure committee); and those who distrusted their peers and the campuswide tenure committee and wanted to be removed from the peer review process—given professional status. As these groups coalesced, tensions increased. The three groups jostled trying to pull into their ranks any undeclared librarian. Coffee breaks became strategic planning sessions, and hallways were populated with whispering enclaves that hushed when a nonallied librarian passed by. Some librarians kept their own counsel, and others vacillated. In the meantime, new recruits were plunked into a steaming cauldron with a different status than their peers. Not surprisingly, some felt betrayed and confused.

The University Libraries plan was submitted in June 25, 1991. Librarians "chose" their preferred status, with ten selecting non-tenure-track appointments and twelve remaining in tenure-track or tenured positions. Within the following year, seven new librarians would be hired, all non-tenure-track appointments, as required by the provost. In the background, a group of tenured library faculty worked to involve the Faculty Sen-

ate by filing a formal complaint with the chair of the Faculty Appeals Board. The complaint questioned the appropriateness of the procedure used to change the librarians' status and suggested it was inconsistent with the university's *Faculty Handbook*.¹⁴ Less than one month later, on August 8, 1991, a new interim provost issued a memorandum. The memorandum stated how the new plan would be implemented and that it would be dependent on the outcome of a study by the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate study would review "consecutive term regular faculty appointments, toward the goal of adding such a faculty appointment category formally to the Norman campus *Faculty Handbook*."¹⁵ Consecutive-term appointments allowed for multiple-year guaranteed employment, without tenure.

Although it considered consecutive-term appointments, the Faculty Senate received two letters, each representing the polarized positions of a number of library faculty. One, signed by five tenured library faculty, supported the continuance of tenure in the libraries.¹⁶ The second, signed by seven untenured and one tenured faculty, supported consecutive-term appointments.¹⁷ After several months of deliberation, the Faculty Senate came down with an unequivocal position supported by strong feelings: There would be no consecutive-term appointments. This position was driven by a campuswide concern that such a change would accelerate the weakening of tenure and open the university to "many sorts of potential administrative abuse of the proposed type of faculty appointment."¹⁸ Clearly, the abrupt administrative decision to remove faculty status for librarians and create an entirely new category of academic appointment had heightened fears among all faculty.

As a result, the plan for changing librarians' status fell apart. At this point, there were now librarians appointed to a status that did not exist. Most librarians were unsure how to interpret their situation. Others were pleased that the threat to faculty status had been parried. The final status of the librarians remained unclear.

Upon receiving the senate's pronouncement, the university administration, now cognizant of the senate's intense feelings, changed its approach. The administration charged the senate to examine faculty status for the librarians. The senate appointed a committee made up of librarians and regular faculty.

The Ad Hoc Committee to Review Tenure within the University Libraries began its work by surveying the librarians. Not surprisingly, the opinions expressed by the librarians were highly conflicted and colored with strong feelings of mistrust. After all, they had been forced onto a roller-coaster ride, nauseated, and never let off. They now were contemplating the prospect of a continuing ride with no clear indication of when or how the new people at the controls would react. Their emotions ran the gamut from despair to seething anger accentuated by mistrust. The mistrust encompassed the administration, one another, the library administration, nonlibrarian faculty, the tenure process, the campuswide tenure committee, and the pollsters themselves.

The committee continued its deliberations through the spring of 1993. Its final report was presented to the senate in April. Before that, it was circulated to the librarians. The report, which was adopted by the senate with a vote of thirty-five to two with one abstention, supported tenure for librarians. During the debate, some faculty senators repeated that they did not believe the librarians engaged in teaching. However, others pointed out that collection development and student contacts represented teaching, but without credit-hour production. Others evidenced serious concern about the dangerous precedent set by an administrative fiat removing faculty status.

