

Academic Status Institutional Comparisons Report

Librarians' and Archivists' Association of the University of Waterloo,
2019-2020

Final report submitted by:

Jordan Hale
Rebecca Hutchinson
Kari D. Weaver

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
Background	3
Perspectives on Status from Professional Librarians' Associations	3
CAUT	3
ACRL	3
Summary of 2015 LAUW Report	3
Librarians' and Archivists' Employment Handbook (LAEH) and Forthcoming Revisions	4
Librarianship	4
Scholarship/Research	4
Service	5
Definitions	6
Academic Status	6
Continuing Appointment/Permanent Status	6
Faculty Status	6
Non-Tenure-Track	6
Tenure(-Track)	7
Environmental Scan	7
Institutions Selected	7
Criteria Selected	7
Faculty Representation	8
Governance Structure	8
Tenure	8
Title and Rank	9
Probation Length/Time to Tenure Review or Permanent/Continuing Status	9
Frequency of Performance Review	9
Content of Performance Review	9
Research Requirement	10
Sabbatical	10
Release for Research	10
Expense Reimbursement	11
Appointment/Employment	11
Dismissal	11
Academic Freedom	11
Excluded Criteria	12
Waterloo Policies	12
Extra-University Activity	12
Intellectual Property	12

Official Employment Files of Regular Faculty Members	13
Overtime, University Support Staff	13
Part-Time Teaching Appointments for Full-Time Staff	13
Compensation	13
Vacation	13
ACRL Standards for Faculty Status for Academic Librarians	14
Library Governance	14
Grievance	14
Questions for Consideration	14
Recommended Readings	15

Background

Perspectives on Status from Professional Librarians' Associations

CAUT

The Canadian Association of University Teachers gets right to the point in the first sentence of [their policy statement](#): librarians are entitled to academic status, which includes full participation in intellectual and academic conversations and processes, including governance, based on our crucial roles in education, research, and making documentary and cultural heritage available for research. As such, our employment policies and benefits should be analogous to those of other academic workers, including advancement policies and ranks that recognize our work in teaching, research, and service, with appropriate supports for release to achieve these aims, including time and academic freedom. In collective negotiations or the development of policies pertaining to academic staff employment and workload, provisions must be made for librarians to determine and arrange their workload, recognizing their autonomy as professionals.

ACRL

Based on the functional duties of librarians within academic institutions, which include research, teaching, policy development, participation in governance, and service, librarians should be considered faculty, given our tripartite commitment to teaching, research and service. As a result, the ACRL [Standards for Faculty Status for Academic Librarians](#) indicate that we should have academic freedom, access to professional development, and the same benefits as faculty members, including rank, tenure, leaves, and research funds. Appropriately, librarians should go through promotion and tenure procedures.

Summary of 2015 LAUW Report

The 2015 LAUW report “Academic Staff Status for University of Waterloo Librarians” examined the employment status and representation of academic librarians at comparator institutions in Canada, as well as the professional contributions, research outputs, and job profiles of the complement of UW librarians. LAUW’s (now LAAUW’s) recommendations included several items, including increased support for research days and study leaves and guidance for progress through the ranks, that have been tentatively addressed in the most recent updates to the University of Waterloo Library Librarian and Archivist Employment Handbook (LAEH); as well as the recommendation for academic freedom equivalent to that of faculty members, partially addressed in the [draft updates to Policy 33 – Ethical Behaviour released in October 2019](#). The report also recommended reopening affiliation talks with FAUW, and reported a strong sentiment in support of this move amongst LAAUW members. It is important to note that at the time of this writing, none of the recommendations of the 2015 report, other than the changes to research days study leaves, are officially approved by the University. This 2020 report builds upon this foundation of policy changes geared towards academic status for

librarians and archivists to recommend meaningful options for LAAUW members, identified through our professional associations' advocacy as well as an environmental scan of working conditions and benefits at peer institutions.

