

Academic Status for Canadian Academic Librarians: A Brief History

Leona Jacobs¹

Introduction

The Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Canadian Association of College and University Libraries believe that the professional staff of university libraries are partners with faculty members in contributing to the scholarly and intellectual functions of the university and should be accorded academic status and the rights and responsibilities of that status.²

Academic librarians³ working in Canadian universities have been mostly informed about the concept of academic status by the predominantly American library literature that focuses on faculty status for librarians. Thus, when asked, many Canadian academic librarians assume that they have faculty status. However, the overwhelming majority of Canadian academic librarians do not officially have faculty status, the single documented exception being the librarians at Laurentian University.⁴ Technically, faculty status equates to the status held by teaching faculty in terms of rights (entitlement to ranks, promotion, tenure,⁵ compensation, leaves, and research funds), responsibilities (the same processes of evaluation and comparable standards for promotion and tenure), acceptance of the status by the institution as a whole, and participation in the governance of the institution.⁶ Academic status, on the other hand, is recognition that the duties performed are integral to the academic mission of the institution but that

all the rights and responsibilities associated with faculty status are not necessarily to be expected.⁷ While the rights and responsibilities of librarians in Canadian academic institutions may approximate, to varying degrees, those of faculty, what the majority of Canadian academic librarians have is academic status and that, as it turns out, was by choice.

The sequence of events leading to academic status for Canadian librarians working in universities is not unlike that relating to the granting of faculty status for academic librarians working in the United States.⁸ In Canada's case, the first step towards academic status resulted from the efforts by the Canadian Library Association (CLA) to develop and promote librarianship as a profession, and then from the persistence of the Canadian Association of College and University Libraries (CACUL), aided and abetted by the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) in the context of the Canadian labour movement and the establishment of public sector unions.

This is a story—a story that chronicles the formation of the CLA and of the CACUL, the role of the CAUT in putting meaning to the concept of academic status, and the push and pull of the debate around academic status, some of which persists to this day.

A National Organization for Canadian Librarians

Right from the beginning, the CLA was occupied with matters of standards, not only as these related to the delivery of library services, but as they also related to the salaries, the working conditions, and the perception of librarianship as a profession, or, in a word, status. In a paper delivered to the Alberta Library Association in 1945, the year leading up to the CLA organizing conference, Hazel Bletcher, librarian at Lethbridge Public Library, noted that one of the objectives of the proposed CLA was to raise the status of librarianship, commenting parenthetically, “We all know we suffer under the general idea that anyone can be a librarian if she can hand out a few books.”⁹ Bletcher went on to assert, “There is no doubt of the unifying influence of such an association and if there is anything in the much used phrase ‘Union is Strength’ we need the association.”¹⁰

Prior to 1946, there was no CLA. Canadian librarians, lacking a formal national organization of their own, often joined the American Library Association (ALA). The earliest mention of a Canadian equivalent was at the ALA conference, held in Montreal, Canada, in 1900. It was there that nine Canadian librarians met and unanimously agreed to form a Canadian library association. However, by that fall, the enormity of establishing a nation-wide library association set in and it was decided instead that the first step would be to organize provincial associations.¹¹

The issue arose again in 1925, when the ALA held an annual conference in Seattle where it was suggested that “this convention be marked by an innovation—a meeting of all Canadian librarians present, to discuss problems purely

Canadian in character.”¹² This was followed by a second meeting in Vancouver, after which it was reported that, “while nothing was done in the way of creating an organization, much was accomplished in arriving at a clearer understanding of both needs and difficulties.”¹³ In 1927, with Canadian librarian Dr. George H. Locke as President, the ALA met in Toronto where two more meetings of Canadian librarians were arranged, the outcome being “a resolution to organize a Canadian Library Association, with the object not of competing with the American Library Association or with provincial associations, but of securing co-operation on all matters affecting the welfare of the library movement throughout Canada as a whole.”¹⁴

Recognizing that a better understanding of library conditions and needs was required to inform the development of such an organization, a commission was formed, made possible with funding from the Carnegie Corporation and with the purpose of inquiring into the state of library services in Canada. The Commission’s work was completed during the summer of 1930, culminating in a report, *Libraries in Canada: A Study of Library Conditions and Needs*.¹⁵ Besides describing the Canadian condition regarding library services across Canada, whether these related to public, government, or academic libraries, the Commission expressed the belief that a national library association would speed progress in addressing deficiencies in library service, but not without paid professional staff. The Commission concluded, however, that help from the national government was unlikely and that the costs would be too great for library workers of Canada to finance. Thus, the idea of a Canadian library association was once again set aside until such time as “some Canadian of wealth, in search of a philanthropic investment . . . may see in this matter a suggestion and an opportunity.”¹⁶ In the end, it was American philanthropy that took up the suggestion.

The need for a Canada-wide library association remained a dominant theme of discussion whenever librarians gathered. In 1934, when the ALA once again met in Montreal, another small group of 11 Canadian librarians gathered and formed a Canadian Library Council but, as with previous attempts at organizing, this fledgling group withered before it could bloom into the much desired national organization.¹⁷ It was not until 1940 when two quite independent lines of thought negotiated the great Canadian compromise. As it is reported, libraries had been left out of any discussions about library services to World War II armed forces because the invitation had only been sent to national organizations. Feeling the missed opportunity for librarians to “meet the responsibility that should be reasonably theirs,”¹⁸ Margaret Gill, president of the Library Association of Ottawa, sent a letter to other library associations that November inviting an “expression of opinion on the proposal that a national association be formed during the coming year.”¹⁹ Meanwhile, the ALA struck the Committee of Canadian Consultants to address the same issue. The two streams of mutual concern merged in a meeting held in Ottawa in January 1941, where they decided to form the Canadian Library

Council, to be staffed by representatives from provincial library associations. The Council would also serve in a consultative role (under the name of the Canadian Library Advisory Board) to the ALA, aided financially by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation²⁰ and with the long term aim of establishing a “permanent and self-supporting Canadian Library Organization.”²¹

The Canadian Library Council held its first meeting in October 1941 and officially incorporated under the Companies Act in December 1943. In May 1944, Elizabeth Morton was hired as the Council’s secretary to begin the process of nation-building as far as library services were concerned,²² the first order of business being to initiate publication of *The Bulletin*, a bi-monthly (at best) newsletter designed to keep all parts of the country informed of all things library and librarian.²³ Expectations for the Council were high; in November 1944, the Vancouver News-Herald reported, “Though officially incorporated only nine months ago, [the Council] has already . . . gathered into one stream various efforts and influences that hitherto have been unrelated and unco-operative, and channelled them into a united strength In the Canadian Library Council there is the promise of a base and a spearhead—a source of pooled and reservoired strength, and a springboard and bridgehead from which to attack problems that are the foundations of national intelligence and well-being.”²⁴

By April 1945, the Council met to discuss its future. Would it be a division of the ALA or would it become a Canadian organization? The provincial association representatives took the question back to their respective associations and returned to the October meeting with the answer: there was unanimous agreement to direct the Canadian Library Council to “proceed with the organization of a Canadian Library Association.”²⁵

Encouraged by the ALA, the CLA was formed in 1946 at the organizing conference held at McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario. At a meeting immediately following the organizing conference, the Canadian Library Council met with the ALA as the Canadian Library Advisory Board (to the ALA), where it was agreed to disband the Board. As well, there was agreement to develop a new affiliation between the two Associations, to continue appointing Canadians to ALA committees, to invite the CLA secretary (i.e., Elizabeth Morton) to continue to serve as a corresponding member of the ALA Editorial Committee, and to continue the Joint Committee of the CLA and the ALA.²⁶ It would seem that the first step, formation of a national organization, was complete.

Focusing on Academic Librarians

Within the CLA, different interests started to emerge and members sorted themselves accordingly, whether by task, by audience, by type of service, or by type of library. Informal interest groups, formal committees and semi-autonomous sections formed to continue working on the details of furthering librarianship,

libraries, and library services in Canada. University and college librarians formed one of these groups. Right from the beginning in 1946, college and university librarians requested the formation of a College and University Libraries Section. Instead they were encouraged by the governing CLA Council to join with the special librarians to form a joint section to be known as the Research Libraries Section.²⁷ It was not a suggestion immediately pursued, for they continued to meet informally as a special interest group until the 1949 conference when, under the leadership of Marjorie Sherlock, the group prepared a petition for the purposes of establishing the Research Libraries Section of the CLA,²⁸ a section subsequently approved at the 1950 conference.²⁹ The Research Libraries Section was active, as evidenced by summaries of their annual reports published in *The Bulletin* and then in the newsletter successor, *Feliciter*, and one might assume the Section served the purposes of the academic librarians as far as dealing with specific issues of library services to researchers. However, it apparently did not address the specific and unique problems of being a librarian in a post-secondary educational system as the college and university librarians continued to meet informally until finally achieving special committee status as the College and University Libraries Committee (CULC) in 1959.³⁰

Meanwhile, the Research Libraries Section was being promoted as the section of choice for special librarians³¹ and, at the Section meeting in 1960, there was a movement to establish closer co-operation with the Special Libraries Association and local chapters of the same.³² By 1962, the Research Libraries Section was considering its future. In doing so, Douglas Lochhead, then chair of the Section, reiterated the original purpose of the Section as being “to act as a clearing house of information between colleges, universities, and research libraries, and to promote the interests of such institutions generally.”³³ He went on to quote from the Section’s Annual Report for 1960-1961:

It is evident that the Section is failing to meet the needs of the libraries which constitute the bulk of its membership. In recent years a committee of university librarians has been formed to deal with their specific problems, and special librarians are calling for greater emphasis on those topics which are of particular interest to their group. Clearly there is a need for a revitalized programme which will satisfy the interests of those libraries for which the Research Section was originally founded.³⁴

In fact, the Research Libraries Section was considering splitting into two new sections, one focused on special libraries and the other on university libraries.³⁵

At the same time, and encouraged to do so by the Research Libraries Section, the CULC once again petitioned to form its own section within the CLA. As stated in the minutes of a meeting held on June 27, 1962, the CULC observed that:

[t]he 1961-1962 report of the Committee on Committees reveals no less than four new committees have been established this year to dissect the

academic library field . . . [C]ommunication between the committees is undirected and tenuous, and none of them has any direct representation of [*sic*] the CLA Executive. Besides these splinter groups exists the Research Libraries Section; but those of you who attended yesterday's meeting of the Section are aware of the feelings expressed at that meeting regarding the needs of college and university libraries.³⁶

