Library Senate Executive Board

Meeting Minutes
8 January 2013, Hamilton Library Room 027

Present: Sara Rutter, Gwen Sinclair, David Flynn, Lori Ann Saeki, Jan Sung, Naomi Chow (recording), Dore Minatodani, Stu Dawrs

Convened: 10:38 a.m.

1. Approval of minutes
   The minutes of December 11, 2012 were approved with corrections.

2. Reports:
   Chair [Dawrs]

   Report of LLT

   At the Jan. 7, 2013, LLT meeting, IUL Geary provided an update on the status of the Elsevier contract. It is currently in procurement, but was sent there without a signed Form 95, which form states (in essence) that the unit entering the contract has the money to pay for the contract. Procurement cannot process the contract without the Form 95, and so it has not gone forward. Geary asserted at the Jan. 7 meeting that without the addition to base of $1.5 million (plus annual inflationary increase) "the scenario to balance the budget is not acceptable" to him and, further, that he "Did not want the library to be committed without funds to pay for it [Elsevier]," (Quotes from Dawrs’ meeting notes). According the Geary, the chancellor has said he is willing to put into writing that the library will receive necessary funding; therefore at the Jan. 7 LLT meeting it was decided that Geary should draft a memo for the chancellor’s signature that spells out this commitment. Geary will send it to chancellor with a request for return within one week. If that written guarantee is received, Gregg will then sign the Form 95 and forward to procurement. In the meantime, the previous 5-year Elsevier contract has officially expired.

   • Comments: The Library seems to be caught in a budget quandary – it appears that we are holding onto our monies (both normal allocation and $700,000 funds from Outreach College), and not spending/allocating for expenditures until there is a decision about whether the library will receive additional monies towards the Elsevier subscriptions. There are concerns that we will not be able to fully expend the monies due to the limited number of viable months left in the fiscal cycle (around 3 months/March) for FY2013. If this open period for expenditures is missed, we will not be able to expend until the new fiscal year opens in the Fall of 2013.

   • Discussion: How should LSEB approach Administration about concerns regarding the internal library budget allocation process for funds to be opened up
for normal operating expenditures? It is understood that monies have been received by the library (Outreach College $700,000 funds as well as normal funding), but they have not been distributed within the library accounts nor opened for invoicing/payments. It may stem from procedural and communication misunderstandings or confusion. LSEB would like to clarify whether information is flowing from the IUL to the Administrative Team onto Fiscal.

- **Action Item:** Chair Dawrs will speak with IUL Geary to discuss budget expenditure concerns with the aim to get the monies flowing.

**Vice-Chair [Sung]**
There are three candidates for the University Librarian position; library and public meetings have been set. All are encouraged to attend.

**Secretary [Chow]**
No report.

**LPC [Flynn attending on behalf of LPC]**
The LPC will meet tomorrow to select a Chair. The 2013 committee includes: Beth Tillinghast, Sharon Ouchi, Ted Kwok, David Flynn, Yati Paseng.

**Elections (Saeki)**
No report.

**MFS [Minatodani/Sinclair]**
No report.

**UHPA [Rutter]**
No report.

3. **Old Business:**
   a. **Working Group on Strategic Planning** [Sinclair]
      No update
   b. **Revisions to Library Senate Constitution & By-Laws to clarify procedures when an elected board member resigns or otherwise cannot fulfill duties** [Dawrs]
      No update
   c. **Request for information from IAUL Weber regarding process to fill position vacancies** [Dawrs]
      Dawrs has been in communication with IAUL Weber who has in turn been in touch with the VCAA. Weber is trying to get a final answer from the VCAA’s office as to what the current policy is about filling faculty vacancies.

4. **New Business:**
   a. **Budgetary questions for library administrative team.**
IUL Geary emailed to ask if could delay Senate budget discussion meeting until February as Eric Fujiwara is not available for the upcoming January Senate meeting.

- **Comment** – See if meeting can be held sooner as fiscal deadlines are coming up with budgetary things.

- **Discussion** about whether to request of a meeting that might touch upon the process of budget as opposed to specific budget questions. Process might be able to be addressed by the Library Administrative Team/Geary.

- **Discussion** about the state of confusion within the library and the desire to have the situation clarified

- **Discussion** about how best to enter a discussion with the IUL to help Administration make some decisions to get a handle on the budget and the budget process with the limited time left in the fiscal year.

- **Suggestions:** Ask for a status update on the budget in general and projections for this fiscal. Include the list of questions that were sent by the Library Senate members as a starting point for discussion – to give an idea about some of the faculty concerns—not asking for an answer to every question; perhaps ask for the current working budget spreadsheet with line items (that John Awakuni used to handout at the beginning of each fiscal year)

- **Comment:** Would like to include a question about hiring new positions: when we hire a new position (casual or apt), how does the library fund the position, whether a temporary position or a permanent position (sustained funding). What happens with the salary savings with currently empty positions?

- **Action Item:** Dawrs will speak with Geary and ask him to attend the upcoming January Senate Meeting (1/15/13), then forward the list of budget-related questions to give an overview. Dawrs will draft a memo to be reviewed by LSEB.

- **Comment:** Dawrs suggested that Faculty Senate Chair meet regularly with the University Librarian to discuss issues and concerns.

b. **Questions for UL candidates.**

- Discussion about how to handle the Faculty Senate – UL Candidate meetings procedurally. It was decided to approach the session as initially a Question/Answer session with time at the end to allow the candidate to ask questions of the Senate. In order to keep the sessions comparative, the same questions would be used for each candidate.
o Comment: Is the meeting a forum for informational purposes, or will the Senate be able to provide feedback into the decision/hiring process?

o Action Item: Poll the Senate membership to rank the submitted questions via electronic poll. Rank the questions by popularity of vote, place in rank order. Aim to ask the top 6 questions time allowing. 45 minute are allocated for the meetings. Senate suggested some consolidation of similar questions. Saeki to create survey, then Dawrs to send out to Senate membership

c. **Revision of LPC policies and procedures**
   - Comment: LSEB Chair is bringing the issue to the attention of the new LPC, to decide whether the LPC works on it, or suggests an ad hoc committee to work on it.

Meeting adjourned at 12 noon.

Next Meeting: February 12, 2013 at 10:30 a.m., Hamilton Library, Room 027