Librarians' and Archivists' Employment Handbook (LAEH) and Forthcoming Revisions

In 2018 Lib Exec and Librarian representatives began work on revisions to the LAEH. The foci of these revisions was twofold: updating the advancement processes for librarians and archivists, and revising the portions of the handbook pertaining to research time and study leaves. While these major areas of revision represent positive steps forward for the conditions of librarian and archivist employment, they still present some barriers and do not address other concerns related to parity with faculty and librarians at other institutions. The following sections of this report outline the changes to the LAEH and their benefits and barriers to the areas of librarianship, scholarship, and service, all of which are outlined as individual areas of consideration.

Librarianship

The revisions to the LAEH incorporate a reduced number of ranks for professional librarians and archivists. This presents a model closer to the three-tier faculty model, but lacks an adjustment to some identified needs and modifications of time consuming processes.

- Faculty reviews are conducted on a bi-annual basis, while librarian and archivist reviews are conducted annually, representing a significant additional investment of time in paperwork and timelines that do not sufficiently support continued work on long-term projects as a large portion of workload. This is of particular concern for specialist roles, but may impact librarians and archivists in any position.
- There are presently concerns around the recognition and respect of intellectual property rights of Librarians and Archivists when undertaking collaborative work at the University that have not been addressed by the LAEH revision.
- There are concerns about the academic freedom rights of Librarians and Archivists that are not addressed in the LAEH revision. The campus has attempted to make some revisions to Policy 33 to address these concerns, but the language is still not as strong as the protections offered to faculty in the MOU between FAUW and the University.
- The current lack of shared governance structure within the Library as an organization and for librarians within the broader institution.

Scholarship/Research

The forthcoming revisions to the LAEH better articulate the time available to librarians and archivists for scholarship. It also clearly defines scholarship as one of a variety of paths for librarians and archivists to advance in their careers. Both of these revisions highlight the

important place scholarship has in librarian practice, but a number of identified barriers to librarian engagement in scholarship still exist. Examples are as follows:

- Difficulties for librarians seeking research ethics approval over a lack of awareness that scholarship is a routine part of librarianship, independent of and coupled with expectations that librarian scholarship is overseen by a faculty member. This is especially true with respect to grants and projects where librarians are acting as principal investigators.
- The extensive amount of time required to apply for and review a study leave proposal compounded by the lack of backfill funds for study leaves.
- Difficulties in the process to distribute grant funds from certain funding agencies (e.g. CARL), especially when librarians are the primary investigator(s) on a study, based on our current staff status.
- Lack of a regularized, articulated understanding of how much time, or a percentage of time, is appropriate to spend on research within the current context.
- Research opportunities arise where the timing and the current/forthcoming processes do not align with one another.
- There are increasing requests for librarians to participate as members of research teams. The expressed allotment of time is per annum and is not related to the number of projects a librarian completes in a year.
- The burden is placed on the individual librarian to negotiate for what is needed, rather than the time being given and adjusted for business needs if required, and reduces individual agency to make professionally beneficial decisions in this area of responsibility.
- Unlike faculty, there is no assumption that librarians/archivists will be eligible to apply for regular sabbatical, = or sabbatical-like, leave.

Service

The revisions to the LAEH do not make significant changes to the area of service outside of identifying it as one path forward for librarian advancement. In particular, the higher levels of advancement require individual librarians to have had an impact on the broader profession or field, necessitating attention paid to resourcing this area of work.

- Concern about uneven distribution of professional development funds, and the confluence of money to support professional growth as opposed to professional service obligations.
- Though research days have been established in the LAEH revision, no such provision has been made to support professional or university service, meaning there is no consistent approach to this work and that librarians are not able to make individual decisions about opportunities without significant discussion. This places the burden on the individual librarian to negotiate for resources or provide their own backfill, rather than the time being given and adjusted for business needs as required. This reduces individual agency to make professionally beneficial decisions in this area of responsibility.

- Lack of a regularized, articulated understanding of how much time, or a percentage of time, is appropriate to spend on research within the current context.

Definitions

Academic Status

Academic status denotes librarians as part of the faculty representative group and able to follow most faculty policies and procedures accordingly. Some institutions have additional policies for librarians within their memoranda of understanding with faculty members. Librarians with such a status may or may not have formal ranks; may have the option, or be required, to conduct research or engage in professional service; and, depending on the institution, may be offered appointment or nomination to various faculty committees.

