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Professor Karkhanis, Professor Jennings, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply grateful for the warm and overly generous introduction. I am delighted to have this opportunity to join you at this landmark conference on collective bargaining and academic librarianship.

My talk this afternoon will center on the theme, "Faculty Status for Librarians: In Retrospect and Prospect," concentrating on the role of key professional associations as well as considering some prospects for the future.

In retrospect, faculty status for librarians is not a new issue in librarianship. I submit that it is as old as the profession of librarianship. The truth of the matter is that during the early days of our country when it was deemed educationally sound to employ a person to administer the library, library history reveals that early librarians were distinguished professors on campuses. Daniel Coit Gilman, the distinguished scholarly librarian of Yale University was so highly regarded in academic circles that he was invited to become the first president of Johns Hopkins University. Although the presidency of colleges and universities is not a position that large numbers of academics are seeking today because of campus problems and the fiscal crisis in higher education, nevertheless, there are not too many librarians approached to assume this arduous responsibility. In all fairness, my academic librarian colleagues are aware of the influence and power of the faculty and the uncertainty of the power and authority of the presidency, and so, like their fellow colleagues in other academic departments, they do not view the presidency of a college or university as the most desired position in academia or the sine qua non of academic achievement.

Rather, academic librarians in recent years have become increasingly cognizant of the fact that the instructional power base in colleges and universities is in the hands of the faculty. Hence, efforts have been made to identify with this group on campus that charts the course of the institution through its power.

As regards the subject, faculty power, T. R. McConnell stated that:

One of the most significant changes during the last quarter of a century is the great growth of faculty power, coupled with rapid faculty professionalization. Either by formal delegation or tacit approval, college and university faculties have attained a high degree of professional self-government. They exercise effective control of the education and certification of entrance to the profession; the election, retention, and
promotion of their members; the content of the curricu-
num; work schedules; and the evaluation of performance.
The individual faculty member's independence is en-

hanced by the principles of academic freedom and
tenure."

Like their colleagues in the classroom, college and university
librarians desire to be an integral part of that faculty power
that has been emerging in the colleges and universities of this
land. By use of the term faculty power is not managerial power
as defined by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Yoshiva University
case. Faculties in America do not have managerial responsibili-
ties. Academic librarians desire to exercise effective control
over the selection, retention, and promotion of their members;
they desire self-determination on the job; they desire to draw up
their work schedules and engage in evaluation of performance.
They are demanding also the academic work year, and work week;
comparable salaries with the faculty, sabbatical leaves, faculty
titles, and in a nutshell, the entire faculty status package.
Yes, academic librarians are insisting on achieving faculty power
and being a part of library governance.

Why should there be a declared war over the subject Faculty
Status for College and University Librarians, since ACRL endorsed
a statement supporting faculty status for librarians more than
two decades ago? In spite of this fact, the issue was raised
again more than eleven years ago by our colleagues from Cali-

cifornia, who sought help and assistance from ACRL in their quest
for faculty status in their institutions in California. The ACRL
standards for college libraries published in 1959, contained a
statement of support for faculty status, but it was vague and did
not provide the machinery for implementation or reaching this
holy state of grace. The unpretentious 1959 statement declared
"professional librarians should have faculty status, with the
benefits enjoyed by the teaching staff."

At the 1969 Atlantic City meeting of ACRL, a resolution was
passed by the ACRL membership calling for, in general terms, the
perquisites of faculty status for academic librarians. The reso-

lution read as follows:

Whereas academic librarians must have:

1. Rank equivalent to other members of the teach-

ing faculty;
2. Salary equal to that of other members of the

teaching faculty;
3. Sabbatical and other leaves;
4. Tenure;
5. Access to grants, fellowships, and research

funds;
6. Responsibilities for professional staff;
7. An adequately supportive non-professional

staff;
8. Appointment and promotion on the basis of
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individual accomplishments and involving peer evaluation;
9. Grievance and appeal procedures available to other members of the academic community and involving peer review;
10. Participation of all librarians in library governance;
11. Membership in the academic senate of their institutions, or other governing bodies;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Association of College and Research Libraries and the American Library Association adopt as their official policy the support of these standards for all academic librarians, including:

