

May 10, 2011

Colleagues,

In preparation for the MAUT-LS Spring General Meeting of May 24, 2011, we are posting on the Section website the status report we submitted to the CAUT Executive on April 7, 2011. The CAUT Executive required this input from us so that it could formulate recommendations to the May 5-8 meeting of the CAUT Council regarding the situation of McGill librarians.

We are pleased by the fact that, as you will see from the attached report, a number of items from our 28-point list of concerns have been resolved satisfactorily (some before Dean Cook's arrival at McGill, some after she took office), and that substantial progress has been made on several of the other issues. Two particularly notable developments which have occurred in the period since the preparation of our report (which because of the deadline for its submission to CAUT only covers the situation up to early April) have been the recent approval by Provost Masi of the recommendations made by the working group which revisited the vacation policy and by the ad hoc committee which drafted terms of reference for the new Library Council. At the May 5-8 meeting of the CAUT Council, the Executive Director of CAUT drew attention to the significant progress made thus far and stated that there is every reason to be optimistic that the matter will be disposed of successfully.

We see it as very positive and important that the satisfactory outcomes described in our report were achieved through a collegial discussion process. We also appreciate the indications given to us by the Administration that this collegial approach will continue to be pursued to address the other issues which were outlined in our report of May 21, 2010, and we look forward to working with Dean Cook on these outstanding issues over the coming months.

To assist the MAUT-LS Executive in its planning, we would appreciate hearing the views of our members regarding which unresolved issues from our list should be the next priority ones on which to work, based on their importance and/or urgency. I would therefore invite our members to let me know their thoughts on the subject, either at the May 24 MAUT-LS Spring General Meeting or prior to it. I can be reached by email at [marc.richard@mcgill.ca](mailto:marc.richard@mcgill.ca) or by phone at 398-2258; I will also be happy to meet with individual members to discuss this topic if they prefer.

Regards,

Marc Richard  
Chair, MAUT Librarians' Section

**April 7, 2011**

**Report card to CAUT on the status  
of the problems faced by McGill  
librarians regarding collegiality and  
academic freedom**

**Prepared by the MAUT Librarians' Section**



2011

## INTRODUCTION

The following report card has been prepared by the MAUT Librarians' Section (MAUT-LS) for the Executive of the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT). It assesses the degree to which measures have been taken thus far to resolve the concerns which were identified by the MAUT-LS Working Group on Collegiality and Academic Freedom (MAUT-LS/WG) in its discussion document of 21 May 2010.

The MAUT-LS/WG document listed 28 issues which have contributed over the past several years to the deterioration of the work situation of McGill librarians, a subject which has been examined in two earlier studies. The first of these studies was the September 2009 *Report on the Academic Status, Tenure and Academic Freedom for Librarians at McGill University* produced by the CAUT Ad Hoc Investigatory Committee into the Situation of Academic Librarians at McGill University. The second study was the February 2010 report prepared by an MAUT Commissioner appointed to determine whether there was sufficient credible evidence to justify some of the conclusions in the CAUT Ad Hoc Investigatory Committee's report. Both of these studies remain confidential.

The MAUT-LS/WG document, which is publicly available on the MAUT-LS website (<http://www.library.mcgill.ca/mautlib/>), was submitted to the McGill University Administration in May 2010. Discussions between the Administration, MAUT and MAUT-LS over the following months led to the establishment, in September, of a Librarians' Concerns Committee (LCC) charged with considering the 28 items in the MAUT-LS/WG document and, where appropriate, making recommendations to the Provost or the Director/Dean of Libraries. The LCC consisted of Associate Provost Lydia White, who chaired the committee, three representatives of the Library Administration, three representatives of MAUT-LS, and the President of MAUT.

The LCC submitted its report on November 10 to Provost Anthony Masi, who forwarded it to all McGill librarians with a covering memo and with a copy of the letter he had addressed to the LCC to acknowledge receipt of their report. Provost Masi indicated that he had accepted and would act immediately upon those recommendations which were addressed to him, and that he would refer the remaining recommendations to the incoming Dean of Libraries, Dr. Colleen Cook, for her consideration and quick action once she had assumed office at the beginning of January 2011.

On the basis of these commitments, CAUT Council decided, in November 2010, to postpone to its May 2011 meeting consideration of whether any action needed to be taken by CAUT with regard to the situation of McGill librarians. Council's decision in May 2011 is to be based on an assessment by the CAUT Executive of whether the many recommendations in the LCC report -- particularly those referred to the incoming Dean -- had been implemented in the interim. The present report card is provided to the CAUT Executive to assist it in making this determination.

The report card is structured around the 28 issues listed in the MAUT-LS Working Group's discussion document of 21 May 2010. The issues are presented in their original order, in boldface type, with the abbreviation "MAUT-LS/WG" added to their original numbering. After each issue, the recommendation (or recommendations) made by the Librarians' Concerns Committee in connection with it are given in italics, preceded by the phrase "LCC recommendation." The report card then assesses what progress has been made so far on each recommendation or set of recommendations. In a few cases, the report card discusses in detail the background of particular issues.

## **THEME 1: SUPPORT FOR ACADEMIC DUTIES OF LIBRARIANS**

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 1: The Regulations Relating to the Employment of Librarian Staff fail to clarify the assignment of academic duties, so as to ensure that librarians have the academic freedom to select their topics of research, participate in seminars and workshops, and collaborate on research projects, etc., without the mandatory prior approval of the Director of Libraries or supervisor.**

*LCC recommendation: • Regulations Relating to the Employment of Librarian Staff. It is agreed that no changes can be made to this document at this time. Problems experienced with implementation of the Regulations are to be addressed in Guidelines, as described below (#1).*

*LCC recommendation: • It is recommended to the Dean that new Guidelines, referring to all librarians, be written concerning Clause 1.4.2 of the Regulations. These guidelines will: affirm the right of librarians to choose their research topic without prior approval, should they choose to do research; make it clear that librarians will not be unreasonably denied the right to transmit the results of their professional and scholarly activities, which may include research, at seminars and workshops; clarify the relationship between the 3 categories of Academic Duties, particularly with respect to cases where there is a potential conflict between time required for position responsibilities and for professional or scholarly activities; clearly indicate what the approval procedures are in such cases (#1).*

*LCC recommendation: • It is recommended to the Dean that The Guidelines for Clause 1.4.2 include clarification of when it is appropriate to include curating (and equivalent activities) under scholarship in a tenure dossier or librarian's annual report and that they include a statement that there will be name recognition in cases where curating involves scholarly activity (#1).*

*LCC recommendation: • It is recommended to the Dean that she establish a working group to consider the following issues pertaining to the Guidelines on Criteria for Reappointment and Tenure for Tenure Track Librarian Staff: appropriate means of including performance assessment in the candidate's reappointment and tenure dossiers; clarification of the relationship between the 3 categories of academic duties; resolving*

*internal inconsistencies in the current document; more clearly separating the reappointment process from the tenure process (#1, #5).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** The MAUT-LS/WG described this issue by means of a single sentence. Before we address the status of the LCC's recommendations on the subject, we feel that it would be useful to elaborate on the MAUT-LS/WG's statement, so that the nature of the issue can be understood more clearly.