Continuing Appointment/Permanent Status

In institutions where tenure is not a status granted to librarians, they may be granted continuing appointments or permanent status instead. In these situations, the university generally relinquishes the right to terminate appointments before the normal age of retirement, as long as the standards for the position continue to be met. It seems that institutions sometimes use continuing appointment/permanent status for librarians instead of tenure to differentiate librarians from faculty, although the shape and process of continuing appointment/permanent status for librarians is essentially the same as that of tenure for faculty.

Faculty Status

In many institutions with faculty status for librarians, the library is seen as a faculty unto itself, often reporting up to a Dean of Libraries. Librarian faculty appointments exist in tenure-track and non-tenure track variants (though the word “tenure” itself may not be used at a given institution). Where tenure (or permanent status) is possible, librarians have ranks (typically assistant/associate/full professor), with an advancement schedule established and communicated upon appointment. Research and service are both required, typically with a greater emphasis placed on one, and access to research support (including funds, leaves, and release time) is provided. Librarians are also represented in university governance.

Non-Tenure-Track

This definition varies between universities. At some institutions, non-tenure-track librarian appointments are restricted to contractually limited term appointment (CLTA) positions, leave coverage, or positions supported by grant funds. At others, this terminology is used to denote that while librarians may not be eligible for tenure as the professoriate would be, they are eligible for continuing appointments or permanent status. *See Continuing Appointment/Permanent Status, above.*

Tenure(-Track)

Tenure-track librarians are generally hired at the rank of Assistant Librarian (or equivalent) and proceed along a defined advancement schedule before undergoing a tenure review, typically in year five or six of their appointment. Tenure-track librarians are expected to, as part of their job responsibilities, engage in research and professional service, and their contributions are reviewed together as part of their tenure review. When tenure is granted, librarians continue to perform these duties, while subject to less frequent review, and may have access to sabbatical leaves at this point. If tenure is denied, the librarian's appointment is usually terminated.

Environmental Scan

Institutions Selected

Comparable institutions were loosely grouped into the type of employment status held by their librarians. In order to ensure that the variations of status were represented, institutions were chosen from each of these groups. The final selections from each group were based on the degree of similarities they had when compared to the Waterloo.

To help us determine similarity, we looked at institutions that were members of CARL, ARL, and/or the U15 (all of which Waterloo is a member), as well as considering their respective locations and level of research conducted at the university. U.S. comparator institutions were selected based on information provided on close peer and aspirational peer institutions by the University of Waterloo Office of Institutional Assessment and Planning. To conduct this scan, members of the working group independently and collectively reviewed current documentation and consulted with colleagues at these institutions where appropriate to seek clarification.

We deliberately included McGill, because like Waterloo, it is not unionized. We deliberately excluded Western and McMaster because the majority of their Librarians are in their own representation group, which is not something that has come up as something of interest from LAAUW membership. We included two close-comparator U.S. institutions, Purdue and Carnegie Mellon, to ensure all types of faculty status were represented.

Comparators:

- Calgary
- Carnegie Mellon
- Guelph
- McGill
- Manitoba
- Ottawa
- Purdue
- Queen's
- Toronto
- UBC

Criteria Selected

Criteria were selected based on:

- What distinguishes the variety of employment statuses for librarians,

- What would/could change for Waterloo Librarians and Archivists if we move from the Staff Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)/policies to the Faculty MOA/policies, and
- The concerns LAAUW membership has identified under current employment articles and policies

A chart of the criteria compared and the results of that comparison may be found in *Appendix A*.

The following sections discuss the findings of the environmental scan by criteria. Institutions and institutional policies were specifically identified in this discussion only when the information could be verified by the scan or through personal contact with an individual at that institution.

Faculty Representation

In 10/10 institutions librarians are represented by faculty, and their policies and agreements are the same as, or modified from, faculty policies. Unlike Waterloo where librarians are represented by staff and their policies and agreements are the same as, or modified from, staff. Not all of these groups include archivists (one definitely does, one definitely does not), and at least one includes museum curators.