Attendees were asked to consider these observations in light of the size of the academic libraries segment within the CLA: the similarities (rather than differences) between college and university libraries, the similarities (rather than differences) between individual academic libraries, the lack of a direct communication channel to the CLA Executive, and the observation that: “[a]lthough comparisons are dangerous, and although the Canadian situation is not entirely similar to that prevailing in the United States, the relative success of the American Library Association's approach to the problems we now face would seem to suggest that the path taken by the A.L.A. is well worth exploring.”³⁷ The minutes go on to recommend a resolution “urging the immediate formation of a College and University Libraries Section of the Canadian Library Association.”³⁸

It is not immediately clear what the path taken by the ALA actually refers to although, given the context (i.e., formation of a section specifically for academic libraries within the CLA), it might be assumed the reference was to the formation of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) as a division within the ALA and the role of the ACRL in addressing the issues of academic librarians. The annual conference in 1960 in Montreal, Quebec was a Joint CLA-ALA affair and the Research Libraries Section, including members representing the CULC, held joint meetings and sessions with the ACRL.³⁹ It is very likely that there was some informal (and undocumented) commiserating and sharing of strategies regarding furthering the issues of academic librarianship in Canada, perhaps including discussions about organizing their own section. The ACRL, in the case of the ALA, was organized as the ALA's first division in 1940 under the inaugural name of the Association of College and Reference Libraries.⁴⁰ In 1958, the ACRL's University Libraries Section established a Committee on Academic Status under the leadership of Arthur McAnally which, in 1959 (only the year before the Joint CLA-ALA Conference), formally endorsed faculty status for academic librarians as a policy and a right, a stand subsequently approved by the ACRL and the ALA.⁴¹

Formation of a College and Universities Section within the CLA required a petition with 50 signatures. Fifty-nine signatures were verified by the CLA Administration. On July 14, 1962, Elizabeth Morton communicated the success of this petition and the agreement by the Council of the CLA to form a college and university library section.⁴² One year later, with the new Section's constitution in place, the CACUL was formed.⁴³

In Search of (Academic) Status

To say that salaries and working conditions and professional status for librarians was a priority for the CLA would be an understatement. At the organizing conference of the CLA, on June 15, 1946, the following resolution passed unanimously, “Resolved that this Conference suggest to the Executive Committee that consideration be given to the setting up of Library Standards for Salaries throughout Canada.”⁴⁴ It wasn’t just about the salaries and working conditions of those already practicing librarianship. One of the main preoccupations for the CLA, in a post-World War II world, was recruitment into the profession of librarianship and a key strategy was to make it an appealing career choice by enhancing salaries and working conditions.

A salary committee was established in the fall of 1946 with Charles D. Kent as Chair. So began a series of surveys that compared the salaries and working conditions of librarians (generally) with the goal of establishing national standards. In that first year, there was no systematic tool for collecting the data; selected libraries, 64 in all, from the public, university, and special sectors, were asked to share their salary schedules as well as any information on pensions, cost-of-living bonuses, qualifications, holidays, sick leave, hours of work per week, and anything else that related to the well-being of librarians.⁴⁵ By the second year, a form had been developed to standardize and make comparable the requested information, but it was clear that getting such information from any library, save for public libraries, was going to be challenging, given that university, special, and legislative libraries were part of the larger parent organization.⁴⁶ Annual surveys of all libraries were conducted until 1951 when it was decided to do them triennially, starting with the 1952-53 survey and to begin, at that time, collecting information on the types of duties associated with the various salaries reported.⁴⁷ Such were the beginnings of work on position classifications and standards, standards which would come to be based on the size of the library.⁴⁸ In a 10-year status report on the activities of the CLA since its founding in 1946, it was noted under Part II, Activity 1 b) *Standards of Librarianship* that:

[t]hese standards are in progress. A standard now exists on salaries for public libraries. A preliminary compilation has been released regarding practices for the welfare of librarians. A classification of positions has been set up and was accepted by the Ottawa Conference. Information has been compiled on the salaries and welfare of university librarians. Preliminary work on the evaluation of library education is in progress.⁴⁹

By 1956, the CLA Committee working on salaries and personnel had split into two, one for public libraries and the other for university libraries. The report of the CLA Committee on University Libraries Salaries and Personnel, reported via *The Bulletin* in 1956, was the first to focus exclusively on university librarians.

Twenty-five libraries had responded in full to the gathering of salary schedules and information on working conditions. Of these, it was noted that only four had reached the public library standard for minimum annual salary of \$3000 per year. More importantly, if some kind of academic status existed, it was usually assigned to the Chief and Assistant librarians; rarely were other professional librarians included.⁵⁰ Meanwhile, the recommendations for standards of employment were published in the May 1956 issue of the *Feliciter*. Of particular relevance, the Committee recommended that:

- “Librarians’ salaries and work year should be commensurate with faculty salaries and work year for positions of similar academic and professional qualifications and responsibilities;”⁵¹
- “Because of their close association with and responsibilities for carrying out the educational programme of the university, professional librarians should be recognized as members of the academic community by receiving faculty status;”⁵²
- Librarians should hold rank “commensurate with their academic and professional qualifications, the responsibilities of the position, and their length of service;”⁵³
- Librarians “after one year of service in a permanent position, should have the same tenure as permanent members of the teaching staff;”⁵⁴ and
- “Sabbatical leaves should be granted to all professional librarians, on the same basis as to members of the teaching staff of equivalent rank in the same institution.”⁵⁵

There is no documented controversy from that time about such ambitions; everyone was in apparent agreement that some form of academic recognition and status for academic librarians was the goal. However, it would be another 10 years, a period which included the establishment of the CACUL in 1963 and its efforts on behalf of university libraries and librarians, to begin the process of transformation from position classification (and salaries) based on duties to a position classification scheme (and commensurate salaries) based on qualifications, ability, and experience, the essence of academic status.

Challenges Within

As the process of transformation began, there were four immediate challenges to be overcome internally within academic librarianship: standards for the library profession as a whole, what realistic standard to aim for within academic libraries, the issue of educational qualifications, and the translation of traditional grades of librarian work to that of faculty rank.

As noted above, the CLA had established standards for salaries in the public library sector, which became the measuring stick for salaries in university libraries. In 1958, the CLA Standards and Salaries Committee reported that academic library salaries were now “generally comparable with those paid in public libraries” but that they had “failed to increase at the same rate as those of their colleagues in the teaching faculties” and that they were “alarmingly low compared to teachers possessing similar academic qualifications.”⁵⁶ Such a low standard represented a serious impediment to making a case to university administrators for improved academic library salaries. The Report continued:

. . . [t]he Committee feels that no significant gain can be made by academic librarians until there is a marked improvement in the salary standards of the library profession as a whole. Increased salaries in the teaching faculties have come about through the necessity of competition with other professions and industry. As long as fully qualified professional librarians continue to make themselves available at reduced rates, therefore, it is likely that academic administrations will accept them at their own valuation.⁵⁷

The second challenge was to decide on a salary standard. In the past, standards for academic librarian salaries were set based on positions, as defined by duties and sorted by the size of the library as categorized in terms of such factors as available budget, volumes held in the collection, number of students, and numbers of professional and clerical staff. Salary standards for teaching faculty, as established by the CAUT, recommended absolute salaries (i.e., not a range) based on faculty rank, a criticism of the CAUT’s standard being that it did not differentiate on the basis of size of institution or library. The second option considered was the Toronto Scale, used at the University of Toronto, which provided a salary range based on faculty rank. The third option was to set a standard based on an approximation of salaries paid across Canadian institutions.⁵⁸ The response from the membership was to adopt the CAUT standard as the goal,⁵⁹ a directive not followed when the following year’s committee chose instead to revise salary standards for that year against the Toronto Scale.⁶⁰

Thirdly, there was the issue of educational equivalencies, the report noting “the possession of bachelor’s degrees and routine professional experience will not be readily accepted as sufficient qualification for positions of professorial rank. Advancement in academic libraries therefore will require higher academic qualifications or superior professional or scholarly achievement”.⁶¹ That said, the following year, Neil Harlow observed that, in some circumstances, faculty status equated to membership in particular faculties regardless of educational credentials, noting that, “in many professional schools in universities, degrees above a Master’s level are still not common, although faculty in these fields are adjudged qualified for positions held,” citing such examples as commerce, social work, law, home eco-

nomics, physical education, and some areas of applied sciences.⁶² Thus, in his opinion, “a shortage of highly qualified men and women with scholarly interests and attainments has been both cause and effect of existing conditions”.⁶³

The final challenge was how to establish reasonable equivalents between how libraries had classified their staff according to titles and duties and size of libraries and the equivalent faculty ranks. The 1958 report noted, “Exact equivalents cannot be made, since the number of grades and the structure of levels in existing hierarchies are different”.⁶⁴ Noting that it was logical to equate the role of chief librarian to that of professor and that of the associate and assistant librarians (all administrative) to that of associate and assistant professor, the report concluded, “This leaves the great majority of library positions, covering several grades, below professorial rank”.⁶⁵

The CACUL, when it came into being in 1963, decided to pursue its own annual salary survey of Canadian academic libraries, timed so the information gathered would inform local budgeting and negotiations.⁶⁶ It also monitored the salaries of teaching faculty through the Dominion Bureau of Statistics,⁶⁷ and, by its second year, had established a committee “to study the question of positions and ranks within the academic library structure”.⁶⁸ By the third year, a Committee on Academic Status was also hard at work on all these issues.⁶⁹

Challenges Without

Any decision on the assignment of academic status to academic librarians rested ultimately with the academic administration. Thus, a major challenge was to convince university administrators that the work of the library, in terms of materials and services, was integral to the teaching and research function and, hence, that professional librarians should be considered academic staff.