Section 1.2.2 of the Regulations Relating to the Employment of Librarian Staff defines three areas of academic duties for McGill librarians: (i) position responsibilities, which require the exercise of professional expertise or practice; (ii) professional and scholarly activities, which may include research; and (iii) other contributions to the University and scholarly communities. All three of these areas are part of a librarian's work, and librarians must perform at defined levels in all three areas in order to be reappointed and to obtain and maintain tenure. The performance requirement related to obtaining tenure are given in section 3.10 of the Regulations, which states:

The Library Tenure Committee and the University Tenure Committee, hereinafter provided for, and the Principal or delegate shall base their recommendations on the candidate's performance of academic duties as defined in Section 1.2.2.

Superior performance in position responsibilities, the first category set out in Section 1.2.2, which is the most important of the academic duties, is required and a superior performance in one of the remaining two categories and a reasonable performance in the other shall be the minimum requirement for the granting of tenure.

In recent years, a number of McGill librarians have faced obstruction from the Library Administration in the fulfillment of the second and third components of their academic duties. These obstacles have included pressure to discontinue or modify research projects, interference with opportunities to give conference presentations, and steps taken to discourage librarians from giving guest lectures at McGill's School of Information Studies. The actions were seemingly motivated by a wish of the Library Administration to exercise close control over the second and third areas of the academic duties of librarians, and an apparent desire to push these activities to the margins so that librarians would spend as much of their time as possible fulfilling the first area of their duties (their position responsibilities). A new clause -- 1.4.2 (i) -- was introduced into the 2009 revision of the Regulations in an attempt to guard against such situations. This new clause stipulates that, when duties are allocated by the Dean / Director of Libraries or delegate, he or she must take into account "the requirement for staff members to meet the criteria for reappointment (Section 2.3.1), tenure (Sections 3.10 or 3.59) or promotion (section 4.2)". Unfortunately, this stipulation appeared to have little mitigating effect.

It would seem that the LCC's recommendations on this issue are based on the premise that the problems which were encountered were the result of a faulty application of the Regulations rather than of faulty Regulations, and that the best way to deal with these problems is to keep the Regulations as they are but to ensure that henceforth they will be

applied correctly. To this end, the LCC recommended that the Dean of Libraries prepare written guidelines on the various issues related to the application of Section 1.4.2. To date, no such written guidelines have been communicated to the librarian staff.

The LCC also recommended that the Dean establish a working group to consider various issues pertaining to the Guidelines on Criteria for Reappointment and Tenure for Tenure Track Librarian Staff. To our knowledge, such a working group has not yet been established. At a meeting of all librarians held on February 3 to discuss the Performance Recognition and Development process, a number of flaws with the Guidelines on Criteria for Reappointment and Tenure for Tenure Track Librarian Staff were pointed out to Dean Cook, who concurred that the document would need to be reviewed.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 2: The Senate Nominating Committee is excluding from consideration librarian nominations to certain committees (including faculty tenure committees) whose terms of reference call for representation from the academic staff, and on which librarians therefore have the right to serve.**

*LCC recommendation: • It is recommended to the Senate Nominating Committee that it continue to ensure representation by librarians on Senate committees (#2).*

*LCC recommendation: • It is recommended to the Provost that the issue of appointment of librarians to faculty UTCs be revisited once approximately 30 librarians have gone through a tenure process (excluding senior professional appointments) (#2).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** Senate's last meeting for the 2009-2010 academic year took place in May 2010. There have been seven sessions of Senate so far in the current (2010-2011) academic year -- one per month from September 2010 to March 2011, inclusive. Reports from the Senate Nominating Committee were presented at six of these seven meetings to fill a number of vacancies on various Senate Standing Committees, Joint Board-Senate Committees, and Committees Arising from University Regulations. None of the people recommended to Senate by Nominating in 2010-2011 to fill these vacancies have been librarians. The only current librarian members on these committees are the ones who were already serving at the end of the 2009-2010 academic year. These members (excluding the Dean of Libraries, who serves ex-officio on various committees) are:

Senate  
(Three elected librarian Senators, as required by the Statutes)  
Johanne Hebert  
Joan Hobbins  
Marc Richard

Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee  
Louise Robertson

Senate Committee on Libraries

(Two librarians appointed by Senate, as required by the Committee's terms of reference)

Natalie Waters

Sara Holder

Nominating Committee

Johanne Hebert

Committee on the Rights of Senate

Marc Richard

Advisory Council on the Charter of Students' Rights

Louise O'Neill [forthcoming vacancy -- resigning from McGill soon]

Committee on Student Discipline

Cynthia Leive

University Tenure Committee for the University Libraries

Daniel Boyer

Joseph Hafner

Cynthia Leive

University Tenure Committee for Recruitment

(Two librarian representatives, as required by the Statutes)

Deanna Cowan

Joseph Hafner [alternate]

Committee on Staff Grievances and Disciplinary Procedures

Daniel Boyer

The committees on which librarians are eligible to serve as members of the academic staff, but which currently have no librarian representation (excluding any applicable cases of the Dean of Libraries serving ex-officio) are:

Committee on Enrolment and Student Affairs

Committee on Physical Development

Senate Steering Committee

Committee on Student Services

Joint Board-Senate Committee on Equity

Appeal Committee for Student Discipline and Grievances

Committee on Student Grievances

University Appeals Committee

Intellectual Property Appeals Committee

There also exists a Standing Committee on Sabbatic Leaves, but it is unclear what its service eligibility criteria are. It currently has no librarian members. The situation is similar for the Panel for the Investigation of Research Misconduct.

Terms of reference for Senate Standing Committees, Joint Board-Senate Committees, and Committees Arising from University Regulations) may be found at:

<http://www.mcgill.ca/senate/committeesofsenate/>.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 3: Librarians making academic contributions at conferences do not receive priority travel funding.**

- All librarians are not informed of the travel awards with the names of recipients, amounts, and conferences or events that will be attended.

- The current travel application form is not adequate.

- Tenure-track librarians have lost time and opportunities by being denied the right to attend conferences and undertake research.

*LCC recommendation:* • It is recommended to the Dean that a list be posted – and updated regularly - on the Library website showing who has presented papers during the year and at which conferences. It is also recommended that for each item on this list there be an indication of whether the activity was fully funded, partially funded or not funded by the Library (#3).

*LCC recommendation:* • It is recommended to the Dean that funding priorities for travel for scholarly and professional purposes be clarified (#3).

*LCC recommendation:* • It is recommended to the Dean that there be different means for requesting travel that involves the need for funding and for travel that involves only a time commitment (#3).

*LCC recommendation:* • It is recommended to the Dean that consideration be given to the approval processes associated with travel requests, taking into account the need for consistency and fair allocation of funding and time (#3).

**Assessment of progress to date:** In late January 2011, the MAUT-LS Executive became aware of the reported intention of the Dean of Libraries to institute a new policy on conference attendance. This new policy will: i) allow librarians to decide on their own what conferences they will attend; and ii) allocate a set amount of funding to each librarian to support conference attendance. In late February, the MAUT-LS Chair contacted Dean Cook to ask whether any announcement on this reported policy would be forthcoming. Dean Cook responded: "I will be talking about this to all librarians soon. Travel funding is definitely on my agenda. Everything devolves to funding and changes will be made and announced in concert with budget planning for the new fiscal year."