Governance Structure

Senate (or equivalent): Most institutions have at least one seat on the senate for an elected librarian. Three also include the University Librarian (or equivalent) as ex officio. Queen's (like Waterloo) only has the University Librarian (or equivalent) as ex officio. But at Queen's librarians can run for one of three faculty seats. McGill's and Manitoba's senates have library representation, though it is unclear as to whether these are restricted to librarians or include library staff as well. At Calgary, librarians may run for one of 30 open faculty seats or be appointed by the General Faculties Council to the Senate.

Board of Governors (or equivalent): Most institutions have 2-3 seats on the board for elected faculty for which librarians can run. Manitoba, Carnegie Mellon, and Purdue do not. At U.S. institutions, such boards are typically made up of community partners and notable alumni, not members currently employed at the institution. In the Canadian context, most boards contain a mix of community partners, notable alumni, and employees. At Waterloo and Toronto, librarians can run for one of two staff seats.

Tenure

Five institutions have procedures leading to a continuing appointment that are similar in process to tenure: Guelph, Manitoba, Ottawa, Toronto, and UBC. These all limit the employer's ability to terminate following probation, but maintain individual institutional distinctions from the faculty tenure process. Examples of such distinctions include different timelines for application/award of continuing appointment in comparison to the faculty tenure process, advancement process that are overseen internally in the Library without broader administrative review, and adjustments to the documentation that accounts for the wide variety of work and specialization in the librarian field.

Five have full tenure that follows the same procedure as, or mirrors that of, faculty: McGill, Calgary, Carnegie Mellon, Purdue, and Queen's.

Waterloo has regular staff positions without tenure or a tenure-like process.

Title and Rank

At most institutions title denotes rank (assistant, associate, etc.). Toronto and Ottawa use numbers (I, II, etc.) like Waterloo.

Probation Length/Time to Tenure Review or Permanent/Continuing Status

- Carnegie Mellon has 5-9 years
- Guelph, McGill, Purdue, and Queen's have 6 years
- Calgary has 4-5 years, depending on stipulation at the start of the contract
- Ottawa, Toronto, and UBC have 3 years
- Manitoba has 2-4 years
- Waterloo has 1 year probation

Probation at Waterloo for librarians is a staff policy, the one consideration is assessment of performance, and documentation is prepared by their manager. At the ten comparator institutions, probation is tied in to the tenure/permanent status/continuing appointment process. Librarians have a set amount of time, usually a range, in which they must prepare their documentation to make a case for tenure/permanent status/continuing appointment.

The process at other institutions is varied:

- Queen's "Renewal for Continuing-track librarians/archivists shall be granted when there is clear evidence of a commitment to academic excellence, some demonstrated professional growth, and the prospect (based on the record of accomplishments to date) of future development. In a decision about Renewal, there shall be a presumption in favour of Renewal. In order to refuse an appointment, the University must be able to demonstrate that the weight of evidence is in favour of non-Renewal."
- Guelph "Assessed on "long-term, established, and outstanding performance in Professional Practice, Scholarship, and Service." For all deliberations, including the yearly annual review process, all member materials go to the Continuing Appointment (CA) and Promotions Committee of peers, who deliberate as a group on the member's progression to CA, achievement of CA, or achievement of Librarian status.
- Carnegie Mellon requires librarians and archivists to complete a progress review part way through their time in probation to assess progress toward tenure. This supplements annual performance reviews conducted during the probationary period (see next section).

Frequency of Performance Review

- Regardless of status
 - Annual
 - Calgary, Ottawa, Toronto, and Waterloo
- Before probation
 - Annual
 - Carnegie Mellon, Guelph, McGill, Manitoba, Purdue, and Queen's
- After probation:
 - 2 years
 - Guelph and Queen's
 - 6 years
 - Carnegie Mellon and Purdue

Content of Performance Review

This refers to the aspects of the job on which librarians are reviewed, and is analogous to ACRL's Professional Responsibilities criteria. All institutions specifically note research as a component of review. Also, all institutions seemed to use a variation of the faculty service/research/teaching model for the content of reviews of librarians. Including librarianship/professional practice, scholarship/scholarly/research, and service/committee. A few pulled out teaching and administrative duties specifically.

