Library Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes
1998-03-10

The Spring semester meeting of the Full Library Senate was called to order at 9:40 a.m. on March 10, 1998 by Chair Gregg Geary in Hamilton Classroom 31. Announcement of the meeting was sent out only to Faculty Senate members. Approximately 24 people attended. Minutes of the Fall 1997 full Senate meeting were corrected and approved.

Chair Geary clarified that groups other than just the Library Faculty Senate Board were instrumental in getting an assessment of library resources specifically mentioned in the guideline document, "Authorization to Plan an Academic Program at Manoa". He acknowledged the work of Carol Schaafsma and CDCC and Ruth Horie and the University Committee on Academic Policy and Planning.

Two questions on the Library Reorganization Plan had been submitted to Administration prior to the meeting.

   Q.1. How were the changes between the draft reviewed by the senate and the final copy submitted for approval arrived at?

   Q.2 If the faculty was asked to review earlier changes, why not seek comments on the latest ones?

In preparing to address these two questions Jean Ehrhorn distributed a two-page document titled "Timeline of Library Reorganization - 1995-1998".

Jean's remarks

There's been long term work involved in this library organization. It started in the summer of 1995 and the approved documents were sent to appropriate bodies January 28, of this year. Procedures outlined in "A3.101 University of Hawaii Organizational and Functional Changes " were followed. The UH Budget Office was consulted and since there were no personnel costs involved they considered the reorganization was a "delegated" one that did not need to go to the board of regents. It was minor in the sense that no instruction or research programs were being added, deleted or merged. (An example of a "non-delegated" reorganization would be the merge of the SLIS program with ICS).

HGEA requested rewording of the functional statement describing the cataloging support unit of cataloging. UHPA and the UH Budget office both had concerns about the group placement of three tenure track librarians in what seemed like a "limbo-box" on Chart III. This chart was changed so that 1 librarian would be positioned in Systems, another in DNS and the third as a digital librarian reporting to the AUL for Library Information Technology. This was a reflection that they would not be interchangeable as appeared in the earlier chart. This change in the overall sense did not appear to warrant another round of review prior to approval. Since both issues were dealt with by communication with the unions and the individual unit or individual concerned, she determined it didn't need to go out to the library senate again.
Questions from the audience

Q.1. I understand that there is no requirement that the Senate be consulted so it is not a legal point, but a collegial one. These changes went in place after we were consulted in effect putting the faculty "out of the loop". The library concerns all of us. I feel changes should have been brought again to the faculty. I would like to see the faculty in the full process.

A. (John Haak) Faculty will be consulted. At the end there were time constraints. Maybe we can work something out to formally involve the Senate. We know there will be more reorganizations coming up. (Gregg) The Board is also inquiring into what's involved in clarifying the procedure guidelines in the university-wide document that Jean mentioned A3.101 as to formalize faculty input on reorganizations. The first step was to determine what body has jurisdiction over the contents of that document and who has the authority to propose revisions.

Q.2. The administration determined in September that the reorganization was a "delegated" one. Yet the Senate, the board, and UHPA all assumed changes would have to go to the Board of Regents. Everyone was surprised that the approval was done spontaneously. Where's the communication?

A. (Jean Ehrhorn) All previous library reorganizations were considered "delegated" and not subject to Board of Regents approval so Administration had no reason to believe anyone else would have a different assumption on this latest plan.

Q.3. This reorganization plan was more complex than previous ones. If Senate had known it too was subject to "delegated" approval, they may have asked different questions.

A. (Jean Ehrhorn) We had the opinion of both the University Personnel Office and the Budget Office that this reorganization was considered in the bounds of the "delegated" approval area.

Q. 4. What difference would it have made if the Board of Regents approval was necessary in this case?

A. (Jean Ehrhorn) It would have added more steps to the process, more stages for discussion- a wider forum.

John said we will continue the process relating to reorganizations. The responsibility for answering the question of whether or not a reorganization is "delegated" or "undelegated" lies with the university administration and is based upon the answers we provide to questions from the budget office. He has a concern about the University in general and the Library in particular being able to adapt effectively to rapidly changing conditions and that we retain our ability to reorganize and make changes in a timely manner.

Updating on other library issues by John Haak

Last week on his trip to the OCLC he met with a collector of Hawaiian recorded music who has a collection dating back more than 50 years that he is considering donating to the Library. Chieko Tachihata arranged the meeting. At OCLC he sought out library directors who are currently switching systems and questioned them on the process and why they made the decisions they did. Right now our mission is to identify the
criteria we should use to determine which vendors we invite here and then what criteria should be considered in the actual evaluation of the systems. Faculty and staff
input will be sought. More on this very soon. (See lib-ids e-mail "Steering Committee"
sent out by Jean Ehrhorn March 11, 1998). Building: Some University faculty say that
the Phase 3 "rudely protrudes" onto Maile Way. It will cost us square footage to satisfy
these critics. Group 70 architects have been consulted to modify the "warehouse" look
of the building. The baseball stadium fiasco has had an impact on the process.
Architects aren't being pushed with a deadline. They are being given time to consider
everything. We are probably looking at summer to get started with bidding.

Budget

A meeting with Sr. VP Smith is set for this Friday. We obtained an exception from the
latest hiring moratorium for student hiring. There is a shortfall of $1 million from the
anticipated Spring tuition funds. We have had funding restored in two areas--$50,000
for tenure track positions hired in the fall and $21,000 for extension of hours. We've
had some upward movement in our standing among ARL Libraries.

John will meet soon with Budget Director Rod Sakaguchi and the budget directors of
the community colleges to negotiate pooling funds for upgrading workstations and
technology within the entire system. Another topic for Sakaguchi will be the use of
summer school funds.

Questions from the audience

Q.1. How will time changes affect building costs?

A. I assume the Legislators want the groundbreaking before the elections, but on the
other hand they don't want another fiasco. Feb. 14 was the deadline for the
architectural plans to be completed, but if that had been adhered to, we certainly
would still have to deal with the concerns that were brought up and that would have
led to cost overruns and other problems. Once we can determine how many floors we
have and what will fit then we can do planning for changes in the present buildings.
We have $200,000 appropriated to begin planning on what to change in Sinclair. Two
areas have been taken off the table in cutting the University budget-- the first is the
library and the second is auxiliary services which includes electricity and other items
in facilities.

Q.2. When you meet with Sr. VP Smith Friday will you be asking about the status of
our temporary positions? I'm especially concerned with the ones in BHSD and ILL that
will be expiring soon.

A. Yes. We want to get the temps permanent. "Free our slaves". Also I'll be
asking,"Where's our money?" We want to set our budgets.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:28 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Elaine Schultz
Secretary, Library Senate Executive Board