1. Censure and sanctions;
2. Accreditation of libraries;

and be it further resolved that the President of ACRL be instructed to present this resolution this afternoon for ALA Council's immediate adoption and implementation or if this is not possible, to the appropriate ALA body at the earliest possible time for adoption and implementation and that he inform the Council or other appropriate body of the ACRL's adoption of this course of action.

The foregoing resolution did not pass the Council, and it was the consensus of the ACRL membership that ACRL proceed with dispatch to resolve this problem within its own jurisdictional responsibility for academic librarians, with or without the help of the American Library Association. A committee has been working diligently on this problem ever since. I was a member of this committee when it was established in 1969, and my tenure on the committee ended at the close of the 1974 New York ALA Conference. During my five years on the committee, I attempted to ascertain from librarians of CUNY, SUNY, and the independent colleges and universities of the state, their views on faculty status, through queries that I made from time to time. Many of you responded thereby providing me with information and data to support your views. The committee's first draft of standards appeared in the October 1970 issue of College and Research Libraries News. ACRL members were invited to react to the proposed standards. The committee received a large number of letters of support. There were some letters that endorsed part of the standards and rejected one or two of the perquisites; but by and large, the overall reaction from academic librarians was favorable. Since the first draft of the standards appeared, several of the college and university sections of state associations that met in late October, November and the following spring, passed resolutions either adopting the standards or enacting similar standards. An
example of the enthusiasm generated by the proposed standards is reflected in the action of the Wisconsin Library Association, the New Jersey Library Association, and the California Library Association which endorsed the proposed standards, and the New York Library Association which also adopted faculty status standards for academic librarians. Endorsements also came from individual librarians and academic library staff associations.

The draft that was published in October 1970 was revised in accordance with the suggestions which came from academic librarians throughout the country, and was endorsed in principle by the ACRL Board on January 19, 1971 at the Los Angeles ALA Midwinter Meeting.

Because of the mandate for viable faculty status standards that would be supportive of college and university librarians, the committee authorized the then Chairman of the committee, Stuart Forth, and the ACRL Executive Secretary, J. Donald Thomas, to negotiate with the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges for support of the proposed ACRL standards. Preliminary discussions were held in the winter of 1971, and the entire Academic Status Committee met with representatives from these two organizations at the ALA Conference in Dallas in 1971.

As a result of this meeting it appeared that ACRL could begin to negotiate for co-sponsorship of faculty status standards by these two powerful organizations. It was felt that this, as well as endorsement by regional accrediting associations, would make the standards more than "paper standards."

Those of you who were present at the ACRL membership meeting in Dallas in 1971 and/or those of you who have read the minutes of that meeting in the September 1971 issue of _ACRL News_ are cognizant of the fact that the interim standards adopted by the ACRL membership at Dallas were not adopted without serious debate. The divergence of opinion was intellectually stimulating and healthy, for as academics, ACRL members were stating unequivocally their views and positions and were calling for more accurate knowledge to facilitate the definition and assessment of the great issues involved in conferring faculty status on librarians. There was a wide range of opinion even among the members of the ACRL Committee on Academic Status, as C. James Schmidt can substantiate, during the early days of our deliberations. Nevertheless, after serious study, research, and, yes, reflection, the document we presented to the ACRL Board and to the ACRL membership in 1971 represented a firm belief in the faculty role of the academic librarian as reflected in the preamble of the standards which states:

_The academic librarian makes a unique and important contribution to American higher education. He bears central responsibility for developing college and university library collections, for extending bibliographical control over these collections, and for instructing students (both formally in the classroom and informally in the library) and advising faculty and
scholars in the use of these collections. He provides a variety of information services to the college or university community, ranging from answers to specific questions to the compilation of extensive bibliographies. He provides library and information services to the community at large, including federal, state, and local government agencies, business firms and other organizations, and private citizens. Through his own research into the information process and through bibliographic and other studies, he adds to the sum of knowledge in the field of library practice and information science. Through membership and participation in library and scholarly organizations, he works to improve the practice of academic librarianship, bibliography, and information service.