When the Constitution of the CACUL passed and was approved by the CLA Council in 1963, the CACUL assumed the leadership role for Canadian academic libraries. One of the first responsibilities transferred to it was the work being done on defining and establishing university library standards and, in short order, it began the process of conducting an annual salary survey of Canadian academic libraries, copies of which were, over the years, circulated to the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) representing university presidents.⁷⁰ The CACUL also established a relationship with the Canadian Universities Foundation (CUF)⁷¹ and, hence, the National Council of Canadian Universities and Colleges (NCCUC), forerunner to the AUCC⁷² and, ultimately, was designated as an advisory committee to the AUCC.⁷³ The CACUL also involved itself in various studies being done on Canadian universities and on the library resources available to support the growth of post-secondary education in the 1960s. It did this by taking action on Edwin Williams’s report on *Resources of Canadian University Libraries for Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences*

(ca.1962), by making submission to the (Vincent) Bladen Commission on *Financing Higher Education in Canada* (ca.1964), and by co-sponsoring, with the AUCC, Robert Downs's report on *Resources of Canadian Academic and Research Libraries* (ca.1967).⁷⁴

The Downs Report, described by Gurdial Pannu in 1968 as a “work of enormous magnitude and undisputed excellence” and “the most comprehensive and detailed library survey done in Canada,”⁷⁵ is of particular relevance. In essence, the Downs Report distilled, for Canadian academic libraries, the impacts on libraries of the growth within universities, especially as it related to a shortage of resources, including librarians. Of note were the first three (of six) recommendations from Section 5 of the “Summary of Recommendations” which, as reprinted in the CACUL newsletter, read as follows:

To help raise the standards for personnel to staff the university and college libraries of Canada, and to correct the gap between supply and demand, the following measures are recommended:

- 1) Recognize professional librarians as key members of the academic community, requiring high standards for their appointment and according them all the perquisites of faculty status.
- 2) The co-operation of the Canadian Association of University Teachers should be enlisted to aid in obtaining academic status for professional librarians.
- 3) Make a clear separation of clerical and professional duties in libraries to free the professional librarians to carry on higher-level tasks; in institutions where the classification does not now exist, create a category of library technical assistant or subprofessional librarian to carry on duties requiring specialized technical training.⁷⁶

No one could say that university administrations were unaware of the case to be made for academic status. At the 1966 annual meeting of the CACUL, even before the Downs Report was published, the CACUL committee on Position Classification and Salary Scales tabled a draft report. In this report, the Committee noted that:

. . . the A.U.C.C.'s reaction to the Bladen Commission's Report—a Commission which received tangible evidence that ‘the library problem’ had now reached critical proportions—may be read as evidence that university authorities are now prepared to spend money on library staff and library resources; are prepared to experiment on new library techniques; and may be prepared to modify organizational patterns within the university, itself a traditionalist and many chambered nautilus. Before doing so, however, they are looking to librarians for direct answers to some very searching questions.⁷⁷

Direct Answers to Very Searching Questions

Such was the perspective with which the Committee on Position Classification and Salary Scales wrote its report. Noting that professional librarians found themselves in an “indefensible limbo between faculty and clerical ranks,”⁷⁸ its report advocated aiming for an ideal by differentiating the roles of librarians vis-à-vis non-librarian staff and articulating the comparability of academic librarians to faculty counterparts for the purpose of furthering the cause of faculty status. That said, the Committee eschewed the adoption of professorial titles preferring to develop general categorical titles corresponding to six grades, equating to the well-known professorial equivalents from Instructor to Dean. These titles were designed to be easily recognizable across institutions, allowing for more descriptive, local titles and position descriptions to be maintained within each category. It was envisaged that these proposed ranks provided an alternative in career growth for librarians, with merit increases provided along horizontal lines and the option to move through the ranks without ever having to seek administrative roles in order to advance, unless the personal choice was made to do so. However, as with titles, so the salary scales did not follow faculty equivalents. Noting the departure of their report from the practice of faculty status as applied in the United States (i.e., identical titles and pay scales as for faculty) the Committee believed that:

. . . with very few exceptions, most Canadian libraries have not reached the size and degree of specialization which would sustain the argument for professorial ranks and pay scales. Nor . . . have Canadian university administrators had sufficient time to accommodate themselves to a principle which has been pressed with growing insistence in the U.S.A. since the early 1920's Hence our recommended [salary] schedule indicates a lag in related salary floors between librarians and teaching staff, a condition which we consider to be necessary during this transitional period.⁷⁹

Although the Committee's report was received at the 1966 annual meeting, it was not approved. After another couple of failed attempts at being approved, it came forward again in 1969, completely revised in terms of grades of professional positions (down to three from the original six) still allowing for local customization if refinement was necessary. This version emphasized that the rank assigned was to be based on qualifications, experience, professional development, and ability. The minimum acceptable qualifications were to be whatever was recognized by the CLA; however, for higher ranks, higher qualifications were to be expected and encouraged after experience was factored in. The revised report noted that professional staff with advanced degrees had an advantage, but noted that a doctoral degree was not to be considered mandatory at any level. The general expectations of each grade were articulated with the repeated reminder that grades assigned were

independent of titles and duties.⁸⁰ No salary scales were included in this revised version, which finally passed at the 1969 annual meeting.⁸¹ Still one might wonder if the idea of salaries that lagged behind those of faculty, as originally proposed, informed the fact that, today, many of the academic librarian scales in Canadian university libraries fall below those of their comparable faculty rank.

The CACUL Committee on Academic Status had been charged to work with the Committee on Position Classification and Salary Scales but to focus less on salaries and classifications and more on the other attributes of academic status, namely academic freedom and tenure, sabbaticals, research and travel grants, participation in governance, and the merits of working with faculty associations and the CAUT.⁸² It had been at work since 1966, having provided a progress report at the 1967 annual meeting of the CACUL.⁸³ At the 1968 meeting, the Committee on Academic Status circulated three papers for discussion, the first and most important of these being a draft document entitled, *Principles of Academic Status in Canadian University Libraries*.⁸⁴ The second document was a sample brief clarifying why librarians should have academic status and acknowledging that, despite some movement in this direction, missing still were the pieces of status, salary, research, tenure, sabbaticals, and academic freedom.⁸⁵ The third and final document provided the results of a survey of 25 Canadian university libraries demonstrating that, at the time, only one institution considered its librarians to have faculty status, while 14 provided some form of academic status, and another 10 provided no formal status at all.⁸⁶ Interestingly, a survey done a few years earlier by the University of Manitoba regarding the pervasiveness of academic status for librarians and reported on at the 1965 annual meeting of the CACUL found, “in general, that the old established libraries tended to lack a policy [with respect to academic status] and eschew change in this field; new libraries were looking for a policy, while small, remote colleges generally accorded faculty status to their librarians.”⁸⁷

As noted, the *Principles* document proved to be the most important. This document defined academic status, as “the possession of some, but not all, of the usual faculty privileges, with definite classification as academic, but always without faculty rank.”⁸⁸ The document made explicit that an advanced professional degree from an accredited library school was the appropriate minimum academic qualification. It went on to delineate the obligations of the librarians holding academic status: to be governed in the same way as faculty within their own institution were governed; to accept the 11-month work year, given that librarianship was a service-oriented profession; and to be involved in continuing education, in research and publishing, and in university committee work. Library administrators also had obligations: to share governance, to encourage research in library science by allowing time to do so, to recognize and support professional activities with time and travel allowances, and to provide the same opportunities for sabbaticals or study leaves as provided for faculty. And finally, in the case of university administrations, librarians were to have academic freedom as faculty

did, to be eligible for tenure on the same basis as faculty, to be represented by the faculty association in matters relating to salary, to have some form of faculty library committee as advisory on academic policy, to be judged using comparable criteria to those used by faculty, and they were to have a contract of employment similar to that for teaching faculty.⁸⁹

The *Principles* document was debated at the 1968 annual meeting, revised and circulated for comment in January 1969,⁹⁰ revised and circulated for comment again in May 1969,⁹¹ and then revised from the floor of the annual meeting in June 1969.⁹² Changes in the final version were subtle, but important. Basic required qualifications referenced the expectations of the CLA, the organization working on professional credentials, although it was acknowledged that advanced degrees might be required, depending on the position. Obligations for librarians were altered to remove the requirement to accept the standards, customs, and regulation of faculty, instead advising librarians to choose to accept them whenever such acceptance was appropriate. As well, there was recognition that, while an 11-month work year may well be the case, “this period of employment carries with it a usually unsurmountable [*sic*] obstacle to research and productive scholarship.”⁹³ And, finally, the revisions allowed that librarians themselves would decide whether faculty associations would represent them. The obligations of library administrations were altered to clarify that they should consider implementing a committee system in order to involve librarians in library governance. Library administrations were also obligated to advocate to university administration on behalf of librarians for the same privileges and benefits accorded faculty. Finally, university administrations were obliged to evaluate, promote, appoint, and grant tenure to librarians according to criteria accepted in academic librarianship and, in the case of appointment, using the same processes as used for faculty.⁹⁴ As with the *Position Classification* document, the *Principles* document was accepted as policy at the 1969 annual meeting.⁹⁵

The Role of the CAUT

The hard work done, the CACUL Committee on Academic Status was reconstituted with direction “[t]o collect information on the status of librarians in Canadian College and University Libraries.”⁹⁶ As reported at the 1971 annual meeting, nothing much happened that first year after the passage of the *Principles* document. As described above, there had been quite a push in the previous year to get the document revised and revised again, with final revisions being made on the floor of the CACUL’s 1969 annual meeting; perhaps those most involved needed a bit of break. However, the plan was to conduct a survey of Canadian academic libraries to determine “how the existing situation in academic libraries compared with the *Statement of Principles on Academic Status*,” with a view to disseminating the results so local librarians could compare situations.⁹⁷ As Donald Redmond,

President of the CACUL for 1969-1970, observed, "Implementation of [academic status] is for the largest part still wishful thinking. Particularly in AUCC it is painfully obvious that librarians are third-class citizens in our universities, ranking somewhere behind students (who complain that they are treated as second-class citizens) and above campus police."⁹⁸

The proposed survey was completed in time for the 1971 annual meeting and the situation did indeed look bleak. Fifty-eight surveys were sent out to the libraries of the AUCC institutions and 48 were returned. It was noted that while the survey had been intended to get a sense of how the principles of academic status for librarians were being applied in institutions relative to the benefits accruing to faculty, little was known about faculty benefits in each institution, making the results more of a comparison between libraries than between librarians and faculty.⁹⁹

Of the responses, the Committee was heartened to learn that the majority of institutions provided for board supported appointments although disappointed that the largest libraries did not make board supported appointments or did so only for senior staff. A majority of institutions provided about a month of vacation time and, while results showed that most librarians received fringe benefits similar to those provided to faculty members, the 12 dissenting responses to this question were noted by the Committee. Most respondents suggested that study leaves were supported, at least technically; however, the Committee's sense was that affirmative responses were only tentative, given that this benefit had not yet been tested in practice. There was widespread financial support for librarians to attend conferences with about half of the respondents funding to varying degrees attendance at learned conferences in particular, interpreted by the Committee as acknowledgment of the relationship of librarians to the wider academic community. In a majority of institutions, librarians were eligible for membership in the faculty associations but the Committee expressed concern for those librarians without such eligibility.¹⁰⁰

It was a minority of institutions that provided librarians with tenure, sabbaticals, access to research grants, participation in university committees, direct representation on the academic senate, or a role within the governance structure of the faculties themselves. Only one library reported that librarians shared faculty titles, which the Committee did not find surprising, given that during the drafting of the *Principles* document, there was little-to-no support for faculty titles. Finally, on the question about the relationship between librarians' salaries and those of the teaching staff, responses indicated some relationship, but only three respondents specified a formal connection between the two with the Committee noting, "In most instances where specific salary relationships are given, [l]ibrarians' salaries are clearly well behind teaching faculty."¹⁰¹

What to do, what to do? At the 1971 annual meeting, it was recommended that, "in the matter of academic status, an approach be made to [the] AUCC and [the] CAUT with the intention of explaining [the] CACUL's objectives in this

regard.”¹⁰² It is unclear whether this recommendation was pursued immediately and it is especially unclear, when it came to the AUCC, what their response might have been.