On April 1, 2011, Dean Cook sent an email to all librarians announcing that three new documents (for use in fiscal year 2011-2012) had been distributed and discussed at SALT and now available for all librarians on the Library's U:\ drive:



- Travel and Personnel Development Guidelines (for academic staff)
- Guidelines for personnel development funds (for all Library employees for training)
- Personnel development/Business/Leave request (the request form to be used for all categories of requests)

The Travel and Personnel Development Guidelines describe three categories of allocations: Individual, Administrative and Personnel Development. Each member of the academic staff is allocated \$1,500, "to be used at the individual's discretion for professional development purposes." Administrative funds are for travel related to administration and the Personnel Development funds are for all academic and non-academic library staff for the purposes of skills training.

Dean Cook's covering email states, "All requests for travel, attendance at workshops, seminars and training (even those in Montreal or with \$0 requested) need completion and submission of the forms. Please refer to the Travel and Personnel Development Guidelines."

This policy makes travel funding accessible to all librarians and is a very positive step. The implementation of the policy will be monitored by MAUT-LS. Given that all requests for travel, even when no funding is being sought, require the submission of a travel form to the Dean's Office for approval, it remains to be seen whether this requirement will affect librarians' ability to attend conferences and similar events of their choosing.

The Travel and Personnel Development Guidelines document indicates that a "McGill Library Personnel Development Committee" has been established. The Dean has defined the committee's terms of reference and the terms governing the length of service of its members, and has appointed its members for fiscal year 2011-2012. No collegial consultation was involved in this process, a subject to which we will return under MAUT-LS/WG issue 16. We also note that the document does not make it clear what specific person will chair this committee; it merely lists the members of 2011-2012 and states rather ambiguously, "Initially each member will serve two years. Thereafter, each will serve a four year term and will chair the final year."

Dean Cook's memo and the three documents posted on the U:\ drive will accompany the present report card when it is emailed to the CAUT Executive.

## **THEME 2: ACADEMIC SALARY PROCEDURES FOR LIBRARIANS**

### **MAUT-LS/WG issue 4: The merit process is neither transparent nor fair.**

*LCC recommendation:* • It is recommended to the Dean that any form used to assess performance for merit should contain only information relating to performance recognition. The form should make it clear that signing indicates that the form has been read and does not necessarily indicate agreement with the assessment and that in cases of disagreement, librarians should use the comment field. Deadlines for both parties to submit the form should be clearly indicated and respected. When an unsigned form is submitted, the Merit Committee Chair should contact both the supervisor and the employee, and allow time to sign (#4).

*LCC recommendation:* • It is recommended to the Dean that the performance review process be made more transparent by posting information about the process on the U-drive (#4).

*LCC recommendation:* • It is recommended to the Dean that she review the performance review process, the training needs of supervisors and staff, and the provision of feedback about merit decisions to staff via their supervisors (#4).

**Assessment of progress to date:** The University's deadline for the completion of the current merit exercise was 25 March 2011. However, at the time of this writing (the beginning of April), the results of this year's merit exercise have not yet been announced to librarians. The following assessment must therefore limit itself to what is known at the present moment.

When Dean Cook took office at the beginning of January 2011, the merit process for the current year was already under way, and was operating under a tight schedule dictated by the previously mentioned March deadline. Dean Cook initially kept the composition of the Merit Committee identical to what it had been in the previous year (though it took until early March for the details of this initial composition, including the issue of who would chair the committee, to be publicly clarified to all librarians). Dean Cook likewise announced (in her email of January 18 to all librarians) that Section 6 of the annual Performance Recognition and Development form would continue to be part of the performance evaluation process, but that it would not be submitted to the Merit Committee.

The MAUT Librarian's Section wrote to Dean Cook in late January to raise a number of issues related to merit. We noted that one of the recommendations made by the LCC was that "any form used to assess performance for merit should contain only information relating to performance recognition," and therefore that Sections 6 to 8 should no longer be part of the Annual Performance Recognition and Development form. We expressed the view that, if Sections 6 to 8 were still considered useful for professional development purposes, it would be preferable to remove these sections from the Annual Performance

Recognition and Development form and make them an entirely separate document. Dean Cook agreed to do so. The form for annual performance recognition was revised, with the sections not dealing with annual performance recognition being split off into a second form. This second form is submitted and discussed with supervisors, but is no longer supposed to be submitted by any librarians to the Merit Committee. It is not entirely certain, however, that this new procedure is being followed uniformly throughout the Library system. We have received some indications that the librarians in the Humanities and Social Sciences Library have been given the option of authorizing their supervisors to submit the second form for merit purposes, and that some HSSL librarians are concerned that they will place their merit files at a disadvantage if they fail to do so. If this is indeed the case, it should be made clear to all concerned that the second form should never be sent to the Merit Committee under any circumstances, and that any second forms which have been submitted in this manner should be returned.

In our January email to Dean Cook, we also requested that, after the completion of the current merit exercise, the MAUT-LS Executive be provided by Dean Cook's office with a statistical report indicating under the various merit categories the number of librarians whose merit awards fell under those categories, as has occasionally been done in the past. Dean Cook agreed to email this information to all librarians after the conclusion of the merit process.

Regarding the composition of the Merit Committee, we requested that an MAUT-LS observer be added to the Committee, as was the practice from 1998 to 2004. The merit process which existed for the Libraries during that period was regarded by McGill librarians as being on the whole fair, objective and transparent, and the presence of an MAUT-LS observer on the Committee was one of the factors which contributed to that perception. The observer sat on the Committee with voice but without vote, and was bound to maintain the confidentiality of the Committee's discussions. The observer's role was to give a report at the next membership meeting of the MAUT Librarians' Section indicating whether the process seemed fair and objective and had followed proper procedures. This report limited itself to general principles, and did not provide any information of a nominative or otherwise confidential nature.

On this point, Dean Cook responded, "After thinking carefully about this request, particularly because I am so new into my tenure as Dean, I have decided that it would be best to maintain the composition of the merit committee as announced this year. I wholeheartedly agree that it is most important for librarians to view the merit award process as fair and above board. Having a representative of the academic staff participate on the Merit Committee in an ex officio capacity as you suggest is one quite good way to accomplish this end. I will explore this possibility as we consider the roles and responsibilities of our soon-to-be-formed Library Council over the next months."

Dean Cook's original plans concerning the composition of the Merit Committee, however, changed in early March. On March 10, Dean Cook emailed the following announcement to the librarian staff: "Representatives from Faculties across campus recently spoke at a Faculty Matters program on their various processes for awarding

merit. In every case the merit process was clearly understood to be an administrative function, in philosophy and in practice. In listening to the program it became clear to me that the Library's merit review process was not in sync with standard McGill practice for academic staff. Therefore to mirror Library practice to that of the University generally, the Library will no longer have a Merit Committee with non administrators as members. In keeping with standard McGill practice, administrators, (in our case, Associate directors), will meet to review cases for merit and will make recommendations to the Dean, who has the final authority and responsibility for awarding merit. I wish to thank the members of the Merit Committee for their work, and the Merit Committee is hereby disbanded. The ADs and I will meet to discuss merit over the next few weeks to meet University deadlines for the merit process this spring."