Without the librarian, the quality of teaching, research and public service in our colleges and universities would deteriorate seriously, and programs in many disciplines could no longer be performed. His contribution is intellectual in nature and is the product of considerable formal education, including professional training at the graduate level. Therefore, college and university librarians must be recognized as equal partners in the academic enterprise, and they must be extended the rights and privileges which are not only commensurate with their contributions, but are necessary if they are to carry out their responsibilities.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my firm belief that the interim standards on faculty status for academic librarians was a giant step for academic librarianship in the United States.

What has happened since the 1971 Dallas Conference? A tripartite committee representing ACRL, the Association of American Colleges, and the American Association of University Professors worked diligently to develop a Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians for about a year. After the Committee on Academic Status reviewed the statement, it was presented to the ACRL membership in Chicago in 1972, and was endorsed by the ACRL membership overwhelmingly. Since this statement was not as specific as the standards passed in Dallas, the Committee on Academic Status, then chaired by Roy Kidman, requested that the ACRL Board reaffirm the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians, as passed at the ACRL membership meeting of June 24, 1971 in Dallas. The ACRL Board reaffirmed the Dallas standards as well as endorsed the Joint Statement prepared by the Tripartite Committee.

Following endorsement of the Joint Statement on Faculty Status by the ACRL membership at the Annual ALA Conference in Chicago in 1972, the statement was subsequently endorsed by the AAUP membership at its annual conference in St. Louis, Missouri in April 1973.

In the meantime, we ran into difficulties with the Associa-
tion of American Colleges. In December 1972, the Board of Directors of the Association of American Colleges announced that it could not endorse the adoption of the statement in its present form. That board did reaffirm its concern for the status of academic librarians, but found that "the teaching and research functions which, in terms of the statement, would justify the 'fundamental identity' of certain librarians with the teaching faculty are insufficiently defined." The ARL Board "feared that adoption of the statement by the AAC would create great pressures on institutions to grant faculty status, including tenure, to most, if not all, professional librarians, regardless of the quality of their administrative performance."

While the Association of American Colleges failed to endorse the Joint Statement on Faculty Status legally, it did assist in formulating it, and, of course, historically it can be viewed that the statement was drafted by a committee of ACRL, AAUP, and ARL and endorsed by ACRL and AAUP. The February 1975 Issue of College and Research Libraries News reveals that the Joint Statement on Faculty Status has been endorsed by 58 state and regional library organizations. One additional organization has subsequently endorsed the statement, which gives a total of 59 organizations. 3

UNRESOLVED PROBLEMS

Unfortunately, the millenium was not reached in spite of the positive action by ACRL members in Dallas in 1971 and again in Chicago in 1972. There remain many unresolved problems. Some people are still asking the question, "Why faculty rank for academic librarians? Why faculty rank for academic librarians?" Because time is of the essence, it is impossible for us to deal with all of these soul-searching questions that are still being pondered in some quarters. As a matter of fact, some of my colleagues who spoke earlier have already touched on some of these knotty questions and a few of these knotty problems.

In some college and university libraries, the concepts of professional responsibility and self-determination, library governance, participation in college and university governance, and tenure and promotion with a peer review system similar to that used by other faculty as the primary basis of judgement in the promotion process for academic librarians will be looked upon as radical reform. I submit this afternoon that the total reexamination of the college and university librarian status is long overdue. It must be followed by radical reform with the granting of faculty privileges including rank and responsibilities if the academic librarian is to survive in the 1980s in an academic environment in which he or she is confronted with new threats to tenure and academic freedom, severe financial pressures on institutions, and the threat towards destroying our collective bargaining rights in higher education, as well as many other threats. Yes, academic librarians must meet the new demands of this new 1980 academic scene.