On the other hand, as Calvin Evans described events, the CAUT made its own overtures to academic librarians by approving a recommendation of its Membership Committee encouraging local faculty associations to extend membership to those librarians wishing to join. In response, the CACUL membership, at their 1974 annual meeting, approved a motion to publicly endorse the CAUT recommendation and encourage librarians to pursue faculty association membership. That fall, representatives of the two organizations met to discuss the possibility of forming a joint task force on academic status for librarians. The CAUT was decidedly receptive to the invitation extended by the CACUL to collaborate on the further articulation of academic status and suggested the terms of reference be expanded to examine all aspects of academic status: appointments, renewal, dismissal, tenure, academic freedom, salaries and benefits, governance, and membership in faculty associations.¹⁰³ The outcome of this joint task force was the first draft of the *Guidelines on Academic Status for Professional University Librarians*, approved in principle by both bodies in 1975, revised jointly over the next two years, and approved by both organizations in 1977.¹⁰⁴

Evans, describing the formation of the joint task force, observed that the “CAUT was perhaps bolder in its approach than some librarians expected” and that “there were a few librarians who looked for nothing more than a motherhood statement.”¹⁰⁵ In fact, the CAUT had its reasons for being so bold: the rise of the labour movement, the rise of collective bargaining, and their own librarian-members’ demands for representation.¹⁰⁶

In the Context of the Labour Movement

We will never know to what extent academic status for librarians would have evolved and been accepted by university administrations if the labour movement and the concept of collective bargaining had not invaded the mindset of the Canadian public-sector, including universities, something almost unheard of prior to 1965. As described by Craig Heron in his book, *The Canadian Labour Movement: A Short History*, prior to the 1960s, employees in the public sector were, in most cases, denied the right to join unions or bargain collectively, but this was not seen as an issue. Public sector employees generally had better job security, higher salaries, and greater respectability than did most other workers and had organized themselves into departmental associations and, ultimately, federations. These federations would meet with management counterparts to discuss issues and make recommendations on working matters to government, recommendations frequently ignored. Heron noted, however, that by the 1960s, discontent with the way things were going was not readily curbed through consultative struc-

tures. Wages in the unionized private sector had begun to outstrip public-sector wages and the workplace was quickly becoming impersonal and bureaucratic with the imposition of capitalist principles to improve efficiencies. Organizational associations took on the characteristics of unions and started demanding collective bargaining rights and, by 1975, all provincial employees were granted some form of these rights.¹⁰⁷

Professors, too, were caught up in the social and economic conditions of the times, seeing their relative prestige erode and respect for their judgment diminish in the context of rigid and bureaucratic management styles.¹⁰⁸ Instead of joining unions, however, many turned their local faculty associations into certified bargaining units and to the task of bargaining collective agreements, while others remained uncertified, by choice or by provincial legislation,¹⁰⁹ and chose (or not) to negotiate their own versions of what were essentially collective agreements. The movement spread rapidly across university campuses. In the face of declining economic status and recognition, collective bargaining strengthened salary negotiations, helped to secure shared power, and, in light of difficulty executing grievance procedures, allowed negotiation of detailed procedures grounded in law and with a final resolution of appeals.¹¹⁰

Librarians were thrown into this academic labour confusion, landing in, as characterized by Julie Schroeder, “the gap between faculty members and support staff.”¹¹¹ According to Schroeder, it was up to the provincial labour relations boards to determine what were appropriate bargaining units for various groups of employees on university campuses, the determination of “appropriate” being based upon whether a community of interest existed among a given group of employees such as “to make it appropriate that they all have their terms and conditions of employment negotiated at one time by one bargaining agent.”¹¹² Labour boards were concerned about fragmentation and appeared to favour larger, more inclusive units, but key among the considerations were not only the desires of the employees, management, and unions concerned but also agreement among the parties. Thus, the matter of whether the university already recognized the academic status of librarians influenced the assignment of librarians to the same bargaining unit as faculty. In some cases, such as at the University of Manitoba, inclusion of librarians into that faculty association for the purposes of collective bargaining was automatic because librarians were eligible to join the association; if the University had objected, the Manitoba Labour Relations Board would have had to rule. In other cases, such as that of St. Mary’s University where librarians were not recognized as having academic status, the Nova Scotia Labour Relations Board excluded librarians from joining the same bargaining unit as faculty because the University objected to their inclusion (although it ultimately allowed the faculty association to be certified as the bargaining agent for librarians as a separate unit). As Schroeder pointed out, academic librarians could not assume they would be included in the faculty unit; it was up to them to convince labour

boards of their community of interest.¹¹³ Those librarians, early in the process of finding their community of interest, were left on their own, armed only perhaps with the *Principles* document and a belief that their work was best aligned with that of faculty. However, once defined, the *Guidelines* served as “formal notice to the university community that faculty and librarians did, indeed share a community of interest and would work together to defend it.”¹¹⁴

Not Everyone Agreed

The idea of academic status had long been in the minds of academic librarians, but with the *Principles* document, the idea started to inform Canadian academic librarianship. The *Guidelines* gave the idea substance and meaning; collective bargaining made it a reality.

Writing in response to the 1968 draft of the *Principles* document, Don White noted that the only pieces, in his opinion, that made this document specific to academic librarians was reference to academic freedom and tenure, hence scholarship. He challenged the practicality of these principles, given the realities of academic librarianship, expressing his opinion thus:

As our libraries increase in size and complexity, we must recognize that we are channeling our efforts more and more into dealing with administrative problems and less and less into actively engaging in scholarship Our present attitude of subtle ambivalence towards scholarship and administration is only one of the larger issues illustrating the gulf between our avowed aims and behaviour ‘on the job.’ As long as these issues go unresolved, one must question our faith in the inviolability of academic status. For most librarians in universities at present, academic status with tenure represents only a festoon for our façade of principles and a less-than-honest link with teachers and researchers.¹¹⁵

Five years later, before the *Guidelines* were drafted but as collective bargaining was forcing the issue, Elizabeth Ward, one of six librarians seeking their community of interest at St. Mary’s University, advocated for a union that retained “the unique identity of librarians,” even if such a union was part of the CAUT¹¹⁶ and reminded librarians “of the necessity of promoting the form of academic status, not necessarily faculty status, that is best suited to the needs and aspirations of the library professional.”¹¹⁷ Ruth Hafter, University Librarian at St. Mary’s University, concurred, noting, “academic status cannot be classed as a ‘motherhood’ issue because a number of prominent university librarians oppose it, a substantial proportion of University administrators ignore it, and many non-University librarians are both puzzled and suspicious of the concept.”¹¹⁸ Although she agreed that tenure (and, by extension, academic freedom), sabbaticals and study leaves, and committee work were beneficial to librarians (and the library), she disagreed that there was any common interest when it came to wages, evaluation of work,

or grounds for promotion. She suggested that librarians would be better served by forming a provincial union inclusive of all librarians with a form of librarian status akin to academic status but focused on conditions of work and promotion specific to the profession.¹¹⁹

Donald Savage, then-Executive Director of the CAUT, agreed with these differences. He acknowledged both that the nature of librarian work was indeed different from faculty work, and that the professional service and administrative components did pose problems in achieving academic status. However, he did not see the issue as insurmountable. He felt it would require working together with library administrators to set workloads and schedules consistent with librarianship and librarian roles within the university and stated that “[a]cademic status does not require absolute identity with teaching faculty.”¹²⁰

Of course, part of the workload issue was the expectation that librarians have an 11-month work year which, as previously noted, the *Principles* document acknowledged as an obstacle to research and productive scholarship,¹²¹ research and scholarship being among the criteria named in the *Guidelines* for evaluation purposes. John Wilkinson (final Chair of the CLA College and University Libraries Committee in 1963) noted, “Librarians should *not* be expected to fill their one-month’s holiday with ‘research and writing’ (few faculty would); but they should be prepared to spend many an evening and weekend in productive study over and above their ‘professional performance’.”¹²² Savage reiterated this statement when he said, “there must be real equivalence [with respect to scholarly activity]. Those librarians who opt to be *de facto* clerical staff working nine to five without other responsibilities and commitments will simply not achieve equal contractual terms with faculty.”¹²³ However, he sympathized with librarians whose library administrators saw scholarship as something to be accomplished in addition to existing responsibilities, and advocated for the incorporation of release time into the librarians’ schedules (in addition to sabbaticals), citing the situation at Laurentian University as a case in point.¹²⁴ As reported by Joan Mount in 1978, librarians at Laurentian University had been recognized, since 1976, as having faculty status with the same ranks, salary scales, and expectations as faculty. Although parallels in workload components had been negotiated, things came to a head when, during a promotion hearing, administrative responsibilities (deemed to be the parallel of graduate student supervision for the faculty) were not recognized and the lack of comparable scholarly output was. As Mount stated, “it was fruitless to argue that personnel resources in the library were stretched to the extent that librarians could not spare substantial amounts of time for research without jeopardizing either their traditional professional service or their family life.”¹²⁵ This was an important observation in the context of librarianship being a feminized profession and women’s domestic roles at the time vis-à-vis the family unit. Unfortunately, things have not improved much. In a study conducted in 2006, David Fox found that these year-round schedules continue to preclude “engagement in sustained,

meaningful scholarship,”¹²⁶ noting that it was clear from written comments that, “it is precisely during the ‘extended work-week’—during evenings and weekends—that many university librarians make time for their research.”¹²⁷