The adopted committee report recommended a rewrite of the tenure criteria, conversion of non-tenure-track back to faculty status with extended probationary periods for tenure consideration, and establishment of a tenure dossier statement, as follows:

The University has determined that academic librarians are eligible for the award of tenure. And while it is true that the accomplishments of *every* candidate for tenure within the University must be evaluated on the basis of criteria developed by his or her academic unit and approved by the Provost, it is worthwhile to remind those making formal recommendations in the case of librarians that their professional responsibilities and duties are, in some important ways, different from those of many other members of the faculty. In their case, therefore, it is particularly important that each librarian's activities during the probationary period be measured carefully against the expectations set forth in the formal criteria established by the University Libraries and approved by the Provost of the University.

The committee also recommended the appointment of an outside monitor to assist in implementing the recommendations.¹⁹ Not all librarians concurred with the recommendations. At least three disagreed so strongly that they sent a formal complaint to the Faculty Senate chair, which repeated their preference to retain the non-tenure track they chose in the summer of 1991.²⁰ Other non-tenure-track librarians felt betrayed but complained less directly.

In August 1993, a newly appointed provost issued a memorandum stating that the president had accepted the ad hoc committee's report. However, the following clause made adjustments for the non-tenure-track librarians and evidenced some institutional concern for potential legal claims:

As the Library faculty works through these activities, the University must consider the prior actions of the campus administration. Members of the Library faculty were given the opportunity to change appointment status and some fac-

ulty opted for clinical faculty appointments. Recent Library faculty appointments were made under a non-tenure-track option. In order to be fair to the people who have worked in the Library or have been appointed during this period, the following opportunities will be offered:

1. Library faculty with non-tenure-track appointments will be given the opportunity to change to tenure-track faculty appointments with the option to include accumulated years of service at the University toward tenure or begin the six-year probationary period. If they choose not to convert to the tenure-track appointment, their positions will be converted to a professional staff appointment.
2. Tenure-track Library faculty who chose clinical faculty appointments will be given the opportunity to continue their original tenure-track appointments. The tenure-track faculty will have the option to proceed with the tenure review process according to their original schedule or to negotiate individually for an extension of the probationary period for up to two years. If a person chooses not to proceed with the tenure-track option, the position will be converted to a professional staff appointment.²¹

When the roller coaster finally stopped in January 1994, the University Libraries roster included sixteen faculty and ten professional librarians. Of the sixteen faculty, nine were previously tenured and others negotiated varying probationary periods. Of the ten professionals, one had been a tenured faculty member. The rest had been either hired as professionals or chosen non-tenure-track positions early in the conflict. Rancor within the libraries remained. Professionals were excluded from regular faculty meetings.

Later, several professional positions reverted to tenure track, due to resignations. Eventually, all positions will revert to tenure-track faculty positions. At this time, only six librarians remain professionals.

New hires and retirements have done much to reduce internal conflict, although the remaining professionals occasionally comment about feeling disenfranchised. New faculty are highly anxious about meeting research tenure criteria, but those library faculty who have been considered in the past few years have all succeeded in their bids for tenure. Additional research support funds have been provided by the libraries' dean to assist librarians in meeting tenure research criteria. Campuswide, most nonlibrarian faculty recognize that librarians have faculty status.

Informal discussions about faculty status and recruitment suggest a growing concern that new librarians will opt for institutions without publishing requirements. However, proponents of faculty status are very wary of any suggestions that might undermine their hard-won victory. Some new recruits have opted to leave because publishing requirements were deemed too burdensome. Others have met the challenge and continue to build solid research records.

Learning from Conflict

The University of Oklahoma Libraries case study invites some noteworthy observations regarding change theory and conflict resolution. Change theory research by Everett M. Rogers suggests that the process of change is not complete until "routinization" takes place. Stated another way, the change is commonly recognized as the way things are.²² It seems obvious that McAnally's enthusiasm for change to faculty status for librarians at the University of Oklahoma failed to fully routinize the concept. The initial rebuff of the Faculty Senate, the weak research productivity by the librarians, and the lack of recognition of librarian faculty status by nonlibrarian faculty in the early 1980s all point to an incomplete transi-

tion. This is reinforced by the questions concerning library tenure criteria raised in 1986 and furthered by questions raised in the program review document of 1990. What may be more fundamental to the development of the conflict, though, is the evidence that faculty status was never fully accepted by the librarians themselves. The strongest supporters were hired by McAnally, whereas the majority who preferred an alternative status were not mentored by him.