Dean Cook's announcement states that the Library's merit review process was not in sync with standard McGill practice. There is in fact no standard McGill practice for merit (a point to which we will return shortly), and some faculty members have expressed concerns that the merit review process in their area is not seen as fair or transparent. Indeed, some faculty members familiar with the merit process which existed in the libraries prior to 2005 have commented on the fact that it seemed to be a very fair model to use.

One significant factor contributing to the transparency of the merit procedure in the Libraries prior to 2005 was the specific weighting given to the three areas of academic duties. Position responsibilities were given adjusted weights in different fiscal years (ranging between 75 and 80%) depending on Library-wide factors that would impact on workload (one example being the 80% weight given to position responsibilities in the year which saw the implementation of the Aleph system). The two remaining academic responsibilities were grouped together and were weighted either at 25% or 20%. Additionally, the point values assigned in the various categories reflected the relative importance of contribution types; for example, writing articles would count for more than writing book reviews, and chairing a committee would count for more than being a committee member. This type of calibration resembles the requirement that faculty members indicate clearly on their course outlines how much each component of a student's work is worth.

Prior to sending out her announcement, Dean Cook invited the Chair and the Secretary-Treasurer of MAUT-LS to her office to discuss her decision on this issue. We indicated to her our appreciation for being consulted, and noted that the Merit Committee as constituted up to that moment was problematic: its entire membership had been appointed, and we felt that it was inappropriate for a committee which would be evaluating the performance of tenure-track librarians to be chaired by a non-tenure track librarian. Regarding her plans for the reconfigured Merit Committee, Dean Cook did not indicate in detail how the committee would "meet to review cases for merit," i.e. whether the Associate Directors would meet as a group to formulate recommendations to the Dean, or whether they and the Dean would meet as a group and arrive at recommendations together. We expressed our concern that it would be problematic for appeals of individual merit awards to be directed to the Dean if the Dean had been

involved in the entire process of making the merit determinations, since this would amount to her hearing an appeal of her own decision. Dean Cook responded that all McGill deans struggle with this issue, and that she would handle such cases in the same way as they did.

During the weeks which have elapsed since our March 10 conversation with Dean Cook, the MAUT Librarians' Section has received feedback from a number of librarians expressing the view that the new merit procedure announced by Dean Cook was not a significant improvement over the procedure it had replaced. One of these concerns involves the lack of specific information about how recommendations would be formulated (as has been discussed in the previous paragraph). It was noted that, if the Associate Directors made the initial determinations as a group, the question of who would chair this group would remain potentially problematic. It was also felt that, in the event that the Dean was involved in the entire merit determination process, appeals should be directed to the Provost rather than the Dean because administrators should not make rulings at two different levels of the same process.

In the comments made to us, some sympathy was expressed for the view that the pressure of this year's merit deadline had worked against having a broad collegial discussion of how merit should best be handled. By the same token, however, it was considered very important that next year's merit process -- for which there will be ample time to prepare -- be improved to address the issues of transparency and fairness over which concerns still exist. It was noted that an important advantage of having good procedures in place is that they help to control the variables which might have negative effects on the process, and that this contributes to achieving greater consistency from year to year.

At a meeting of MAUT Council in March, part of which was attended by Provost Masi, the Provost indicated that a survey examining the range of merit procedures at McGill was currently under way, and that the data from this survey would be analyzed over the course of the summer. He noted that it was already clear from the results gathered to date that there were considerable variations in merit practice across the University. An informal consultation carried out by MAUT-LS in the past few weeks confirms this impression. In faculties with departments, the practice which seems most commonly followed is for the departmental Chairs to make recommendations to the Dean, who then approves the recommendations (sometimes with adjustments), and to whom merit appeals can be directed. In at least one faculty, each department has a merit committee which is elected by anonymous vote among the professors; each member of that committee gives a ranking to the Chair, who then makes recommendations (adjusted or not as he or she sees fit) to the Dean. In one faculty without departments, merit determinations are made by the Dean, with whom professors can discuss their awards if they have concerns. At least one School receives its own discrete merit amount; the recommendations for its use get made by the Director to the Dean, who gives the final approval (frequently after making adjustments).

As a final point on the merit process, we must draw attention to the fact that this year's annual performance evaluation exercise has proved to be -- as has been the case in recent

years -- a source of considerable friction between some librarians and their supervisors. In implementing the LCC's recommendations that she "review the performance review process, the training needs of supervisors and staff, and the provision of feedback about merit decisions to staff via their supervisors," the Dean should emphasize that supervisors need to approach annual evaluation meetings with their staff in a constructive and supportive manner, even when possible areas of performance improvement are being discussed. She should also stress the need for supervisors to discuss all feedback statements, both positive and negative. Regarding the LCC's recommendation that the evaluation form "should make it clear that signing indicates that the form has been read and does not necessarily indicate agreement with the assessment and that in cases of disagreement, librarians should use the comment field," the Dean should emphasize to supervisors that it is necessary to identify feedback statements by name or initials when there is more than one supervisor, that one supervisor should not change the feedback statement of another supervisor, and that it is inappropriate for them to write additional text on the form after it has been signed by a staff member.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 5: The Guidelines on Criteria for Reappointment and Tenure for Tenure Track Librarian Staff should not make specific reference to yearly merit evaluations; rather there should be a global assessment of performance over the entire period in issue, as is the practice in other academic units.**

*LCC recommendation:* • It is recommended to the Dean that she establish a working group to consider the following issues pertaining to the Guidelines on Criteria for Reappointment and Tenure for Tenure Track Librarian Staff: appropriate means of including performance assessment in the candidate's reappointment and tenure dossiers; clarification of the relationship between the 3 categories of academic duties; resolving internal inconsistencies in the current document; more clearly separating the reappointment process from the tenure process (#1, #5).

**Assessment of progress to date:** The Dean has not yet established a working group on Criteria for Reappointment and Tenure. The *Guidelines* document (see [https://www.mcgill.ca/files/apo/LGCRT\\_January-2010.pdf](https://www.mcgill.ca/files/apo/LGCRT_January-2010.pdf) reached from the [Reappointment of Tenure-Track Librarian Staff page](#)) has not been updated (to April 1, 2011). It still contains reference to the need to include all performance recognition forms and merit letters. It does not address the concern that a global assessment over the entire period at issue is appropriate, indicating that: "Merit allocation falling into the range of 1 – 3 would normally be considered to constitute sufficient evidence for reappointment and tenure consideration." Since there has been no revision, there has not been clarification of the relationship between the 3 categories of academic duties and the other issues (internal consistencies; reappointment clearly separated from tenure) have not been addressed. The form for annual performance recognition has been revised, splitting off the sections not dealing with annual performance recognition and no longer supposed to be submitted by any librarians to the Merit Committee.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 6: There are serious anomalies in librarians' salaries.**