What has happened since academic librarians have begun to
work diligently and hard for faculty status? An ACRL survey shows that seventy-five percent of the librarians had reached faculty status in 1976 compared with fifty-one percent who had faculty status in 1966.

PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

As we move further into the 1980's there will continue to be repeated attempts to classify librarians as non-teaching or non-instructional personnel. Even those institutions that have conferred faculty status upon their librarians, will try to defrock them or remove them from this status. Librarians must remind the authorities that they are faculty and that they do participate in the teaching and research process. More importantly, librarians must resist these attempts with all of their strength and creative energy that they can muster.

Let me share with you some of the attempts that have been made to take away faculty status from librarians. In late June 1978 the Vice President for Academic Affairs of Atlanta University asked the University Librarian to call together the library faculty. In his remarks, the Vice President for Academic Affairs informed the group that at the end of that academic year they would no longer be considered members of the faculty. In short, he told them that the President of the university had instructed him that they must be relieved of their faculty status and that they would no longer have the rights and privileges and the perquisites that they had enjoyed with regard to sabbaticals, faculty rank, vacation and the other provisions of faculty. The Vice President told the group that they were being stripped of all their rights and privileges except tenure and retirement. The library faculty of Atlanta University did not take this threat to their status lying down. They met with their bargaining agent which was a local AAUP chapter and together called upon the Association of College and Research Libraries. The Association of College and Research Libraries and the AAUP jointly wrote a letter to the university protesting the threat to the status of the librarians, and in the meantime, the local library faculty worked with the Atlanta chapter of the AAUP. When the President found that they were about to sue the university and go into litigation, he backed down. He changed his mind about taking the faculty status away from this group primarily because of two reasons: 1) It became crystal clear to him that he was in breach of contract because late June was beyond the deadline for informing any faculty member about any change in his or her status for the ensuing academic year; and 2) the threat of a suit on the university at a time that the university was probably trying to create good will in the community as well as to generate funds for a capital program was not in the best interest of the university.

At Fisk University, the University President decided to relieve the library faculty of its faculty status. The library faculty of Fisk wrote a letter of protest to the Board of Trustees which pointed out that this was in violation of Standard 6
for Accreditation of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools as well as in violation of the joint statement of ACRL, AAUP, and AAC. The Fisk University Board of Trustees listened to the complaint of the library faculty and the Chairman of the Board appointed a board committee to study the librarians' faculty status. Interestingly enough, this board committee was chaired by the eminent historian John Hope Franklin, a former member of the faculty and chairman of the History Department at Brooklyn College, now in City University, and now distinguished Professor of History at the University of Chicago. Dr. Franklin and his committee decided that this matter should go before the faculty for a decision because the faculty members were peers of the librarians. While the Board of Trustees' committee were sympathetic to the library faculty, they felt that the decision would fare better if it was returned to the faculty. At a subsequent faculty meeting with the president of the university and the academic dean present, the faculty overwhelmingly approved faculty status for librarians by reaffirming it in a vote. This led to the appointment of a committee to develop procedures for further implementation. In the two cases cited above the librarians challenged the enemies of faculty status for librarians, and I am certain that academic librarians all over the country, when faced with a similar challenge, will do likewise.

Another unresolved problem in some quarters of academic librarianship is equal pay for librarians. I am certain that most people present at this conference are in favor of equity in salary scales for librarians as faculty; there are librarians in this country who are still fighting this battle.