The ratio of 16/10 (librarians that chose faculty status/librarians that chose professional status), or 62 percent to 48 percent, reveals that as the roller coaster slowed to a stop, the numbers closely reflected the status as it is distributed among the profession nationwide. In public institutions, 69 percent of librarians in Vesper and Kelley's study were eligible for tenure (the least ambiguous "faculty status").²³ It appears that the ambiguity within the profession as a whole is still present and proportionately mirrored within the University of Oklahoma Libraries. During the conflict, opinions were not changed but, rather, were hardened. How then, when significant threat from the outside fails to unite librarians, can this continuing polarization be managed? Also, what characteristics of the conflict abated or escalated that polarization? Finally, is there a solution to the ambiguity of librarians' status within academe, and what would have to be done to foster unity in the profession? Or, can we successfully live with the ambiguity in the upcoming decade?

Heightened Conflict

According to Morton Deutsch, several factors underlie conflict. Three of those factors are quite evident here and served to escalate this particular conflict: issue control, issue rigidity, and issue centrality. Issue control is controlling what is perceived to be at stake (i.e., something with limited or short-term importance or something affecting rights and principles that "transcend time and space").²⁴ In this instance, the perception that the issue af-

fected the rights and principles of librarians, and even the rights of nonlibrarian faculty, made it more difficult to resolve. Second, when the ability to use a compromise status failed (faculty status without tenure), the issue became more rigid because possible alternative solutions were narrowed. The conflict was further intensified by the centrality of faculty status. This conflict pointedly infringes on things such as perceived socioeconomic status and self-esteem. Such matters will always be hotly contested.

Library committees met, searches were conducted, reports were generated by librarians working together, even though they otherwise were actively warring on the faculty status issue.

Personalities affected how the conflict escalated, as some librarians became more emotionally invested than others. This confirms the assertion of Raymond A. Friedman and others that how an individual handles a conflict is related to personality characteristics that act to increase or decrease stress.²⁵ But the solution to the issue was dominated by three things: third-party intervention, a cooperative process on unrelated issues, and the reformulation of an alternative option, all factors that Deustch indicated help resolve conflict.²⁶

Conflict Resolution

Third-party Intervention

Inclusion of the Faculty Senate was the first step toward resolution of the conflict between university administration and librarians. As Deustch pointed out, "Third parties who are prestigious, powerful and skillful may deliberately facilitate a constructive resolution of a conflict by using their prestige and power to encourage such a resolution and by helping provide the problem-solving resources."²⁷ Fortunately, the Faculty Senate was in a position to influence the administration and to serve as a leader to the librarians. The administration might overlook the com-

plaints of a campus minority but could not overlook the recommendations of the official representative of all faculty. Further, the Faculty Senate had a vested interest in resolving the conflict—particularly if the resolution furthered Faculty Senate issues. The senate had serious concerns about the administration usurping faculty rights in general. Therefore, the senate was the perfect third party, a group highly motivated and with significant political resources.

Cooperative Processes outside the Conflict

Without fail, during even the most suspicious times, the librarians continued to provide uninterrupted library services. In fact, many library users were totally unaware of the conflict as were many librarians in the state. Their ability to continue service, as noted by the ad hoc committee report, was a crucial element in a positive resolution. "We were given the impression that tensions have tended to make the workplace unpleasant. However, it is a tribute to the sense of professional responsibility on the part of the faculty and the Dean that these feelings have not been allowed to disrupt the orderly functioning of the University Libraries."²⁸

Such activity ensured that the librarians were constantly involved in cooperative processes outside the conflict issues. Library committees met, searches were conducted, reports were generated by librarians working together, even though they otherwise were actively warring on the faculty status issue. The ad hoc committee report further stated: "As a result of their differences over this ... faculty have come to suspect the motives, the sincerity, the good will, and even the capacity for fairness of colleagues who have taken one position or another."²⁹ Given such a dire state it seems likely that the conflict would have continued if the librarians' sense of professionalism had not encouraged them to cooperate to provide services. That professionalism and dedication forced repeated interactions with adversaries who might otherwise never have interacted

positively. Although goodwill was clearly in doubt, it never ceased to exist and the opportunity to demonstrate goodwill in other nonconflicted areas continued.