The experience of Laurentian University was also a good lesson in the definition of what constituted scholarship. As noted, Laurentian University librarians had faculty (not academic) status and, as such, when the time came to evaluate librarians for the purposes of promotion, the Promotions Committee took the stand that librarians were expected “to research and publish like the teaching faculty, specifically like those in the humanities stream.”¹²⁸ Savage took a broader perspective on this particular matter, noting that, “it is important in considering both the weight and the definition of criteria that inappropriate faculty models not be adopted on the evaluation process.”¹²⁹ He recognized that scholarly activities take many forms given the discipline and can differ from the traditional perspective of published research but he did insist that, whatever constituted scholarship for librarians, there must be real equivalence.¹³⁰ This was, in fact, how the situation at Laurentian was resolved. When the faculty association certified, some long standing issues with the concept of research in other non-traditional areas surfaced. The School of Nursing, for example, commented, “We tend to try and call everything research because we have come to value research. Rather, we should be valuing scholarly activity of which research is one.”¹³¹ As a result, a longer statement on scholarly activity was negotiated that was more beneficial and inclusive of the activities of all types of faculty¹³² but, as David Fox found, it is still the more traditional forms of scholarship that are perceived as important for tenure and promotion.¹³³

In an article written after the acceptance of both the *Positions Classification* and the *Principles* documents in 1969, Stephen Horn pointed out that the new classification structures, as they were described in the *Position Classifications* document, were in conflict with the *Principles* document, in that in the description of the different ranks, there remained an implicit hierarchy of authority.¹³⁴ Indeed, the *Principles* document was silent on the inclusion of librarians in any governance model but the *Guidelines* were not. The *Guidelines* made explicit the expectation that librarians would be eligible for participation in governance throughout the university, but especially in the libraries.¹³⁵ This caught the attention of Margaret Beckman, someone who had been active in the CACUL and on the Committee on Academic Status and who was now writing as the Chief Librarian at the University of Guelph. She argued that a library council—composed of professional librarians, accountable to the academic senate, responsible for the policies and procedures of the library, and proposed as a means to counter authoritarian and bureaucratic decision-making—was unworkable in a library situation. She proposed instead a consultative management model that sought the advice of librarians but left the decisions to the library director (the director being accountable to the president, or the board, or the senate but, nonetheless, the final authority

in the library).¹³⁶ Savage replied to Beckman in a letter published the following September:

[T]he crucial difference between Ms. Beckman and the CAUT/CACUL proposal seems to be whether or not a management team headed by the Chief Librarian develops these proposals and then consults the librarians thereby, in my opinion, ensuring that consultation will only result in marginal changes or whether the original team is composed both of management and of the librarians or their elected representatives. It seems generally agreed at the moment that evaluation schemes and similar devices are much more likely to succeed when self-created than where they are laid down from on high even if opinions are asked for first If German factory workers can sit on the boards of their companies, why cannot the elected representatives of the librarians sit on the management committee of the library?¹³⁷

On the flip side, Savage admonished librarians that it was “unreasonable to demand academic status and then refuse the responsibilities of that status by failure to create . . . participatory governing structures within the library. Those who refuse to participate have no moral right to complain about tyranny in the library.”¹³⁸ In 2008 and in the context of contemplating the formation of a local library council, this author undertook a quick and informal survey of Canadian university libraries to determine how prevalent such bodies were and to learn from other libraries about structures and pitfalls. It was interesting to find out that only about 50% of the libraries (13 of 25 responses) had something akin to a library or management council. Most of those reporting a library council or similar body included all academic librarians and most (but not all) of these bodies reported to the equivalent of an academic senate. There were mixed reviews about the effectiveness of these bodies but five respondents perceived their council to be ineffective or not as effective as it could be, the main reason being attributed to the relationship of the council to the university (or chief) librarian.¹³⁹

William Watson, then-Chief Librarian at the University of Waterloo, was skeptical of the need for librarians to have academic status. In a presentation to the Ontario Association of College and University Libraries made after the acceptance of the *Principles* document in 1969, he asserted that “[a]cademic librarians would be well to pay less attention to status and its perquisites, and more to professional responsibilities.”¹⁴⁰ He felt that the pay was sufficient for the qualifications of the day and the jobs plentiful (although it is worthwhile remembering that Watson’s presentation was made at the close of the 1960s as growth was starting to level off and labour unrest on university campuses was starting to ramp up). He felt the work year for librarians was appropriate for the work associated with librarianship. He agreed with the perspective that tenure was protection for those delivering mediocre results. He felt that librarians already had access to

study leaves and sabbaticals by making proposals to their library administrators, and that those benefits did not need to be codified. He believed librarians' inclusion in university governance was already possible. He identified the desire for academic status as being an issue of public esteem and concluded, as he had begun, that the professionalism to be strived for by librarians was one of focusing on meeting users' needs.¹⁴¹ What Watson didn't quite understand, given, no doubt, that he was a library administrator and on the granting, rather than the receiving, end of requests, was that there was no due process at the time for accessing these benefits, such access being contingent on the benevolence of the library administrator.

Watson was correct in concluding that academic status was an issue of public esteem. As Savage noted, "academic status is not easily defined since it is a psychological and political matter as well as a question of contractual terms In North America, status is frequently measured by pay. If professional librarians were to be paid as support staff, they would be treated as support staff. If they were paid salaries similar to faculty, they would be treated equally as professionals."¹⁴² Of course, elevating the status, the 'public esteem,' for librarianship, was indeed the objective from the beginning of the CLA in 1946. It was a strategy purposefully pursued to attract people into the profession generally and into academic librarianship specifically during a time of rapid growth and expansion when there were not enough librarians, something perhaps forgotten in the economic and social contractions of the 1970s.

The Current Status of Academic Status

Key points outlined in the *Guidelines* as they were originally published in 1979 included: types of appointments comparable to faculty; ranks and salary floors comparable to faculty; promotion through the ranks based on criteria determined by librarians but reflective of professional performance, professional and academic service and scholarly activities; due process when dealing with personnel issues; benefits and leaves comparable to those available to faculty; involvement in library and university governance; tenure; academic freedom; and collective bargaining done by faculty associations.¹⁴³ In 1986, the CAUT assumed responsibility for monitoring the state of academic status for librarians. The most recent of these biennial surveys was released in 2012 and, with 63 of 67 universities responding to the survey, it provides the best summary of academic status available. Although the responses might be informed by the wording and interpretation of the survey questions, taken at face value, it is clear from this 2012 survey that developing consistency in the definition of academic status for librarians continues to be a work in progress.

Today, librarians in approximately 85% of the Canadian universities that are members of the CAUT, have found their community of interest with their faculty

colleagues, defined as being represented by their faculty associations and working under collective agreements that accord with some, if not all, of the *Guidelines*. In fewer than half is there total compliance with the *Guidelines* and even these have local interpretations.¹⁴⁴

Thirty years ago, Savage noted: “The manner and extent to which [academic status], in all of its components, has been achieved by librarians at Canadian universities has been influenced by the method of governance and type of administration at each institution.”¹⁴⁵ Indeed, regardless of institution, this influence means that the same terms and conditions of employment that faculty members might take for granted are things that librarians cannot assume and will need to read carefully in any collective agreement.

The CAUT Survey outlines some of the more blatant variations. Librarians are not always participants in university governance structures, either directly or through eligibility as members of the academic staff, nor, in some cases, are they necessarily expected to be involved. Librarians do not always hold the majority of seats on their appointment and review committees. Librarians may not always have the same number of career ranks to progress through as do faculty members. The salary floors of the librarian ranks may not always be on par with those of the faculty ranks. Engagement in scholarly activity and research may not always be an obligation, or even an expectation, of employment. Time to engage in scholarly activity and research, in terms of annual release time available or sabbatical leaves to be applied for, may not always be a valid expectation for a librarian to have. Yes, the majority of Canadian universities offer the majority of attributes considered by the *Guidelines* to constitute academic status for Canadian academic librarians but, according to the CAUT Survey, it is a rare institution that offers all of these without some sort of footnote qualification.¹⁴⁶

Conclusion

It has been almost 35 years since the approval of the *Guidelines* by the CAUT and the CACUL. The librarian activists of that era did tremendous service getting academic librarians recognized for their contributions to the academic mission of universities. Since then, it has fallen to academic librarians within institutions to shape the local interpretation of academic status, a job, for the most part, well done. That said, there is a sense that the original goal of academic status is yet to be achieved and will remain so until there is commonality in both the expression and experience of academic status, both within institutions with respect to faculty colleagues and across institutions with respect to academic librarian colleagues. Only then will academic librarians, as a whole, have achieved true academic status.

Bibliography

- “ACRL History.” American Library Association, <http://www.ala.org/acrl/aboutacrl/history/history>.
- Appelt, D. C. “From the President of CACUL: Executive Meeting [25 October 1966].” *CACUL Newsletter*, no. 7-8 (1967): 13-15.
- “Association of College and Research Libraries Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Libraries.” American Library Association, <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/jointstatementfaculty>.
- Association of College and Research Libraries, University Libraries Section, Committee on Academic Status. “Status of College and University Librarians.” *College & Research Libraries* 20, no. 5 (September 1959): 399-400.
- Beckman, Margaret. “Library Governance.” *CAUT Bulletin* 24, no. 5 (March 1976): 22.
- Bell, I. F. “President’s Mid-Year Report.” *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 5 (1970): 457-64.
- Blackburn, Robert. “Report of the President.” *CACUL Newsletter* no. 1 (1963): 3-4.
- Bletcher, Hazel. “On the Formation of a Canadian Library Association: Paper Given before the Alberta Library Association.” *Canadian Library Council Bulletin* 2, no. 2 (December 1945): 19.
- CACUL Committee on Academic Status. “Principles of Academic Status in Canadian University Libraries: Draft Report [24 June 1968].” *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 1 (1969): 12-13.
- . “Principles of Academic Status in Canadian University Libraries: Revised Draft May 1969.” *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 2 (1969): 93-94.
- Canadian Association of College and University Libraries. “Annual General Meeting [Minutes, 10 June 1969].” *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 4 (1970): 397-402.
- . “Annual Meeting 1967 [Minutes, 17 June 1967].” *CACUL Newsletter*, no. 9 (1967): 16-20.
- . “Annual Meeting and Workshop - 1965.” *CACUL Newsletter* no. 6 (1966): 18-21.
- . “Annual Meeting and Workshop, Halifax: Report from the Secretary [9 June 1964].” *CACUL Newsletter* no. 3 (1964): 14-16.
- . “CACUL Annual Meeting [Draft Minutes, 1971].” *CACUL Newsletter* 3, no. 1 (1971): 12-16.