Waterloo uses criteria like client service, working relationships, communication, job knowledge and its application, taking initiative, and goals. Also possibly team participation, time management, team management, and development and coaching of others, and other considerations can be included.

Research Requirement

All institutions mention research as an expectation. How strongly it is required varies by institution. For example, at Ottawa, Queen's, and Toronto, research is a component for promotion, but in theory it is possible to advance all the way through the ranks with minimal scholarship if strong in other criteria. At UBC, research is a component of the review, but the weight it receives varies by individual based on an agreement struck between the librarian and their department head at the time of continuing appointment review. At Calgary, Guelph, and Manitoba, librarians must have a record of scholarship and address it as a component of their review process. At Carnegie Mellon, McGill, and Purdue, research was a required component throughout the probationary period and contributed heavily to tenure decisions.

At Waterloo, research is not a set criterion for performance review or promotion, although it can be included. Though the sections of the LAEH pertaining to promotion have yet to be approved at the time of writing, they stipulate that job performance plus at least two other criterion areas must be included as part of the evaluation, so research is not required, but can be considered.

Sabbatical

Almost all institutions have a variation of research/study leave. Calgary, Guelph, Manitoba, Ottawa, Queen's, Toronto, and UBC outline entitlement for length of leave and percentage of compensation in relation to length of service, which is modelled off of or equivalent to the traditional faculty sabbatical. Tenured librarians at Carnegie Mellon and Purdue are entitled to sabbatical. The approval process varies.

The new sections of the LAEH pertaining to research and study leaves outline the application and adjudication processes for librarians to take leaves ranging from two weeks to one year in length. It is incumbent upon the applicant to determine a coverage plan for their absence, in consultation with their manager.

Release for Research

Amount provided ranged from 12 days, to 24, to one day a week. However, not every institution provides a number for research days or approval process. Some allude to the idea that employees have full, autonomous discretion as long as all responsibilities are met, or explicitly acknowledge research as a job responsibility, allowing autonomous distribution of needed time.

Waterloo provides 1-2 days a month, or up to 24 days per year on approval from manager, in consultation with their manager, as necessary.

Expense Reimbursement

Professional expense reimbursement caps vary from \$750-\$2186 per person per year in 2018-2019 or 2019-2020. Reimbursement is restricted to expenses related to academic and professional competence, and disciplinary or specialist expertise. Sometimes travel is separate (Queen's). Most include conferences, subscriptions, software, and memberships.

Almost all institutions allow for carryforward of expenses. Calgary, Guelph, McGill, Manitoba, and Queens allow two years. Ottawa has three years, and UBC has nine years.

Some institutions (Carnegie Mellon, Calgary, Guelph, and Purdue) provide individually available funds that are supplemented by Library-wide funding to support professional scholarship and service work. No institutions indicated that librarians must request to use the funds allocated - only that approval of claims are required afterwards to ensure they were used for professional development. Guelph, Ottawa, and UBC all indicated that the funds are provided automatically.

Librarians and archivists at Waterloo can apply for funding up to a \$1800 yearly cap (2018-2019 and 2019-2020) with no option for carryforward. Conferences, workshops, and research and study days are included, but no mention is made of memberships. Research material can be purchased if the cost is less than \$150, but it is unclear if subscriptions and software fall into this category.

Appointment/Employment

None of the institutions had an overall requirement for their librarians to have a second undergraduate degree, second master's degree, or a doctoral degree. Some job descriptions (from Carnegie Mellon and McGill) listed a second master's degree or a doctoral degree as a preferred qualification. There may be other individual positions at any of the institutions that do require further educational degrees.

Waterloo does not have an overall requirement for their librarians to have a second undergraduate degree, second master's degree, or a doctoral degree. However, there may be individual positions that do require further educational degrees.

Few institutions indicated how widely job advertisements needed to be circulated. Toronto stated a preference for qualified internal candidates. Waterloo's candidate pool can be limited to only qualified internal candidates at the purview of the hiring committee.

