The Fall semester meeting of the Full Library Senate was called to order on December 17, 1997 by Chair Gregg Geary in Hamilton Classroom 31. Two meetings were held, at 10 a.m. and 1:30 p.m. All library staff were invited to attend. Approximately 38 people attended the morning session and 20 in the afternoon. Minutes of the Spring 1997 full senate meeting were approved.

Chair Geary spoke briefly on the role of the Library Senate as a formal advisory body to the University Librarian in matters bearing on the goals and programs of the library. Improving communication avenues between administration and the library faculty will be a focus of the board. In order to get a timely sense of administration activities Gregg will be attending administration meetings this year. He outlined the board's recent activities and plans. The board is looking into the issue of review procedures for non-tenure track librarians. This has been an on-going question and the board would like to see a procedure in place. This is in the discussion stage and we hope to get input from those involved directly, the Library Personnel Committee and all Senate members interested in participating in the discussion. Questions from the floor--

1. Q. Who are those "directly involved"?
   A. Non-tenure track librarians
2. Q. Will LPC be involved?
   A. Yes, in the discussions and recommendations of what to do, other involvement will depend on decisions made.
3. Q. Why should those involved have input while tenure track librarians have no say in how their renewal process is set up?
   A. Believe it's good management policy to get input of those affected.

Gregg reminded all that Karen Peacock is coordinating donations within the libraries for Guam Typhoon Paka disaster relief.

**John Haak's Remarks:**

Wished everyone a Happy Holiday. Several important issues to mention before answering the submitted questions. In all areas, we've been working with the University administration to take a longer view of matters to bring the library to the forefront of their thinking. We are encouraged by the recent formal inclusion of the assessment of library resources in new program requests.

1. Building Issue. The comptroller wants all plans for the building to go out for bid in March- April. There will be lots of meetings over the next few months to make this possible. We need to meet projected cost requirements in preliminary budget releases.
2. Budget. $500,000 promised but has not come through. We'll wait until after Spring registration.
3. Technology Plan. Library Information Technology Strategic Goals and Priorities Plan for the next 3-4 years has been constructed and was presented by John and Wil Frost to Executive Vice Chancellor Dean O. Smith yesterday.
The plan calls for about $2,000,000 over the next 4 years. It includes upgrades of equipment and systems for the public as well as for library faculty and staff. The points stressed were that these needed improvements require substantial funding that can’t be allocated from the Library's regular operating budget. The meeting went well. For details of plan see Library Staff Materials page.

4. Manoa Strategic Plan. Plan has been updated and comments are being sought. One item is the desire to have the library rated in the Top 50 ARL Libraries by 2007.

Questions submitted by the Library Senate Executive Board:

Q. 1. The Library is in the midst of the WASC accreditation process. What will this mean for us in the Library? We are aware of some of the survey results and reports, but how will they specifically impact the future of the Library?

A. Task forces on 9 standards were formed. John's committee was on standard #6-Libraries and Information Technologies including classroom support. These standards haven't been revised since 1988. Process of self-study includes the collection, the facilities, technology support and staffing. A cross section of the university community on the committee gave us feedback from different groups. This gives us a snapshot of where we are and we can relate this to the last report. Professionalism of staff was commended; CARL perceived as not so good; Library Web Pages were great-users wanted more; there were concerns about the reserve books and missing books. This gives us a basis for doing research to correct areas of concern. In all, we're hoping to get out of this exercise an acclamation of the value of the library in the community so the library can reassert itself in getting funding. John hopes we will look at the notebook for the Task Force in the Library Administration office.

Q. 2. The Library administration has just completed the Library Reorganization documents following input from the LSEB, UHPA, and HGEA. Please review briefly the administration's response to the comments made by the LSEB.

A. HGEA concerns centered on position descriptions and how up-to-date they were. The LSEB issue was more AUL's. Most peer libraries have 4 AULs; we have only one. LSEB says we need more. We recognize this, but we have to deal with the realities we have now. Why was the AUL placed in Information Technology? Important responsibilities of supporting 10 campuses we serve in this area require management position. Why put Information Technology and Collection Services together? We've tried other models of where to place collection services, but for various reasons they didn't work, now staffing concerns led us to this model. In the division head descriptions we agree with the terms coordinate and facilitate in place of supervise. On the question of the reporting structure of the project development and grants coordinator, it is common practice as all library directors have fundraising as a major aspect of their job description. They need to work directly with donors. See Memorandum from Library Director to LSEB Regarding Reorganization

Q. 3. Library Director has recently visited all Library Departments. What specifically have you learned from these visits that was new? Do you feel these visits should be a regularly scheduled part of the Director's responsibilities?

A. Enjoyed meetings and liked doing it on a quick 1 month schedule. So much work went into the department annual reports and strategic plans that we wanted to open up a dialog about these plans. It was good to get thoughts on what directions we should take. We saw some consistent issues across departments. We need to
upgrade technology to enable you to do your work, coordinate training with arrival of new equipment, product and services, rebuild liaison relationships and knowledge of collection and processes with new staff after all the mass retirements. We have to get past phase 3 and think of what can be done to original buildings. What needs to happen to get things going? We need to revise some recommendations of the first floor task force. You were concerned about printing costs, extension of hours for special collections and exploring options other than CARL. On that front, Carol Schaafsma and others at ALA will be viewing demos of other system vendors. Access services wants to investigate initiating self-check out. Yes, I do think the department visits should occur annually. Whole function of the strategic plans, annual report and department visits set the agenda for future of the library. When several departments are concerned about the same issue they can coordinate their actions to solve problems. Notes and summaries of these department meetings are available in the Library Administration Office for checkout.

Q. 4. The Library Director was recently part of the Dean's and Director's review. Do you feel this was a useful means of evaluation: What did you learn from the process?

A. This was the first time and the process needs work. Since John's review occurred right after the death of his vice-president Carol Eastman he didn't feel he got the best impact of the process. He didn't have any input into the review. The review criteria was unknown -- no goals or objectives to measure against. The subjects didn't know what implications the review would have on salary or reappointment. He only saw the report of the Senior Vice President. Commentary of other deans on this new review varied. Discussions are going on with all these issues. Statement from the audience: The evaluation form that some staff members were asked to complete was very flawed and not a good tool; did other directors express similar critiques? John said he never saw the staff evaluations nor heard comments.

Questions from the floor:

Q. Did Dean Smith agree to the necessary long-term funding for the Technology Plan?

A. He agreed in principle. He saw it in terms of overhead. We provided him with the cost calculations and he saw the need to move overhead money into the library. He shows a willingness to talk about the issues.

Q. What did you learn at the CARL Directors' Meeting?

A. Sales talk dominated. Information was given on CARLWEB II. They were non-committal on their commitment to old environments as they move to the new one. In the CJK arena, the work with Singapore and the Chicago and LA public libraries will lead to progress here. Public libraries in general say it's absolutely necessary to have a Spanish language interface.

Q. Will CARL go the way of Ameritech and have two different systems -- one public and one academic?

A. CARL will have to have an academic one and make progress to back up what they are saying.

The morning session adjourned at 11:05 a.m., the afternoon session at 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Elaine Schultz
Secretary, Library Senate Executive Board