- . “Committee on Academic Status: Terms of Reference.” *CACUL Newsletter* no. 9 (1967): 30.
- . “General Meeting [Minutes, 26 June 1963].” *CACUL Newsletter* no. 2 (1964).
- . “Minutes of the CACUL Annual General Meeting at Hamilton, Ontario [24 June 1970].” *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 6 (1971): 588-92.
- . *Position Classification and Principles of Academic Status in Canadian University Libraries*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Library Association, 1969.
- Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, Academic Status of Librarians [Committee]. “Reports of Committees: Academic Status of Librarians.” *CACUL Newsletter* no. 7-8 (1967): 5.
- Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, and Canadian Association of University Teachers. *Guidelines on Academic Status for University Librarians*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Library Association, 1979.
- Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, Committee on Academic Status. “CACUL Committee on Academic Status: Report, June, 1968.” *CACUL Newsletter* no. 10 (1968): 9-15.
- Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, Salary and Budget Survey Committee. “Salary and Budget Survey.” *CACUL Newsletter* no. 7-8 (1967): 9.
- Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, Salary Survey Committee. “Report of the CACUL Salary Survey Committee.” *CACUL Newsletter* no. 2 (1964): 9.
- Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, Committee on Academic Status. “Committee on Academic Status Report.” *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 6 (1971): 609-24.
- Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, Position Classification & Salary Scales. “A Draft Report on Position Classifications and Salary Scales in Canadian Academic Libraries.” Calgary, Alberta: CACUL, 1966.
- Canadian Association of University Teachers. “Librarian Salary Survey and Academic Status Survey. Part 1: Salaries, Salary Scales and Academic Status.” Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2012.
- Canadian Library Association. “Annual General Meeting, 1958: Standards and Salaries.” *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 15, no. 2 (September 1958): 66-75.
- . “Annual Meeting: Reports of Meetings, Colleges and University Librarians.” *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 6, no. 2 (1949): 101.

- . “Annual Reports of Officials, Projects, Sections, Committees for 1959-1960.” *Feliciter* 5, no. 9 (Part 2) (May 1960): 1-50.
- . “Association Activities.” *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 11, no. 6 (1955): 273-78.
- . “The CLA-ACB Committees 1960-1967: College and University Libraries Committee.” *Canadian Library: the Bulletin of the Canadian Library Association - le Bulletin de l'Association canadienne des Bibliothèques* 24, no. 6 (May 1968): 590-629.
- . “Committees: 1 September 1955 [to] 31 August 1960.” *Canadian Library: the Bulletin of the Canadian Library Association - le Bulletin de l'Association canadienne des Bibliothèques* 17, no. 6 (May 1961 1961): 331-81.
- . “Conference Reports: Summary Reports of Sections, Research Libraries.” *Canadian Library* 17, no. 3 (November 1960): 137-50.
- . “From Council to Association.” *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 3, no. 1 (October 1946).
- . “Library Associations of Canada, 1900-1946.” *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 11, no. 6 (1955): 270-72.
- . “Library Standards for Salaries.” *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 3, no. 1 (October 1946): 19-20.
- Canadian Library Association, College and University Libraries Committee. Canadian Library Association Papers. Library and Archives Canada.
- Canadian Library Association, Committee on Salaries. “Report of the Committee on Salaries, 1947-1948.” *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 5, no. 1 (July 1948): 46-49.
- . Canadian Library Association Papers. Library and Archives Canada.
- Canadian Library Association, Committee on University Libraries Salaries and Personnel. “CLA-ABC Committee on University Libraries Salaries and Personnel: Summary of Replies to Questionnaires, 1955 and 1956.” *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 12, no. 6 (1956): 225-31.
- Canadian Library Association, Committee on University Salaries and Personnel. “Salaries and Personnel (University Libraries).” *Feliciter* 1, no. 3 (May 1956): 27-42.
- Canadian Library Association, Salaries and Personnel Committee. “Annual General Meeting: Summary Reports of Committees, Salaries and Personnel Committee.” *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 10, no. 7 (June 1954): xvi-xvii.

- Canadian Library Association, Salaries Committee. "Annual General Meeting of the Corporation: Committee Proceedings, Salaries Committee." *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 9, no. 2 (1952): 50-51.
- Canadian Library Association, Standards and Salaries Committee (University and College Libraries). "Sub-Committee on Standards and Salaries (University and College Libraries)." *Feliciter* 4, no. 10 (June-July 1959): 57-59.
- Canadian Library Association, Standards and Salaries Committee (University Libraries). "Report of the Standards and Salaries Committee (University Libraries)." *Feliciter* 3, no. 11-12 (July-August 1958): 1-4.
- Commission of Inquiry. *Libraries in Canada: A Study of Library Conditions and Needs*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association, 1933.
- Dominion Bureau of Statistics. "DBS Daily Bulletin: Thursday, December 3, 1964." *CACUL Newsletter* no. 3 (1964): 5.
- Donnelly, F. Dolores. "The National Library in the Library Community: Current Developments and Trends." *Archivaria* 15 (Winter 1982-1983): 96-111.
- Downs, Robert B. "Resources of Canadian Academic and Research Libraries: Summary of Recommendations." *CACUL Newsletter* no. 10 (1968): 40-47.
- Evans, Calvin D. "Librarians and CAUT: Historical Overview and Future Directions." *CAUT Bulletin* 24, no. 5 (March 1976): 12-13.
- Fowlie, Les. "The National Conference of Canadian Universities and Colleges and the Canadian Universities Foundation." *Canadian Library* 19, no. 5 (1963): 351-52.
- Fox, David. "Finding Time for Scholarship: A Survey of Canadian Research University Librarians." *portal: Libraries & the Academy* 7, no. 4 (October 2007): 451-62.
- . "The Scholarship of Canadian Research Librarians." *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library & Information Practice & Research* 2, no. 2 (2007): 1-25.
- Hafter, Ruth. "Academic Status - the Wrong Name, the Wrong Game." *APLA Bulletin* 39, no. 1 (Spring 1975): 9-12.
- Heron, Craig. *The Canadian Labour Movement: A Short History*. 3rd ed. Toronto, ON: James Lorimer & Company Ltd., Publishers, 2012.
- Horn, Steven. "The Professional Ladder." *Canadian Library Journal* 27, no. 3 (May-June 1970): 200-01.
- Hulse, Elizabeth. *The Morton Years: The Canadian Library Association, 1946-1971*. Toronto, ON: Ex Libris Association, 1995.

- Hunt, Edna. "Why Join the Research Libraries Section of CLA?" *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 16, no. 3 (November 1959): 148-50.
- Jacobs, Leona M. "Library Councils in Canadian Academic Libraries: A Summary of Responses." University of Lethbridge, 2008, <http://www.uleth.ca/dspace/handle/10133/564>.
- Jenkins, Kathleen. "Review of the Association's Constitutional Structure, Traditions, Inter-Relations with Sections and Committees, with Critical Comment." *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 7, no. 3 (November 1950): 91-96.
- Kroll, Susan, ed. *Academic Status: Statements and Resources*. Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1994.
- Lewis, Doris E. "CACUL as of October 1964: Excerpts from CACUL President's Report to the Fall Meeting of the Canadian Library Association." *CACUL Newsletter* no. 3 (1964): 3-4.
- . "Report of the President." *CACUL Newsletter* no. 4 (1965): 3-4.
- Lochhead, Douglas G. "The Research Libraries Section and the Canadian Library Inquiry." *Canadian Library: the Bulletin of the Canadian Library Association - le Bulletin de l'Association canadienne des Bibliothèques* 18, no. 6 (May 1962): 258-61.
- McAnally, Arthur M. "Status of the University Librarian in the Academic Community." In *Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A History and Policy Statements*, 1-30. Chicago: American Library Association, 1975.
- Morton, Elizabeth Homer. Canadian Library Association Papers. Library and Archives Canada.
- . "These Years of the CLA-ACB: 1955-1960." *Canadian Library: the Bulletin of the Canadian Library Association - le Bulletin de l'Association canadienne des Bibliothèques* 17, no. 6 (May 1961): 294-395.
- . "Winnipeg Conference." *Canadian Library: the Bulletin of the Canadian Library Association - le Bulletin de l'Association canadienne des Bibliothèques* 20, no. 2 (September 1963): 49-58.
- Mount, Joan. "Faculty Status at Laurentian—Two Years Later." *Canadian Library Journal* 35, no. 6 (December 1978): 427-31.
- News-Herald (Vancouver). "The Canadian Library Council." *Canadian Library Council Bulletin* 1, no. 2 (December 1944): 17.
- Pannu, Gurdial S. "The Downs' Survey: A Summary and a Review." *Canadian Library* 24, no. 6 (May 1968): 638-41.
- Post-Secondary Learning Act*, RSA 2003, c. P-19.5, http://www.qp.alberta.ca/574.cfm?page=p19p5.cfm&leg_type=Acts&isbncln=9780779737932.