Dismissal

Most institutions stated that, with the achievement of tenure/continuing appointment/permanent status that librarians could not be terminated unless there was cause (gross misconduct, incompetence, or abandonment of duties) or financial exigency. Some also mentioned fiscal stringency, ongoing low enrollment, or redundancy as other legitimate reasons for dismissal.

At Waterloo, staff can be dismissed for performance issues if performance management has failed, actions are considered detrimental to the unit or the university, organizational change, or other reasons (although this may mean voluntary termination (retirement, etc.)).

Academic Freedom

The academic freedom statements that apply to faculty also apply to librarians at all institutions. All statements have a general definition or detail the components of academic freedom around

teaching, learning, or research. They also all mention, except for Carnegie Mellon, that the ability to conduct teaching, learning, or research, without deference to prescribed doctrine (or the like), is key to academic freedom. They all, except for Purdue, include the institution's and association's obligation to defend academic freedom. At the two U.S. comparators, Carnegie Mellon and Purdue, academic freedoms are also protected via the U.S. First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, which protects freedom of speech, religion, assembly, press, and the right to petition the government for a redress of grievances, as originally established in the Supreme Court Case *Sweezy v. New Hampshire (1958)*. This right has been upheld and expanded due to a number of subsequent U.S. Supreme Court Cases.

Half mention that members have the right to criticize the university (or institutions in general). Almost half included that library collections are to be free of censorship. Guelph, Queen's, and Toronto also mention the freedom from institutional censorship.

Some of the responsibilities that relate to academic freedom that were commonly mentioned are: members do not have the right to infringe on other members' academic freedoms, members are obligated to base their scholarship on an honest and ethical quest for knowledge; members should be clear when they are not speaking on behalf of the institution; and academic freedom cannot be used to avoid professional duties or to skirt the law.

At Waterloo, there is currently a campus wide policy and a separate policy with more expansive language covered in the faculty MOA. The Waterloo faculty MOA provides a level of protection, allowing individuals who are in a dispute over an issue of academic freedom, to receive support from FAUW during the resolution. [Article 6.5 of the Waterloo's MoA with faculty](#) also speaks directly to the work that librarians carry out, even though librarians are not represented by FAUW.

Neither the [current staff Policy 33 \(General Principles\)](#) or the [new draft Policy 33 \(Ethical Principles\)](#), which covers librarians at Waterloo, articulates a process of support should an academic freedom complaint be filed. [Policy 36](#) could be enacted which allows individuals a support person from the regular staff of his/her choosing. Neither version of Policy 33 explicitly state the right to freedom from institutional censorship; or the protection to conduct teaching, learning, or research without deference to prescribed doctrine.

Excluded Criteria

Waterloo Policies

Extra-University Activity

Policy #49 [F]: "This document is designed to assist members of faculty and the administration in understanding what may or may not be appropriate by way of extra-University activity."

This did not seem applicable for comparison.

Intellectual Property

Policy #73 [G]: Applies to both faculty and staff at Waterloo. It is important to note that there has been tension in the past regarding how this policy has been interpreted, particularly if a

librarian/archivist creations are assigned tasks or scholarly work. Because the environmental scan focused on written policies and employment articles (assessing interpretation and implementation would have been unmanageable), we elected not to include this as a comparison.

Official Employment Files of Regular Faculty Members

Policy #75 [F]: “A faculty member's Official Employment File is the collection of documents relevant to her/his employment at the University of Waterloo...This policy sets out the procedures for maintaining, accessing, and using the Official Employment File.”

This did not seem applicable for comparison.

Overtime, University Support Staff

Policy #16 [S]: “This Policy defines overtime and explains the compensation available to eligible regular full- and part-time staff members for overtime. Overtime is time worked beyond a staff member's normal hours if formally scheduled and approved by the appropriate manager.”

This did not seem applicable for comparison.

Part-Time Teaching Appointments for Full-Time Staff

Policy #47 [S]: “Some qualified staff members are invited to teach part time in an academic department. In recognition of the desirability of this kind of exchange of services... guidelines have been established... The fundamental objective of this policy is that the home department Head retain the proper authority and accountability for all monies received from the University by that department's staff members.”