*LCC recommendation: • It is recommended to the Dean that she address the proposal regarding standardization of stipend allocations in the light of the report on stipend anomalies submitted to the Provost on Oct. 29th 2010 by the Interim Director of Libraries and that the final policy concerning stipends be communicated to librarians in a written document (#6).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** There has been no communication to librarians about a policy concerning stipends. Stipends paid to team leaders were included in the anomalies documented and there has been some discussion of the effectiveness of the team structure implemented in the Library; changes to the team structure may address the issues documented. The MAUT Librarians' Section has not been asked for input, nor has it been made aware of any review of stipend allocations or efforts to standardize them. Another area of concern to be noted is the fact that, when the new team leaders were established, stipends were not paid to all librarians who were already carrying administrative responsibilities equivalent to or even greater than those of the new team leaders.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 7: The librarian vacation policy is flawed.**

*LCC recommendation: • Vacation Policy: It is recommended to the Provost that a small working group be established – including representation from the Provost's office, the library administration and MAUT-LS – to revisit the vacation policy through a collegial process and to consider whether revision to the substance and/or implementation of the policy should be recommended (#7).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** A Working Group on the Vacation Policy was created and its membership composition was established in consultation with MAUT and MAUT-LS. The members are: Lydia White (Chair), Colleen Cook (Dean of Libraries), Louis Houle (Associate Director of Libraries), Diane Koen (Associate Director of Libraries), Sharon Rankin (MAUT-LS representative), Michael Smith (MAUT representative), and Diana Dutton (Human Resources). The Working Group held three meetings this term and has completed a report with recommendations to both the Provost and the Dean of Libraries. The report is now (as of April 2nd) still a confidential document and is with the Provost for his review. In general terms, the recommendations contain two revisions to the current vacation policy, clarification of librarians' vacation allotment and use of vacation days, and comparative vacation information from other Canadian universities.

### **THEME 3: COLLEGIAL REVIEW OF LIBRARY OPERATIONS**

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 8: A Library Council with oversight of Library operations, guided by best practices and that includes all librarians, provides a clear and strong mandate, reports to Senate, and is not necessarily chaired by the Director of Libraries is required.**

*LCC recommendation: • Library Council: The University Administration has accepted the principle of establishing a Library Council. The objective is to have a functioning Library Council – meeting the standards developed for Faculty Councils at McGill – in place by 1 September 2011. The Secretary-General's Proposal to Establish a Library Council at McGill is appended (#8).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** A Committee on the Library Council was struck in late January. The committee's composition was established in consultation with MAUT and MAUT-LS. Its members are: Lydia White (Chair), Colleen Cook (Dean of Libraries), Joseph Hafner (Associate Director of Libraries), Diane Koen (Associate Director of Libraries), Marc Richard (MAUT-LS representative), John Galaty (MAUT representative), and Steven Strople (Secretary-General). The Committee began its work in early February. Over the course of four meetings, the Committee arrived at a satisfactory set of terms of reference for the Library Council. The Committee submitted these recommended terms of reference to Provost Masi on April 6 for his consideration and approval. Once the Provost has approved the document, the first meeting of the newly constituted Library Council may take place as early as this month (April).

Under the terms of reference, all persons holding an appointment as a member of the librarian academic staff in the McGill University Libraries would be voting members of the Council. The terms of reference include a provision enabling the Council to recommend to the Provost amendments to the terms of reference. They also permit the Council to develop and adopt rules and regulations to govern its proceedings, including the determination of quorum; it is expected that the development of these operating procedures will be one of the first orders of business to which the Council will attend, and that this work will be carried out between now and September.

It should be noted that a process is currently under way to review all of McGill's faculty councils in a comprehensive manner. This process may result in more uniform practices being adopted at McGill for the constitution and operation of all faculty councils. Depending on the outcome of this review process, some adjustments to the Library Council's terms of reference may eventually need to be considered.



**MAUT-LS/WG issue 9: The Workplace Values and Service Guidelines documents are flawed.**

*LCC recommendation:* • *Other guidelines. It is recommended to the Dean that she review the need for and substance of the Workplace Values and Service Guidelines documents (#9).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** To our knowledge, no review of the Workplace Values and Service Guidelines has yet occurred. To assist any eventual review which takes place, we wish to note that the Workplace Values document (U: \ Collection Services \ Common \ Workplace Values) was flagged as a particular concern by the MAUT-LS/WG for two reasons. First, there have in recent years been cases in which the document has been used by supervisors to criticize staff members for alleged violations of the values stated therein. Second, there is a perception that the application of the values document has been asymmetrical: staff members do not always feel that supervisors apply its provisions (such on the ones concerning respect and empathy) in their dealings with them, even though staff members themselves have been admonished for not adhering to the same provisions.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 10: Workload policies are inequitable.**

*LCC recommendation:* • *It is recommended to the Dean that she consider the matter of time allocation for academic duties, with view to establishing greater consistency in how supervisors allocate time (#10).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** This concern relates to the points mentioned in MAUT-LS/WG issue 1. As we noted at greater length in our comments for issue 1, it is a Regulation requirement that librarians be given the opportunity to fulfill their obligations under all three areas of academic duties. Section 1.4.2 (ii) of the Regulations Relating to the Employment of Librarian Staff stipulates on this point that the allocation of duties must take into account "the pattern of such allocation within the McGill University Libraries." To our knowledge, no steps have yet been taken to establish greater consistency in the allocation of workload by supervisors.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 11: The Library's policy of scholarly recognition does not follow standard practices.**

*LCC recommendation:* • *It is recommended to the Dean that, in cases where curating involves scholarly activity, there be recognition by name of the librarian(s) who curated the exhibit in question, as well as others involved, listing respective roles (#11).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** Pages 24 to 26 of the Library's 2009-2010 annual report lists twelve exhibits held by the McGill Libraries. The only curators mentioned by name in this list are a U3 Honors student and two professors. Unless we assume that no

McGill librarians were involved in curating these twelve exhibits or that their preparation involved no scholarly activity -- both unlikely eventualities -- we must conclude that the LCC's recommendation on this issue was not applied in the 2009-2010 annual report. The lack of recognition given to curating activities in recent years reflects, as far as we have been able to gather, the view by the Library Administration that curating falls under the first area of academic duties (position responsibilities) and hence that it requires no recognition as a scholarly activity which might contribute to the fulfillment of the second area (professional and scholarly activities). The same problem has been encountered in other situations, notably on the issue of what constitutes library instruction and what constitutes teaching. We do note, however, that the 2009-2010 annual report does provide a detailed list of publications by librarians for that time period, which is a welcome improvement over the annual reports for 2005 to 2008.

#### **THEME 4: MANDATE OF THE NEXT TRENHOLME DIRECTOR OF LIBRARIES**

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 12: The mandate for the Director of Libraries should explicitly affirm the importance of the academic duties of librarians.**

*LCC recommendation:* • *It is recommended to the Provost that a substantive affirmation of the importance of academic duties of librarians be made in the appropriate venues (#12).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** On 11 December 2010, Provost Anthony Masi sent an email to all librarians stating "I am very pleased to report that the workgroup charged with reviewing the concerns raised by librarians in August 2010 has concluded its work and made several recommendations that I immediately accepted. Some of these recommendations are referred to Dean Cook who will look into them upon her arrival. This report, along with a copy of my letter to members of the work group accepting the recommendations made to me, is attached for your information. You will note that many of the matters originally raised are considered to be resolved. In particular it was agreed that a Library Committee will be formed, with a view to make it operational in time for the Fall 2011 term. I take this opportunity to thank you for the substantive contribution each of you makes to the University's mission, and for your dedication to excellent service to our students, professors and community at large." Attached to the email were copies of: i) the 21 May 2010 list of concerns prepared by the MAUT-LS Working Group; ii) the final report of the Librarians' Concerns Committee chaired by Lydia White; and iii) a letter from Provost Masi to the members of the LCC acknowledging receipt of their report. This letter stated in part: "With regard to the issues surrounding the academic duties of librarians, I confirm that I will seek all available opportunities and venues to affirm the importance of academic freedom for tenured and tenure stream librarians, as well as for our professional and other academic staff. Let me take this opportunity to state for the record that McGill University, and the current senior

administration in particular, are dedicated to fostering a community in which the distinctive professional, scholarly, and community contributions of librarians can be recognized and appreciated."