- Redmond, Donald. "Annual Report of the President to CACUL-ACBCU for 1969-1970." *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 6 (1971): 593-94.
- Savage, Donald C. "73-74 Reports: Report from the Executive Secretary." *CAUT Bulletin* 22, no. 6 (1974): 24-27.
- . "A Historical Overview of Academic Status for Librarians." *Canadian Library Journal* 39, no. 5 (October 1982): 287-91.
- . "Letters: Library Governance." *CAUT Bulletin* 25, no. 1 (September 1976): 14.
- Schmidt, C. James. Introduction to *Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A History and Policy Statements*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association, 1975.
- Schroeder, Julie. "The Bargaining Unit for the Academic Librarian." *Canadian Library Journal* 32, no. 6 (December 1975): 463-73.
- Thomson, Ashley. "Five Years Later: Faculty Status at Laurentian." *Canadian Library Journal* 38, no. 4 (August 1981): 221-24.
- Ward, Elizabeth. "The Community of Interest and Academic Status." *Canadian Library Journal* 31, no. 6 (December 1974): 540-43.
- . "Libraries and Unions: The Saint Mary's University Experience." *Canadian Library Journal* 31, no. 3 (June 1974): 238-40.
- Watson, William. "Professional Status and Professional Responsibilities." *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 4 (1 June 1970): 416-27.
- White, Don. "Academic Status: Right or Rite?" *Canadian Library Journal* 26, no. 4 (July-August 1969): 287-89.
- Wilkinson, John. "Letters: Faculty Status." *Canadian Library Journal* 36, no. 1-2 (February/April 1979): 52.

Notes

Introduction

Dekker & Kandiuk

1. CAUT, *Librarian Salary and Academic Status Survey, 2012 Part I: Salaries, Salary Scales and Academic Status, Dec. 2012* <http://www.caut.ca/docs/default-source/librarians/2012-lsass---part-i-revised.pdf>. This number includes colleges from British Columbia as represented by the Federation of Post-Secondary Educators of BC; from Alberta as represented by the Alberta Colleges Institutes Faculty Associations; and from Ontario as represented by the Ontario Public Services Employees Union.
2. United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Union Members Summary 2013*, (Jan. 2014), 1, <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/union2.nr0.htm>.
3. Kathleen de la Peña McCook, "Unions in Public and Academic Libraries," Adopted from *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Sciences* (3rd ed. New York: Taylor and Francis, 2010), 2013 http://www.academia.edu/5665510/_Unions_in_Public_and_Academic_Libraries_.
4. Roma M. Harris, *Librarianship: the Erosion of a Woman's Profession* (Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 1992): xiv – xiii.
5. HRSDC calculations based on Statistics Canada. *Table 282-0078 - Labour Force Survey Estimates (LFS), Employees by Union Coverage, North American Industry Classification System (NAICS), Sex and Age Group, Annual (Persons)*, CANSIM (database); United States Department of Labor, *Union Members*; Sarah Barriage, "Library Workers Will Not be Shushed: 2012 Union Review," *Progressive Librarian* 41 (2013): 86.

6. Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, "Our Universities," <http://www.aucc.ca/canadian-universities/our-universities/>.
7. Bruce Barry, *Speechless: The Erosion of Free Expression in the American Workplace* (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 2007): 64.
8. Henry Giroux, "Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University," *Truthout* (Oct. 29, 2013) <http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university>.
9. With a contribution by Francesca Holyoke.

Chapter 1

Jacobs

1. The author wishes to acknowledge, with much appreciation, the assistance of Rosemary Howard, Judy Vogt, and Mark Sandilands for their support and assistance.
2. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries and Canadian Association of University Teachers, *Guidelines on Academic Status for University Librarians* (Ottawa, ON: Canadian Library Association, 1979), 1.
3. Although the phrase "academic librarians" typically refers to librarians working in both college and university settings, the use of the term in this chapter is in the context of universities only.
4. Joan Mount, "Faculty Status at Laurentian—Two Years Later," *Canadian Library Journal* 35, no. 6 (1978); Ashley Thomson, "Five Years Later: Faculty Status at Laurentian," *Canadian Library Journal* 38, no. 4 (1981).
5. For the purposes of this chapter, the word "tenure" is used to describe those employment contracts for academic staff that may only be terminated as a result of some demonstrated cause.
6. "Association of College and Research Libraries Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Libraries," American Library Association, <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/jointstatementfaculty>.
7. Susan Kroll, ed., *Academic Status: Statements and Resources* (Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1994), 9-10.
8. "ACRL History," American Library Association, <http://www.ala.org/acrl/aboutacrl/history/history>.
9. Hazel Bletcher, "On the Formation of a Canadian Library Association: Paper Given before the Alberta Library Association," *Canadian Library Council Bulletin* 2, no. 2 (1945): 19.
10. Ibid.

11. Canadian Library Association, "Library Associations of Canada, 1900-1946," *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 11, no. 6 (1955): 270-71; Elizabeth Hulse, *The Morton Years: The Canadian Library Association, 1946-1971* (Toronto, ON: Ex Libris Association, 1995), 2.
12. Commission of Inquiry, *Libraries in Canada: A Study of Library Conditions and Needs* (Chicago, IL: American Library Association, 1933), 3.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid., 4.
15. Ibid.; Hulse, *The Morton Years*, 3.
16. Commission of Inquiry, *Libraries in Canada: A Study of Library Conditions and Needs*, 144.
17. Hulse, *The Morton Years*, 3.
18. Ibid., 4.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid., 4-5; Canadian Library Association, "Library Associations of Canada, 1900-1946," 271-72; Kathleen Jenkins, "Review of the Association's Constitutional Structure, Traditions, Inter-Relations with Sections and Committees, with Critical Comment," *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 7, no. 3 (1950): 91.
21. Hulse, *The Morton Years*, 9.
22. Ibid., 8.
23. Ibid., 9; Jenkins, "Review of the Association's Constitutional Structure," 91.
24. News-Herald (Vancouver), "The Canadian Library Council," *Canadian Library Council Bulletin* 1, no. 2 (1944): 17.
25. Hulse, *The Morton Years*, 9-10.
26. Canadian Library Association, "From Council to Association," *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 3, no. 1 (1946): 17.
27. Canadian Library Association, "Committees: 1 September 1955 [to] 31 August 1960," *Canadian Library: the Bulletin of the Canadian Library Association - le Bulletin de l'Association canadienne des Bibliothèques* 17, no. 6 (1961): 344.
28. Canadian Library Association, "Annual Meeting: Reports of Meetings, Colleges and University Librarians," *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 6, no. 2 (1949): 101.
29. Jenkins, "Review of the Association's Constitutional Structure," 92.

30. Canadian Library Association, "Committees: 1 September 1955 [to] 31 August 1960," 344.
31. Edna Hunt, "Why Join the Research Libraries Section of CLA?," *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 16, no. 3 (1959).
32. Canadian Library Association, "Conference Reports: Summary Reports of Sections, Research Libraries," *Canadian Library* 17, no. 3 (1960): 145.
33. Douglas G. Lochhead, "The Research Libraries Section and the Canadian Library Inquiry," *Canadian Library: the Bulletin of the Canadian Library Association - le Bulletin de l'Association canadienne des Bibliothèques* 18, no. 6 (1962): 258.
34. Ibid.
35. "Elizabeth Morton (Executive Director, Canadian Library Association) to John Wilkinson (Chair, Colleges and Universities Committee, Canadian Library Association)," 18 June 1962, Canadian Library Association Papers, MG28 I197 v17, Library and Archives Canada.
36. "Minutes," 27 June 1962, Canadian Library Association, College and University Committee, Canadian Library Association Papers, MG28 I197 v2, Library and Archives Canada.
37. Ibid., 2.
38. Ibid., 3.
39. Canadian Library Association, "Annual Reports of Officials, Project, Sections, Committees for 1959-1960," *Feliciter* 5, no. 9 (Part 2) (1960): 19; Canadian Library Association, "Committees: 1 September 1955 [to] 31 August 1960," 344-45.
40. "ACRL History," <http://www.ala.org/acrl/aboutacrl/history/history>.
41. Arthur M. McAnally, "Status of the University Librarian in the Academic Community," in *Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A History and Policy Statements* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1975), 10; C. James Schmidt, Introduction to *Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A History and Policy Statements* (Chicago, IL: American Library Association, 1975), v; Association of College and Research Libraries, University Libraries Section, Committee on Academic Status, "Status of College and University Librarians," *College & Research Libraries* 20, no. 5 (1959): 399.
42. "Elizabeth Morton (Executive Director, Canadian Library Association) to John Wilkinson (Chair, Colleges and Universities Committee, Canadian Library Association)," 14 July 1962, Canadian Library Association Papers, MG28 I197 17, Library and Archives Canada.
43. Canadian Library Association, "The CLA-ACB Committees 1960-1967: College and University Libraries Committee," *Canadian Library: the Bulletin of the Canadian Library Association - le Bulletin de l'Association canadienne des Bibliothèques* 24, no. 6 (1968): 595; Elizabeth Morton, "Winnipeg Conference," *Canadian Library: the Bul-*

letin of the Canadian Library Association - le Bulletin de l'Association canadienne des Bibliothèques 20, no. 2 (1963).

44. Canadian Library Association, "Library Standards for Salaries," *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 3, no. 1 (1946): 19.
45. "Report of the Salary Committee, 1946-1947," n.d., Canadian Library Association Papers, MG28 I197 v61, Library and Archives Canada.
46. Canadian Library Association, Committee on Salaries, "Report of the Committee on Salaries, 1947-1948," *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 5, no. 1 (1948): 47-48.
47. Canadian Library Association, Salaries Committee, "Annual General Meeting of the Corporation: Committee Proceedings, Salaries Committee," *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 9, no. 2 (1952): 50-51.
48. Canadian Library Association, Salaries and Personnel Committee, "Annual General Meeting: Summary Reports of Committees, Salaries and Personnel Committee," *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 10, no. 7 (1954): xvi-xvii.
49. Canadian Library Association, "Association Activities," *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 11, no. 6 (1955): 277.
50. Canadian Library Association, Committee on University Libraries Salaries and Personnel, "CLA-ABC Committee on University Libraries Salaries and Personnel: Summary of Replies to Questionnaires, 1955 and 1956," *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 12, no. 6 (1956).
51. Canadian Library Association, Committee on University Salaries and Personnel, "Salaries and Personnel (University Libraries)," *Feliciter* 1, no. 3 (1956): 30.
52. *Ibid.*, 32.
53. *Ibid.*
54. *Ibid.*
55. *Ibid.*, 33.
56. Canadian Library Association, Standards and Salaries Committee (University Libraries), "Report of the Standards and Salaries Committee (University Libraries)," *Feliciter* 3, no. 11-12 (1958): 1.
57. *Ibid.*
58. *Ibid.*, 1-2.
59. Canadian Library Association, "Annual General Meeting, 1958: Standards and Salaries," *Canadian Library Association Bulletin* 15, no. 2 (1958): 68.
60. Canadian Library Association, Standards and Salaries Committee (University and College Libraries), "Sub-Committee on Standards and Salaries (University and College Libraries)," *Feliciter* 4, no. 10 (1959): 58.