This did not seem applicable for comparison.

Compensation

Please see LAAUW's annual Compensation Report for comparisons.

Vacation

Number of vacation days one could expect over a 30 year career as a librarian (data from 2017-2018):

Ottawa	660
Waterloo	702
Queens	710
Toronto	744
McGill	758
Guelph	776

Calgary	771
Manitoba	810
UBC	895

ACRL Standards for Faculty Status for Academic Librarians

Library Governance

“College and university librarians should adopt an academic form of governance similar in manner and structure to other faculties on the campus.”

It was difficult to find any note of how these institutions' libraries are governed. Only one mentioned a library council (Calgary) for internal decision making (rather than an advisory council). Their structure (vertical vs. horizontal; managerial roles vs. rotating chairs) may give insight into if they are similar to academic departments/faculties. However, this may require making more assumptions than we are comfortable with.

Grievance

“Librarians should have access to the same grievance process as other faculty which include a list of grievable issues, procedures to be completed within specified timeframes, safeguards against repercussions by the institution, and abuse of the policy by the grievant. The process must be consistent with institutional regulations and contracts.”

This was not considered as the majority of the institutions we examined are unionized environments and are not comparable to Waterloo for this criteria.

Questions for Consideration

A. The criteria

1. What criteria as outlined in this document do people feel are irrelevant or unimportant for decision making regarding status?
2. What, if anything, would you like to avoid changing for Waterloo librarians?
 - i. What would make you wary about the possibility of a change in status?
3. For each criterion, is there an approach that appeals considering the context of Waterloo?

B. The performance appraisal process

1. Through this scan, we identified the review process as an area with significant differences for librarians at Waterloo and other institutions.
 - i. Do you agree?
 - ii. If so, what changes would you like to see?
2. What should be the requirements for librarianship at Waterloo?
 - i. What would you need to be successful in meeting these requirements?
3. What should be the requirements for research/scholarship at Waterloo?
 - i. What would you need to be successful in meeting these requirements?

4. What should be the requirements for service at Waterloo?
 - i. What would you need to be successful in meeting these requirements?
- C. The next steps
1. Based on the information presented in this document, would you like LAAUW to further explore academic status?
 2. Based on the information presented in this document, would you like LAAUW to further explore tenure-track faculty status?
 3. If we opt not to pursue a change in status, what of the criteria presented in this document are still important for librarians at Waterloo?

Recommended Readings

[Academic Staff Status for University of Waterloo Librarians, 2015](#) (links to LAAUW SharePoint site)

Applegate, R. (2019). Librarians in the Academic Ecosystem. *Library Trends* 68(2), 295-315. doi:10.1353/lib.2019.0040.

If you only read one thing, I suggest the Not perks but decisions: Implications for practice section on pg 309

Cary, S. (2001). Faculty rank, status, and tenure for librarians: Current trends. *College & Research Libraries News*, 62(5), 510-520. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.62.5.510>

[CAUT Librarians' Committee Discussion Paper on Governance and Librarians](#)

[CAUT Librarians' Committee Discussion Paper on Library Councils](#)

Gilman, T. (January 4, 2008). Academic Librarians and Rank. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Academic-LibrariansRank/45926>

Hartnett, E., Arant-Kaspar, W., & vanDuinkerken, W. (2019). Scope of Work, Roles, and Responsibilities for Academic Librarians: Tenure-Track vs. Non-Tenure-Track Professionals. *Library Trends* 68(2), 269-294. doi:10.1353/lib.2019.0039. [ank/45926](#)

Jacobs, L.M. 2013. "Academic status for Canadian academic librarians: a brief history." In *In solidarity: Academic librarian labour activism and union participation in Canada*, edited by Jennifer Dekker and Mary Kandiuk. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press <http://hdl.handle.net/10133/3691> Downloaded from University of Lethbridge Research Repository, OPUS

[LAUW IGG Survey on Librarians Employment Handbook: Summary, 2016](#) (links to LAAUW SharePoint site)

[LEH Revision Brainstorming Meeting: April 19, 2018](#) (links to Librarians' Employment Handbook Revision Committee SharePoint site)