Alternative Options

The university administration became quite creative in its final offer to resolve the situation. Because the senate had taken a very firm stand and many librarians felt strongly that the university had not fulfilled its contractual obligations, flexibility was the only way to find a safe trajectory. By offering both professional and faculty status to those already hired and forcing only new hires into faculty status, the administration chose a wise course. No current staff could claim they had not received some concession, even if they did not win on all fronts. New hires were not yet there to complain.

The Future: Living with Ambiguity

Changing conditions within academe as a whole are affecting perceptions about tenure and tenure-track positions. The past few years have seen both a change within the University of Oklahoma and nationally. In February 1999, the University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate voted to redefine research faculty positions, non-tenure-track positions, but chose not to allow representation on the senate for these appointments.³⁰ Such a departure from no consecutive-term appointments, so strongly opposed just five years earlier, is remarkable. Also, the university administration has recently defined renewable-term appointments, without much campus protest. This decade, it appears, has seen a relaxation of the senate's concern for administrative abuses. A new administration accounts for some of these changes, but new demographics and recruitment challenges may be more convincing.

A demographic study by Stanley J. Wilder shows academic librarianship to be quite vulnerable to recruitment woes. Wilder pointed out that,

The retirement projections indicate that retirements will have an enor-

mous impact on ARL libraries over the next 25 years. Between 1995–2000, ARL libraries will lose 16 percent of their population to retirement. Of the remaining population, another 16 percent will retire between 2000–2005, and 24 percent between 2005–2010.³¹

These figures, along with current recruiting difficulties caused by jobs far outpacing new librarians, suggest that some “adjusting” will need to take place within the profession. Wilder made the argument that these difficulties might even force a salary increase.³² Another possible development, which may arise as competition for recruits among academic libraries increases, is the lessening of tenure requirements. This might not occur if standards among the profession were equal. But considering how inconsistent faculty status is among libraries, recruits will be able to choose to work under the tenure demands they prefer. If so, salaries and other perks among libraries with more demanding tenure criteria may have to be more generous. It seems unlikely that new recruits, weighing equal salaries and benefits, would choose more rigorous job duties.

Such pressures could eventually squeeze ambiguity from the profession.

More rigorous job duties and low salaries have squeezed teachers out of common education. New librarians have more and more alternatives and may demand some changes in a profession where salaries are low compared with most other faculty appointments on campus. The nature of those demands will depend on institutional culture, upcoming generational values, economics, and tradition. The speed of change may happen as quickly as consecutive-term appointments have reappeared at the University of Oklahoma, a mere five years.

Realistically, the academic library profession will have a more difficult time maintaining ambiguity about who they are, what they do, and where they fall within the broader academic community. This case study points to the importance of support from the broader faculty and reveals benefits from sharing status with a politically powerful campus population. However, it also points out that academic librarians firmly retain conflict-generating identity ambiguity. Optimistically, academic librarians maintain a strong sense of service and professionalism that serves as a unifying force through which conflict can be minimized or overcome. Nurturing this sense may help colleagues find common ground on more divisive issues.