Although the mandate of the new Dean of Libraries has not been released, Dean Cook has held a number of group meetings with the librarian staff since taking office at the beginning of January 2011. Various comments made by Dean Cook at these meetings have indicated that she has a correct understanding of what academic status for librarians means, that she grasps the distinction between scholarship and professional development activities, and that she supports and encourages the achievement of tenure by all tenure-track librarians at McGill. One of Dean Cook's most positive statements along these lines was her remark, at a meeting of librarians held on February 3rd, that she would consider it to be a failure on her part if a McGill librarian were to be denied tenure, and that she would expect the Provost to want to discuss with her how such an outcome occurred.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 13: There is inequity in librarian position reassignments made during the last five years.**

*LCC recommendation:* • *Given the need for librarians with specialized skills in a student-centred and research-intensive university, it is recommended to the Dean that when reassignments are necessary, appropriate training and support be provided, taking into account the service requirements of the library and the needs of the University, as well as librarians' skills and specialization (#13).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** This recommendation will be addressed as reassignments occur. Since no reassignments have occurred since January, progress on this recommendation by the new Dean cannot be determined. We note two internal postings and competitions to handle reassignments which were put forward in February 2011 and which are not yet completed. While most clauses are generic, both postings do include library branch customization in the title and both -- Macdonald Campus as well as Life Sciences -- include the clause, "A degree and recognized professional library qualifications are required; professional experience in the information services area of an academic, special or research library, experience in health or allied sciences or equivalent relevant experience is highly desirable". Both noted that the "position reports to the Section Head of the Library Service or the relevant Team Leader". In neither library (Macdonald Campus and Life Sciences) are there section heads.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 14: The process for filling Library positions should ensure the relevancy of position postings as well as collegial and transparent interviews and selection procedures.**

*LCC recommendation:* • *Given the need for librarians with specialized skills in a student-centred and research-intensive university, it is recommended to the Dean that she review the process for filling Library positions. It is agreed that progress on adequate*

*procedures has been made, as per Diane Koen's letter of June 7th 2010 (attached) in response to the letter from the Karen Jensen on behalf of the MAUT Librarians' Section of May 11th 2010 (attached) (#14).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** Librarians have not been informed that any review of the process for filling Library positions has been undertaken, nor have enough positions been posted and filled to allow for appraisal of the implementation of changes in procedures, if any have been implemented. A February 2011 posting for a position in the Nahum Gelber Law Library consists of the standardized job description for a McGill Liaison Librarian with no mention of the Law Library except in the title and the reporting information. Any review must take into consideration the need for all positions to be posted externally as well as internally.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 15: Offices and phones are not equitably made available for all librarians on staff.**

*LCC recommendation: • Availability of phones to all librarians: The Interim Director of Libraries has undertaken to ensure that all librarians currently without phones will be offered a choice between access to a phone within reach of their desks or to individual voice mail on a shared phone (#15).*

*LCC recommendation: • To ensure that librarians have sufficient space suitable for consulting with clients and conducive to undertaking their academic and supervisory duties, it is recommended to the Dean that she review workspace allocation for librarians and report her findings to them (#15).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** On 12 October 2010, Interim Director of Libraries Diane Koen sent the following email to six librarians: "It has come to our attention that you share a phone with a colleague in your office or office space. If you would like your own phone line, we can arrange for this to be set up. Alternatively, it is very easy for us to arrange for a separate voicemail box for each of you on your shared phone. Please let Francisco Oliva know which option you would like to implement and we will get this set up as soon as possible." At the 3 December 2010 Fall General Meeting of the MAUT Librarians' Section, the MAUT-LS Executive reported to the membership that the Administration had been following up on its commitment to ensure that all librarians wishing to have their own phone or voicemail box would receive one. The Executive suggested that librarians who needed a phone or voicemail box but who had not yet been offered one (if there were any) should submit a request to the Administration.

Although the issue of librarians having their own phone and/or voice mail has been addressed, this is not the case for the issue of workspace allocation. The open concept arrangement for staff clearly has proven to be a failure: for example, complaints (including one LibQual comment to this effect) have been received from students about hearing staff conversations in the Life Sciences Library, where there is a large bank of computers very near to the staff area. Some librarians have no space or privacy to

conduct business, particularly consultations, and some team leaders have no place in which to meet with staff on their teams (e.g., they needed to book a room when they conduct performance appraisals).

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 16: There is no timely, collegial process for appointing librarian members to committees. Such a process should include defined length of appointments, regular elections, and calls for nominations distributed to all librarians.**

*LCC recommendation:* • We note that it is desirable to encourage broad participation on committees to ensure career progress and recommend to the Dean that she review membership of library committees, considering established practices in the libraries. In the case of committees with elected membership, it is recommended that length of service be defined and that procedures for nomination and election of librarians be developed in a collegial manner (#16).

**Assessment of progress to date:** To begin with, it should be noted that the MAUT-LS/WG statement refers primarily to internal Library committees. There are University-level bodies on which the inclusion of librarian members is mandatory -- three of these being the University Senate, the Senate Committee on Libraries, and the University Tenure Committee for Recruitment -- and for which election or appointment procedures are defined to various degrees. Within the Libraries, however, the establishment of committees and the appointment of members to committees has in recent years been carried out almost entirely by administrative fiat, and not always with sufficient transparency. Two recent examples of this practice have occurred in the past month; they are discussed in detail under MAUT-LS/WG issues 3 (travel funding) and 4 (merit). To our knowledge, the LCC recommendation that the Dean review Library committee memberships has not been implemented.

As this report card was in the last stages of preparation, we received indications that some unannounced changes might have taken place in the past few weeks to the composition of the University Tenure Committee for the Libraries. We contacted Secretary-General Stephen Strople, who confirmed that Dean Cook is now serving on (and chairing) this committee, and that one of the former librarian members is no longer serving on the committee.

Regarding the reasons for these changes, the Secretary-General stated, "I am not sure of the rationale other than the Dean thought it was appropriate for her to chair the UTC in light of the regulations identifying this as the usual practice." The Secretary-General's statement refers to the established practice of Deans chairing the University Tenure Committees for their respective faculties. It is therefore in line with this practice for the Dean of Libraries to chair the University Tenure Committee for the Libraries.