61. Canadian Library Association, "Report of the Standards and Salaries Committee (University Libraries)," 2.
62. Canadian Library Association, "Sub-Committee on Standards and Salaries (University and College Libraries)," 57.
63. Ibid.
64. Canadian Library Association, "Report of the Standards and Salaries Committee (University Libraries)," 2.
65. Ibid.
66. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, Salary Survey Committee, "Report of the CACUL Salary Survey Committee," *CACUL Newsletter* no. 2 (1964): 9.
67. Dominion Bureau of Statistics, "DBS Daily Bulletin: Thursday, December 3, 1964," *CACUL Newsletter* no. 3 (1964): [6].
68. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, "Annual Meeting and Workshop, Halifax: Report from the Secretary [9 June 1964]," *CACUL Newsletter* no. 3 (1964): 14.
69. D. C. Appelt, "From the President of CACUL: Executive Meeting [25 October 1966]," *CACUL Newsletter*, no. 7-8 (1967): 14.
70. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, Salary and Budget Survey Committee, "Salary and Budget Survey," *CACUL Newsletter* no. 7-8 (1967).
71. Les Fowlie, "The National Conference of Canadian Universities and Colleges and the Canadian Universities Foundation," *Canadian Library* 19, no. 5 (1963): 351. The CUF was an executive arm of the NCCUC.
72. Robert Blackburn, "Report of the President," *CACUL Newsletter* no. 1 (1963): 3.
73. Appelt, "From the President of CACUL: Executive Meeting [25 October 1966]," 13.
74. For example, see: Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, "General Meeting [Minutes, 26 June 1963]," *CACUL Newsletter* no. 2 (1964); F. Dolores Donnelly, "The National Library in the Library Community: Current Developments and Trends," *Archivaria* 15 (1982-1983); Doris E. Lewis, "CACUL as of October 1964: Excerpts from CACUL President's Report to the Fall Meeting of the Canadian Library Association," *CACUL Newsletter* no. 3 (1964); Doris E. Lewis, "Report of the President," *CACUL Newsletter* no. 4 (1965); Gurdial S. Pannu, "The Downs' Survey: A Summary and a Review," *Canadian Library* 24, no. 6 (1968).
75. Pannu, "The Downs' Survey," 640.
76. Robert B. Downs, "Resources of Canadian Academic and Research Libraries: Summary of Recommendations," *CACUL Newsletter* no. 10 (1968): 43.

77. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, Position Classification & Salary Scales, "A Draft Report on Position Classifications and Salary Scales in Canadian Academic Libraries," (Calgary, Alberta: CACUL, 1966), 2.
78. *Ibid.*, 4.
79. *Ibid.*, 15-16.
80. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, *Position Classification and Principles of Academic Status in Canadian University Libraries* (Ottawa, ON: Canadian Library Association, 1969).
81. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, "Annual General Meeting [Minutes, 10 June 1969]," *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 4 (1970): 401.
82. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, "Committee on Academic Status: Terms of Reference," *CACUL Newsletter* no. 9 (1967): 30.
83. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, "Annual Meeting 1967 [Minutes, 17 June 1967]," *CACUL Newsletter*, no. 9 (1967): 20.
84. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, Committee on Academic Status, "CACUL Committee on Academic Status: Report, June, 1968," *CACUL Newsletter*, no. 10 (1968): 10-11.
85. *Ibid.*, 12-14.
86. *Ibid.*, 15.
87. CACUL Committee on Academic Status, "Principles of Academic Status in Canadian University Libraries: Draft Report [24 June 1968]," *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 1 (1969): 12-13.
88. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, "CACUL Committee on Academic Status: Report, June, 1968," 10.
89. *Ibid.*, 10-11.
90. CACUL Committee on Academic Status, "Principles of Academic Status in Canadian University Libraries: Draft Report [24 June 1968]," *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 1 (1969): 12-13.
91. CACUL Committee on Academic Status, "Principles of Academic Status in Canadian University Libraries: Revised Draft May 1969," *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 2 (1969): 93-94.
92. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, "Annual General Meeting [Minutes, 10 June 1969]," *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 4 (1970): 401-02.
93. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, *Position Classification and Principles of Academic Status*, 23.

94. Ibid.
95. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, "Annual General Meeting [Minutes, 10 June 1969]," 402.
96. I. F. Bell, "President's Mid-Year Report," *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 5 (1970): 458.
97. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, "Minutes of the CACUL Annual General Meeting at Hamilton, Ontario [24 June 1970]," *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 6 (1971): 590.
98. Donald Redmond, "Annual Report of the President to CACUL-ACBCU for 1969-1970," *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 6 (1971): 594.
99. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, Committee on Academic Status, "Committee on Academic Status Report," *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 6 (1971): 609.
100. Ibid.
101. Ibid., 617.
102. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, "CACUL Annual Meeting [Draft Minutes, 1971]," *CACUL Newsletter* 3, no. 1 (1971): 14.
103. Calvin D. Evans, "Librarians and CAUT: Historical Overview and Future Directions," *CAUT Bulletin* 24, no. 5 (1976): 12.
104. Donald C. Savage, "A Historical Overview of Academic Status for Librarians," *Canadian Library Journal* 39, no. 5 (1982): 287. The title for this document also underwent revision with the final version approved being *Guidelines on Academic Status for University Librarians*.
105. Evans, "Librarians and CAUT," 12.
106. Donald C. Savage, "73-74 Reports: Report from the Executive Secretary," *CAUT Bulletin* 22, no. 6 (1974): 25-26.
107. Craig Heron, *The Canadian Labour Movement: A Short History*, 3rd ed. (Toronto, ON: James Lorimer & Company Ltd., Publishers, 2012), 94-98.
108. Ibid.
109. *Post-Secondary Learning Act, RSA 2003, c. P-19.5 s. 90*. A current example of this situation is the author's home province of Alberta, Canada where academic staff are excluded from the *Employment Standards Code* and the *Labour Relations Code*, as noted in Section 90 of the Province's *Post-Secondary Learning Act*.
110. Savage, "73-74 Reports: Report from the Executive Secretary," 25.
111. Julie Schroeder, "The Bargaining Unit for the Academic Librarian," *Canadian Library Journal* 32, no. 6 (1975): 463.

112. Ibid., 464.
113. Ibid.
114. Savage, "A Historical Overview," 287.
115. Don White, "Academic Status: Right or Rite?," *Canadian Library Journal* 26, no. 4 (1969): 289.
116. Elizabeth Ward, "Libraries and Unions: The Saint Mary's University Experience," *Canadian Library Journal* 31, no. 3 (1974): 240.
117. Elizabeth Ward, "The Community of Interest and Academic Status," *Canadian Library Journal* 31, no. 6 (1974): 543.
118. Ruth Hafter, "Academic Status - the Wrong Name, the Wrong Game," *APLA Bulletin* 39, no. 1 (1975): 9.
119. Ibid.
120. Savage, "A Historical Overview," 288.
121. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, *Position Classification and Principles of Academic Status*, 23.
122. John Wilkinson, "Letters: Faculty Status," *Canadian Library Journal* 36, no. 1-2 (1979): 52.
123. Savage, "A Historical Overview," 290.
124. Ibid.
125. Mount, "Faculty Status at Laurentian," 428.
126. David Fox, "Finding Time for Scholarship: A Survey of Canadian Research University Librarians," *portal: Libraries & the Academy* 7, no. 4 (2007): 452.
127. Ibid., 457.
128. Mount, "Faculty Status at Laurentian," 78.
129. Savage, "A Historical Overview," 290.
130. Ibid.
131. Thomson, "Five Years Later," 222.
132. Ibid.
133. David Fox, "The Scholarship of Canadian Research Librarians," *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library & Information Practice & Research* 2, no. 2 (2007): 9-10.
134. Steven Horn, "The Professional Ladder," *Canadian Library Journal* 27, no. 3 (1970): 200-02.

135. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries and Canadian Association of University Teachers, *Guidelines on Academic Status for University Librarians*, [8].
136. Margaret Beckman, "Library Governance," *CAUT Bulletin* 24, no. 5 (1976): 22.
137. Donald C. Savage, "Letters: Library Governance," *CAUT Bulletin* 25, no. 1 (1976): 14.
138. Savage, "A Historical Overview," 290.
139. Leona M. Jacobs, "Library Councils in Canadian Academic Libraries: A Summary of Responses" (unpublished report, University of Lethbridge, 2008), <http://www.uleth.ca/dspace/handle/10133/564>.
140. William Watson, "Professional Status and Professional Responsibilities," *CACUL Newsletter* 2, no. 4 (1970): 417.
141. Ibid.
142. Savage, "A Historical Overview," 287.
143. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries and Canadian Association of University Teachers, *Guidelines on Academic Status for University Librarians*.
144. Canadian Association of University Teachers, "Librarian Salary Survey and Academic Status Survey. Part 1: Salaries, Salary Scales and Academic Status," (Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2012).
145. Savage, "A Historical Overview," 288.
146. Canadian Association of University Teachers, "Librarian Salary Survey and Academic Status Survey."

Chapter 2

Dekker

1. Toni Samek, "Library Workplace Speech, a Modern Irony! The Push for Library Workplace Speech," Concerned Librarians of British Columbia, <http://concernedlibrarians.blogspot.ca/2009/02/library-workplace-speech.html>; Andrew Lockhart, "The Canadian Library Association's Failure to Advocate for Librarians and Libraries," Progressive Librarians Guild London Chapter, <http://plglondon.wordpress.com/2012/01/27/the-canadian-library-associations-failure-to-advocate-for-librarians-and-libraries/>; Lisa Sloniowski, "Who Speaks for Libraries and Librarians (1/2)," Progressive Librarians Guild Toronto Area Chapter, <http://plggta.org/archives/113>; Jennifer Dekker, "Who Speaks for Libraries and Librarians (2/2)," Progressive Librarians Guild Toronto Area Chapter, <http://plggta.org/archives/154>.
2. CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers), "CAUT Withdraws Consideration of Censure of McGill University," Canadian Association of University Teachers, <http://www.caut.ca/issues-and-campaigns/librarians-and-libraries/2012/11/26/>