Notes

1. Terry Bragg, “Ten Ways to Deal with Conflict,” *IIE Solutions* 3 (Oct. 1999): 36–37.
2. Gaby Divay, Ada M. Ducas, and Nicole Michael-Ostryk, “Faculty Perceptions of Librarians at the University of Manitoba,” *College & Research Libraries* 48 (Jan. 1987): 27–35; Sherman E. Pyatt, Josephine B. Williamson, and Edgar Williamson, “Faculty Status in South Carolina,” *College & Research Libraries News* (Nov. 1989): 927–33; Devlin Feldman and Susan Sciammarella, “Both Sides of the Looking Glass: Librarian and Teaching Faculty Perceptions of Librarianship at Six Community Colleges,” *College & Research Libraries* 61 (Nov. 2000): 491–98.
3. Susan Kroll, ed., *Academic Status: Statements and Resources*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: Academic Status Committee, Association of College and Research Libraries, 1994).
4. Stanley J. Wilder, *The Age Demographics of Academic Librarians: A Profession Apart* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1995).
5. Virginia Vesper and Gloria Kelley, *Criteria for Promotion and Tenure for Academic Librarians: Clip Note #26* (Chicago: ALA, 1997), 2.
6. Shannon Cary, “Faculty Rank, Status, and Tenure for Librarians: Current Trends,” *C&RL News* 62 (May 2001): 510–11, 520.
7. University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate Journal 4-1956, “Status of Professional Librarians,” 4–5. Available from the University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate Archives.
8. Arthur McAnally, University of Oklahoma Libraries, Administrative Memoranda, “Sta-

tus of Professional Librarians," March 6, 1967. Available from the University of Oklahoma Libraries, Office of the Dean.

9. University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate Journal 3-1970, "Faculty Representation on the University Senate," 3. Available from the University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate Office.

10. It is worth noting that during consideration of the representation issue, the Faculty Senate was chaired by Duane Roller. Dr. Roller held a faculty appointment through the History of Science Department but also was curator of the History of Science Collections in the libraries.

11. University of Oklahoma Libraries, "Response to Campus Program Review Panel Preliminary Report," Nov. 13, 1990, 3. Available from the University of Oklahoma Libraries, Office of the Dean.

12. Peter T. Flawn, *A Primer for University Presidents: Managing the Modern University* (Austin: Univ. of Texas Pr., 1990), 122.

13. University of Oklahoma, Office of the Provost Memoranda, "Provost Program Review Recommendations," May 29, 1991. Available from the University of Oklahoma Libraries, Office of the Dean.

14. Marcia Goodman et al., personal correspondence with Leonard R. Rubin, chair, Faculty Appeals Board, July 11, 1991. Available from the University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate Office.

15. University of Oklahoma, Office of the Provost Memoranda, "University Libraries Faculty," Aug. 8, 1991. Available from the University of Oklahoma Libraries, Office of the Dean.

16. Marcia Goodman, et al., personal correspondence with Richard Van Horn, president, University of Oklahoma, Aug. 29, 1991. Available from the University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate Office.

17. Dan Chandler, et al., personal correspondence with Faculty Senate, University of Oklahoma, Oct. 11, 1991. Available from the University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate Office.

18. University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate Journal 5-1992, "Report of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Regular Non-Tenure-Eligible Consecutive Term Faculty Appointments," 5. Available from the University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate Office.

19. University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate Journal 4-1993, "Final Report and Recommendations of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee to Review Tenure within the University Libraries," 7. Available from the University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate Office.

20. John Lovett et al., personal correspondence with Susan Vehik, chair, University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate, Apr. 6, 1993. Available from the University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate Office.

21. University of Oklahoma Office of the Provost Memoranda, "Tenure Track Appointment within the University Libraries," Aug. 31, 1993. Available from the University of Oklahoma Libraries, Office of the Dean.

22. Everett M. Rogers, *Diffusion of Innovations* 4th ed. (New York: Free Pr., 1995), 399.

23. Vesper and Kelley, *Criteria for Promotion and Tenure for Academic Librarians*, 3.

24. Morton Deutsch, *The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Processes* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale Univ. Pr., 1973), 370.

25. Raymond A. Friedman, et al., "What Goes Around Comes Around: The Impact of Personal Conflict Style on Work Conflict and Stress," *International Journal of Conflict Management* 11(Special issue 2000): 32-55.

26. Deutsch, *The Resolution of Conflict*, 351-400.

27. *Ibid.*, 376.

28. University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate Journal 4-1993, "Final Report and Recommendations," 3.

29. *Ibid.*, 2.

30. *Ibid.*

31. Wilder, *The Age Demographics of Academic Librarians*, 42.

32. *Ibid.*