Our concern over this particular case stems not so much from its substance as from its lack of transparency. The University Tenure Committee for the Libraries is one of the

the Committees Arising from the University Regulations, and its membership is supposed to be a matter of public record. The web page for this Committee (<http://www.mcgill.ca/senate/committeesofsenate/committeesarisingfromregulations/tenurelibraries/>), which is part of the Senate website, was not updated until we brought the matter to the attention of the Secretary-General, and no announcement of the change of membership was made to the librarian staff as a whole by either the Secretary-General or the Office of the Dean. Indeed, the only general announcement issued to date on this topic is the one which MAUT-LS itself made on April 5th via its listserv. Regarding the lack of an update to the Committee's web page, Secretary-General Strople has apologized for this oversight and has made the necessary corrections. Regarding the failure to inform the librarians as a whole, the Secretary-General stated, "I am not aware what communications were or were not sent to the whole Librarian staff. The Dean informed me and the Provost and her office informed the candidates who are up for consideration this year. The UTC has not yet met to discuss candidate dossiers."

In applying the LCC's recommendation regarding the appointment of librarians to committees, one idea which may warrant consideration would be the creation of a Nominating Committee for the Libraries, perhaps in the form of a subcommittee of the Library Council which is currently in the process of being established.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 17: In budget allocations for collections, there is not a collegially established set of funding formulas for the various subject areas and across-the-board budgets.**

- There is no accurate division of monies for approval, firm, and standing orders according to previous year's spending, cost increases, changes to approval plans, etc.
- Special funds that require specific subject area purchases are not divided appropriately.

*LCC recommendation: • It is recommended to the Dean that the library budget be presented annually to the Library Council, with opportunity for discussion (#17).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** As discussed under MAUT-LS/WG issue 8, it is expected that the new Library Council will be operational as early as this month (April). With a new fiscal year beginning in May 2011 and the possibility of the Council being formed even sooner, there is a very good chance that the Library budget could be presented to the Council for discussion.

Although the LCC's recommendation is a good one, the underlying issue is a deeper one than a matter of reporting mechanisms. The Library Council needs to consider what steps should be taken prior to the presentation of the budget to the Council. The prior steps we recommend are:

- (i) The current funding formulas should be described to all librarians, as these are not generally known, and a general discussion of these factors should occur with the possibility of making revisions to the formulas.
- (ii) The pros and cons of across-the-board budgets and their impacts on the individual subject budgets should be addressed in an open discussion.
- (iii) The Council needs to address staff time inefficiencies which are caused by the fact that there is no accurate division of monies for approval, firm, and standing orders by subject budget according to the previous year's spending, cost increases and changes to approval plan. Correcting this problem would significantly assist in the liaison's selection workload for firm orders by providing them a more accurate picture of the monies available to them.
- (iv) The Council needs to have an open discussion on the various aspects of special funds which could result in efficiency gains.
- (v) The division of the entire collections budget into categories for print monographs, electronic books and electronic serials (and some print serials) should be discussed on both the philosophical and practical levels in order to best serve our clients and fulfil the mission of the Library and the University.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 18: There have been problems with the use of outside consultants.**

*LCC recommendation: • It is recommended to the Dean that, in the event that there is deemed to be a need for outside consultants, their mandate, purpose, and selection be explained, and that the Dean consider making some consultants' reports available to all librarians (#18).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** This recommendation would only apply if the Library Administration were to consider hiring a consultant at some future date. No specific action will be required on this issue until such time as the services of a consultant are being contemplated.

To illustrate the kinds of issues which would need to be considered when new consultants are hired, we wish to draw attention to two examples. The first case to be considered involves the half-dozen or so consultants' reports have been commissioned over the years to offer recommendations on how to improve the Technical Services / Library Technical Services unit (now named Collection Services). All of these reports are still confidential and very few people have seen them, so it is impossible to determine whether or not they made any useful recommendations. The second example involves the "Effective Leadership Training" program which was offered from September 2009 to April 2010 by Michael Healey of EQ Advantage. This program, which involved about 42 staff members for 7 all-day sessions, was a continuation of the learning and development

programs which were conducted in the Library in 2008-2009 with the same consultant. The chosen consultant had no experience with the academic setting, and the sessions were geared to working with teams at the most senior level; that is, they were more oriented towards a senior group in a business environment, or towards the level of the Director and Associate Directors at the Library. These leadership sessions were never evaluated after their completion.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 19: An annual report including budget information and staffing levels has not been consistently issued.**

*LCC recommendation:* • *It is recommended to the Dean that an Annual Report for the Library (including budget and staffing levels) be consistently issued (#19).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** An annual report covering the period from 1 June 2009 to 31 December 2010 was submitted by Dean Cook to the Provost's Office on 15 February 2011. It was also posted on the Library's website at: <http://www.mcgill.ca/files/library/annual-report-2009-10.pdf>. This annual report contrasts markedly with the ones for 2005-2006, 2006-2007, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009, which can be found here: <http://www.mcgill.ca/library/library-about/pubs/annualreports/>. The earlier reports -- which, as far as is known, were issued more or less simultaneously in 2010 rather than on a yearly basis -- place a great emphasis on colour illustrations, offer few statistics, and seem to contain a great deal of material which originally appeared in the Library's newsletter Library Matters. By comparison, the 2009-2010 annual report is almost entirely textual, emphasizes facts and figures, and presents much of its information by way of lists and tables. As will be discussed at greater length under MAUT-LS/WG issue 25 (lists of librarians on staff), the 2009-2010 annual report offers extensive information related to staffing. On the negative side, information related to the budget remains rather thin, consisting of little more than three pie charts. It is expected that this weakness will be rectified in next year's annual report, given Dean Cook's statement at a meeting of library staff held on 3 March 2011 that budget planning is an area of great importance to her.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 20: The University has failed to respond annually to the CAUT Librarian Salary Survey by the April 30th deadline.**

*LCC recommendation:* • *University response to the CAUT survey of librarians' salaries: The Interim Director of Libraries has agreed that the Library will participate in the biennial CAUT Librarian Salary Survey, starting with the next survey in 2012 (#20).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** The commitment made on this issue is satisfactory. No immediate action is required, since the next survey will only take place in 2012.



## **THEME 5: COMMITMENT TO COLLEGIALITY AND TRANSPARENCY**

### **MAUT-LS/WG issue 21: A method should be developed for consulting all librarians on candidacies for the position of Director of Libraries.**

*LCC recommendation:* • *Consultation with librarians on candidates for the position of Director: It was decided that no further action needs to be undertaken at this time, the matter having been overtaken by events (given the recent appointment of a new Dean of Libraries) (#21).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** While the recent appointment of Dean Cook does indeed obviate the need for immediate action on this issue, it is important that the matter be discussed and resolved satisfactorily in the medium term so that proper consultations can be carried out when the time comes either for Dean Cook to be considered for reappointment or for her eventual successor to be chosen. This is an issue which it would be appropriate for the future Library Council (see MAUT-LS/WG issue 8) to take up in due course.

