Library Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes
2003-06-18

Guest attendance: J.N. Musto; Ed Yuen, UH Director of collective bargaining; Louise Kubo, Interim Program Officer, Chancellor's Office; Jean Ehrhorn.

Faculty count: 21

Purpose of meeting: To discuss articles IX, XXII in the recent ratified 2003-2005 UHPA contract.

Distribution: Rank of librarians in Hamilton and Sinclair Libraries; Article IX; Article XXII; Chapter five and nine of the Board of Regents Policies; an article entitled "Do Librarians with Tenure Get More Respect?" From American Libraries June/July 2003.

Article IX

After brief introductions, Musto began the discussion with Article IX. He indicated that the change to article IX was a codification of historic changes. He also informed the library faculty that the idea for the changes came from the duties and responsibilities of the department chair in regards to the tenure and promotion process. The positions of senior faculty in rank IV or V come with responsibility. In creating the new contract, Musto suggested that there was concern over the possibility of senior faculty shirking their responsibilities, which could then be left to lower ranking faculty who may or may not be prepared for the responsibility at that point in their careers. Musto informed the library faculty present that the Community College faculty face a similar situation. He also said that he has only heard from the Librarians of Hamilton and Sinclair Libraries, but not from UH-Hilo or UH-Manoa Law Librarians. He wanted to hear from the librarians as to what consequences the contract may impose, and if a memorandum of understanding may be wanted or needed. However, the contract is for a two-year period and could be re-negotiated for the next contract if any issue is not working.

The Senate indicated that there were two points in Article IX on which it wanted clarification - [1] section B item (c) which says that only faculty members of an equal rank or higher can vote on applications for promotion; and, [2] section B last paragraph which states that Department or Division Chairs shall not participate in the deliberations of the Departmental Personnel Committee over individual tenure and promotion applications.

Musto indicated that it was indeed their intent to exclude department chairs from participating on any DPCs. He expressed two concerns - first, that department chairs not have any opportunity for misuse of influence over other DPC members; and, second that a department chair not have the opportunity to vote or assess twice on a tenure/promotion application if deliberating on a faculty member from the chair's department.

Musto felt strongly about the responsibilities of faculty at rank IV and V and indicated that only faculty members of an equal rank or higher should vote on applications for promotion. It would be a matter of negotiation and the library presenting a strong case.
for modifying this clause

The Senate indicated that the Library's past practices and current personnel policies and procedures require that a department chair be recused when there is an applicant from the chair's department. Senate members also responded that library personnel committee members do not feel there is any undue influence on themselves by having a department chair serve on the committee.

The Senate indicated that there were limits in library faculty numbers, in regards to rank, to serve on an LPC under the new Article IX stipulations. There were a number of concerns raised: [1] eliminating department chairs from participating on DPCs would reduce the number of higher-ranking faculty available to serve on the personnel committee; [2] although the Senate recognized that limiting voting to faculty of equal rank or higher parallels the practice of the TPRCs, in the library's case it could severely affect the number of available faculty. There was also concern that there would need to be too many LPC elections and alternates to achieve a personnel committee configuration to fit each individual case; [3] the Senate indicated that contrary to most other departments on campus, the library faculty can be tenured at rank II. The library also has many cases where library faculty, for example, remain at rank III throughout their careers. This does not necessarily affect their ability to assess a librarian applying for rank IV or V, and [4] the current LPC policies and procedures provide that members who have two years of service on the committee will have two years of non-service before serving again. This again limits the pool of eligible faculty. These policies would need to be revised.

Kubo also pointed out that having the same small pool of eligible higher-ranking faculty (eg. There are only three rank V librarians) who constantly vote on promotion cases would result in a limited assessment and perspective.

There was discussion with Musto about the nature of department heads in the library. Musto explained the conventional departmental organizational structure and compared it to the Libraries to see a clear picture. He used the English Department as an example. Musto pointed out that the Community Colleges have a similar multidisciplinary structure. Ehrhorn explained the total number of department chairs and the number of department chairs with no faculty within their department. Ehrhorn indicated that there were 13 and 2, respectively and suggested that the "proliferation" of department chairs in the library stems from organizational and managerial needs in regards to supervision of civil service and APT staff.

After Musto and Yuen understood the organizational structure of the library and understood the Library Personnel Committee's policies and procedures, they agreed that in the library a department chair could serve on the personnel committee so long as the chair is recused when deliberating on a candidate from the chair's department.

Regarding the clause that only faculty members of an equal rank or higher should vote on applications for promotion, Musto indicated that the problem was not unique to the Libraries, as Student Services is in the same situation. If the Libraries do not have the required amount of faculty at a high rank to sit on the LPC, then the Dean or Director (University Librarian) must convene a panel with outside faculty. Musto again reiterated that the library could negotiate with UHPA and ask for changes after trying it out.

The Senate also indicated that it wanted to make sure any memorandum of agreement or clarification would address specific issues and avoid using wording that
questioned the library as an "academic department." Musto agreed that such wording could call into question the faculty status of librarians.

**Article XXII**

Ehrhorn said that the problem with article XXII may be one of 'semantics'. Multiple department chairs exist in the Libraries due to managerial responsibilities. She said that the Libraries cannot be run without department chairs of rank II and III. Musto agreed that in the absence of an adequate number of staff at higher ranks that it would be a problem. Kwok expressed that the library faculty may not be unified on this issue, as some people may be looking at the issue from a practical standpoint (that the library needs faculty of all ranks to serve as department chairs to more evenly distribute the work; otherwise the small number of higher ranking faculty in a department will always be stuck serving as chair), while others may be looking at the perspective that the Libraries should not be hiring department chairs at lower ranks. Cartwright suggested that Administration should not actively decide to hire at lower ranks in order to save money. Musto and Ehrhorn discussed hiring as a department chair or hiring an individual and then appointing the individual as department chair. Musto said that both UH Administration and UHPA were open to suggestion from the library faculty on this matter, and that he liked to have the conversation take place so that all could understand the possible consequences and participate in any decisions. When asked if there was a certain timeframe to work with, Musto suggested that there was no rush. The contract is for two years. But he warned against sitting on the issue. Changes could be made within or at the end of the two years.

Kubo wondered about untenured faculty members burdened with the department chair activities. She asked if being appointed department chair helps or is problematic for the tenure process. Ehrhorn responded that the department chairs in the library do incorporate administrative activities into their contract renewal and tenure documents.

Chun and Musto summed up the choices for the library faculty: 1. the default choice-do nothing; 2. Make a change. Musto said that UHPA will help to make changes, provided that the changes reflect consensus. Yuen said that the problems were not specific to Hamilton Library, and suggested that the library faculty look at the broader picture. Musto said that he is open to whatever works for the Libraries, whether the library faculty work with other faculty at UH-Hilo or the Law Library or would like something crafted specific to Hamilton and Sinclair Libraries. He strongly suggested the need for consensus.

Chun closed the meeting and thanked the guests for their participation.

Recorded by Amy Carlson on behalf of the LSEB Secretary.