At Temple University the collective bargaining unit appealed to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to force librarians' salaries more nearly into line with those of faculty members. The Temple librarians claimed they get lower salaries because they work in a "women's profession." Elaine Clever of Temple reported to me recently that EEOC has recently reorganized its program and has established an office of systematic programs to handle cases of systemic program. The Temple University library has a lawyer who is helping them develop their case and they are working towards "equal pay for work of comparable worth." In their fight for equal pay at Temple, the Temple Library Group has taken the salaries of five schools within the university—Allied Health, Engineering, Art, Music, and Social Administration—and compared them with salaries of the librarians. They have discovered that in spite of the fact that within those five schools the professors by and large do not have the terminal degree, nevertheless, there is a great differential in salary between the faculty salary and the librarians' salary. We shall be watching with great interest to ascertain the outcome of the Temple Case.

USE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING TO GAIN FACULTY STATUS

Those of us who advocate faculty status for librarians have for many years urged our librarian colleagues to use collective bargaining as a tool to obtain this end. We have pointed to the
efforts of City University and many other colleges and universities throughout the country. But a few weeks ago the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that faculty members at Yeshiva University are managerial employees and do not have the right to bargain collectively under the federal labor law. Of course, this was a shock to librarians as well as other faculty. How will this decision affect faculty status for librarians as well as all faculty in our colleges and universities? In a recent article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, it was reported that Sheldon E. Steinbach, Staff Counsel for the American Council on Education, indicated that "the court has laid a foundation for all private universities to come within the confines of the Yeshiva decision... The administrations of private and independent institutions may try to set themselves into the Yeshiva mold and claim their faculties are indeed management within the terms of the National Labor Relations Act," Beverly T. Watkins reported that "About eighty-five private higher-education institutions now engage in collective bargaining under the Act. More than 560 public college and university campuses bargain under state labor laws." Continuing, Watkins contends that "although the Supreme Court ruling applies specifically to private institutions, it may have some 'carry-over effect' to the public sector, ... because 'public employee-relations boards often are influenced by private-sector developments in dealing with public colleges and universities under state public-employee statutes.'"

Sheldon E. Steinbach of the American Council on Education also believes that the decision could have a "real impact on public institutions in states with collective bargaining laws modeled after the federal labor-relations act. If the model is close, you might find that institutions will claim they are in a posture similar to Yeshiva's." Professor Martha Friedman, AAUP, said that "the Yeshiva decision can be overruled by new federal legislation." In addition she said that the AAUP had established a committee to draft amendments to the labor relations act explicitly to provide faculty members at all private colleges and universities protection by the act. If the new federal legislation corrects this particular problem then we may have a way out. In spite of the wrong-headed decision of the Supreme Court, librarians must use collective bargaining as a mechanism and a means to gain faculty status where they do not have it as well as to retain their faculty status when it is threatened by outside forces.

In spite of the complex problems that library faculty continue to face, I sincerely believe that great progress has been made since the institution of faculty status. Very recently in an assessment of what has transpired following the granting of faculty status to librarians, Gallouvy has suggested that academic librarians have "obtained more degrees and involved themselves in professional growth through continuing education, research, publication, and teaching. Many academic librarians acquired entirely new skills in automation and management which are making enormous changes in the services they perform in their libraries."
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As we look to the future, we are cognizant of the fact that librarians have made some progress in the area of faculty status with faculty rank and all of the perquisites. At the same time, academic librarians have encountered problems of attempts to relieve them of their faculty status. Nevertheless, I am confident that the talented academic librarians of the City University, State University and independent sector of New York State as well as throughout the country, along with the leaders of their collective bargaining units, will courageously challenge any attempt to return college and university librarians to their former status of being handmaidens to the faculty rather than their rightful place as partners of the faculty. I am certain that the librarians of CUNY and SUNY will never forget that the Board of Regents in its Position Paper on Library Service in 1970 affirmed that "the librarian and his professional staff should have faculty status."9

**NOTES**


2. See the September and October 1972 issues of College and Research Libraries News.

3. Personal communication from Dr. Julie A. C. Virgo, Executive Secretary, Association of College and Research Libraries, February 5, 1980.
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