### **MAUT-LS/WG issue 22: There is no encouragement of individual thinking and critique on all existing librarians' listservs, no encouragement of librarians to express their personal views on topics of public interest, whether those topics fall within their area of professional expertise or not, and there is no affirmation that McGill's support of academic freedom means that these opinions are encouraged and will not be censored.**

*LCC recommendation:*

The LCC did not issue a recommendation on this issue, but the introductory page of its report stated the following:

*As a general point, the committee would like to emphasize the need to encourage a climate of collegiality and communication across the library spectrum (#22). The committee is encouraged by the recent letter (dated October 20th 2010) from Colleen Cook, the incoming Dean, to all library staff and takes it as an indication of her wish to facilitate collegiality and communication. To sustain this climate, the committee supports documentation of policies and procedures using the Library's U-drive or the Academic Personnel website.*

**Assessment of progress to date:** The statement by the LCC on the introductory page of its report indicates that the LCC supports the documentation of policies and procedures on publicly-accessible locations. We agree that it is very important for policies and procedures be documented in this way, and that doing so would be helpful in resolving some of the difficulties discussed elsewhere in the present report card. The core of the problem raised by MAUT-LS/WG issue 22, however, has little or nothing to do with how

such matters are documented. Rather, it reflects the fact that, in recent years, librarians have on some occasions been criticized for expressing their views at public meetings (even when they were invited to do so), or for communicating with each other without prior authorization or without adhering to rigid (though not always previously defined) channels.

We are encouraged to note that, at the group meetings for library staff which Dean Cook has held since her arrival, comments from the floor have been welcomed. This has prompted staff members to ask questions and express opinions more freely than was the case previously. These regularly scheduled meetings, which were instituted by Dean Cook to foster improved communication, are advertised to all library staff well in advance through notices sent out periodically by email. They comprise Dean's Corner events (bi-monthly group meetings with all library staff, which are streamed over the web for the benefit of staff members not able to attend), Colleen's Coffee/Tea events (informal monthly meetings for all library staff, held on a rotating basis in different branch libraries), and weekly office hours scheduled by the Dean and by individual Associate Directors (opportunities for staff members to discuss issues and concerns one-on-one with the Dean or the Associate Directors). Dean Cook has also held a number of group meetings exclusively with librarians, for example in order to present information on the annual performance evaluation process for librarians.

We are also encouraged by the fact that, as far as we know, there have not been any recent cases of librarians being admonished for posting messages on the librarian and library staff listservs. On the other hand, there have still been recent instances of librarians being told that they are not handling email communications through proper channels, or that it would be advisable for them to inform their supervisors of meetings they have scheduled with other librarians.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 23: The existing Library committees and their membership and mandate are not on the Library's website.**

*LCC recommendation:* • *Library committees: Information about existing library committees, including membership and mandates, is now available on the Library's U-drive. Committees will record their decisions in writing and prepare a written annual report. These reports will also be posted on the U-drive, along with decisions and minutes, where available (#23, #24).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** The U:\ drive's "Common" folder presently includes a "Committees" subfolder, which in turn contains subfolders for nine library committees. Most appear to include all or most of the following: membership lists, terms of reference, agendas and minutes, as well as other documentation. A tenth subfolder is devoted to a number of old committees.

There is also a "University Wide Committees" subfolder, containing a single but noteworthy document titled "Committees Update 2010." This fourteen-page document

appears to be a reasonably complete and reasonably current (last updated in December 2010) list of every McGill librarian serving on every Library-level and University-level committee at McGill, as well as on CREPUQ committees. We wish to state our appreciation at seeing such a valuable document being made available to McGill librarians. Three ideas for enhancing its value even further are: i) giving its subfolder a different title, since the current title "University Wide Committees" does not reflect the fact that the document includes Library-level committees; ii) making its presence on the U:\ drive better known to librarians; and iii) updating it on a regular basis.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 24: The mandates, minutes, and reports of the existing Library committees are not available to all librarians and need to be reviewed.**

*LCC recommendation:* • *Library committees: Information about existing library committees, including membership and mandates, is now available on the Library's U-drive. Committees will record their decisions in writing and prepare a written annual report. These reports will also be posted on the U-drive, along with decisions and minutes, where available (#23, #24).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** As noted in our discussion of MAUT-LS/WG issue 23, the U:\ drive now includes such documentation for most committees.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 25: The MAUT-LS Executive is not provided an annual list of librarians on staff, including status (tenure-track vs. contract academic staff, both definite term and indefinite term contracts) as well as start and end dates.**

*LCC recommendation:* • *Annual list of librarians for the MAUT-LS Executive. It has been agreed that some of the desired information is in fact available on library websites and that no further action needs to be taken (#25).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** The LCC recommendation on this issue was less than fully satisfactory. MAUT-LS has for several years been tracking librarian staff arrivals and departures as best it can, using publicly available sources, and it has found this method to have a number of shortcomings. Checking staff listings on the websites of individual libraries is labour-intensive, and only yields information regarding who was on staff at the time of the site's last update. Although the Library newsletter Library Matters has been useful in past years to track some staff arrivals and departures, not all such staff changes -- notably the departure of librarians having only short-term appointments -- are reported in the newsletter. Such staff departures must be inferred (and their probable dates must be estimated) by checking individual library websites periodically to look for the disappearance of names. These methods, moreover, do not always provide adequate (if any) information on the rank and appointment status of a given librarian.

Fortunately, there has been good progress on this issue since the start of 2011. The regular Dean's Corner meetings implemented by Dean Cook include an agenda item

devoted to staff change announcements, and the recently-issued library annual report for 2009-2010 provides detailed tables of information on the following topics (with dates in most cases):

- Nominative list of librarians, their academic ranks and current status
- Staff arrivals
- Grants of tenure
- Grants of sabbatical leaves
- Staff departures
- Staff retirements
- Grants of Emeritus / Emerita status
- Transfers and reassignments

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 26: Exit interviews of departing librarians have not been conducted with the appropriate central Human Resources staff.**

*LCC recommendation: • Exit interviews: The Interim Director of Libraries has agreed to implement exit interviews of librarians, conducted by HR, effective immediately. HR has recently conducted the first exit interview of a librarian (#26).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** Human Resources has conducted exit interviews with two further librarians who left McGill in the past few months (one resignation and one retirement), so this practice now appears to be well in place. Five additional librarians will be leaving McGill in the next few months (four retirements and one resignation), so there will be further opportunities for HR to conduct exit interviews with librarians in the near future.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 27: Practices for reporting incidental illnesses are different for librarians than they are for other academic staff.**

*LCC recommendation: • Reporting of incidental illnesses: It has been agreed that librarians will continue to report absences to their supervisors and that absences will be recorded in Present. Once an absence has been reported, the librarian has fulfilled their responsibility. It has also been agreed that the Senior Advisory Library Team (SALT) will review current practices and disseminate information to supervisors and librarians to ensure that the 9-day incidental illness policy applicable to other University staff (such as MUNACA) is not applied to librarians (#27).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** We do not currently have detailed enough information to assess how well the agreement mentioned in the LCC recommendation has been implemented.

**MAUT-LS/WG issue 28:** There is no assurance that all web pages created by librarians are publicly accessible.

*LCC recommendation:* • *Accessibility of web pages:* (i) *The Interim Director of Libraries has agreed that the Library will review best practices and determine how best to provide pages where each librarian would maintain a standardized profile and links to their work.* (ii) *The Collections Services web pages are now accessible (#28).*

**Assessment of progress to date:** To date, we are not aware of LCC's recommendation (i) being implemented. Regarding LCC's recommendation (ii), the Collection Services web pages -- some of which had previously been subject to sign-in restrictions -- are now indeed freely accessible.