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Library Faculty Senate Meeting
February 17, 2004
Guest attendance: J.N. Musto; Executive Director, UHPA
Faculty count: 35

Purpose of meeting: To discuss workload issues for librarians, and UHPA contract negotiations.

LSEB Chair Chun opened the meeting at 10 a.m. and introduced UHPA representative Carlson, who in turn introduced J.N. Musto.

Following introductions, Musto began the meeting with a brief update on the status of the MOU, which we are waiting for University Administration to formally propose to UHPA regarding Library Personnel Committee procedures.

PRESENTATION:
Musto then addressed the topic of workload for librarians: Workload issues affect librarians as well as other "non-instructional" faculty, such as counselors. Musto has asked these groups about industry standards, and indicated that UHPA is willing to take up this matter if there is consensus among library faculty to do so. He stressed that a balance must be sought between codifying workload which is more specific, and maintaining flexibility.

Musto stated that librarians have had a profound effect on UHPA's thinking, as he has met with most groups of librarians, system-wide. There has not, however, been any progress report from Hamilton Library since the MOU was drafted. Musto acknowledged the interplay between APT/clerical support staff is sometimes more difficult. Musto reiterated the understaffing levels endured by the library.

Musto stressed that it is never too early to seriously sit down with a sub-committee to review these issues and consider proposing changes. He asked if we would want to pull together a task force of just Hamilton and Sinclair librarians, or include representatives from across the system.

Musto stressed UHPA does not have a system they want to overlay on top of us. He cautioned us to retain the sense of professionalism inherent in the contract language of librarian faculty status, pointing out that faculty are not hourly employees! He believes the administration does not really want us to become hourly employees since we would then actually work less!! Musto suggested we try to work out any workload issues amongst librarians, rather than competing with librarians at other system libraries. He again expressed his feeling of encouragement that we are taking a proactive stance by engaging in this conversation.

DISCUSSION:
The floor was then opened to questions and comments, outlined below, with Musto's responses summarized in italics:

1. Have other non-instructional faculty begun the process of discussing this issue?
   JN: No.
2. I am pessimistic about including workload language. We don't want the administration to become dictators of who does what when.
   JN: Balance is required but is definitely against giving up flexibility. Better understands our "quasi-administrative" structure now, and would like to CONSIDER workload language. Default is to protest/grievance when things go wrong. Sees major problem as size of library staff. Encourages argument to increase library staff and make it sustainable.
3. Problem is not just enough professional staff, but also lacking in support staff.
   JN: Good to know this so we can lobby for it. UHHPA always needs to know what you want us to lobby for. How do you want the mix/balance? UHPA doesn't presume to have the answers for you, though they do want librarians to be faculty members.
4. Is the contract the place for these issues to be articulated? When teaching faculty lose positions, they teach fewer classes. For us there is a baseline of work that needs to be done, and it cannot be lowered. How do we leverage for more
positions?

JN: Is the only way to work with UHPA through the contract? NO! You could work to have something in your contract (more specificity), but must weigh this against flexibility and general protection. A good example is that of instructional faculty not having sick leave pre-1985. There are always trade-offs. I’d like to see you make a concerted effort and if you have a good argument to make you can influence the Board of Regents who set priorities for the budget.

5. Concerned with the need for support staff, who form the core of Collection Services. We have 4 departments headed by a single professional librarian.

JN: UHPA makes effort with Board of Regents for specific arguments. Need to have data to support need.

6. We need to propose a task force to study this issue and take results to UHPA.

**Task force volunteers include Carlson, Cartwright, and Chun.**

JN: With current negotiations underway for contract which expires June 30, 2005, only one issue is left for bargaining right now, which is salary. This is the first time in the history of UHPA that there is no other issue on table besides money.

7. It is important to share information regarding other models.

JN: Every university DOES have a library, mehtodologies should be easier to find. Start by looking at the JBL salary study, which looks at our peer institutions.

8. The problem with identifying workload by numbers of hours (e.g., 30 hours) is that it would not address task overloads.

JN: I agree. We bargained very hard to include language that faculty are not hourly, but it was all we could accomplish at the time. There will be more aspects of this issue addressed in the future. This will not come from UHPA, but from all of you. Find a way to look at the issue, and reach consensus (note: not unanimous!).

9. What are the options for a librarian to file a workload grievance if one feels they are being required to do more work than they should be required to do?

JN: Refer to the non-hourly statement in the contract on pages 3 and 4, article 4, which is very broad, and provides a lot of options. Be sure to file a written grievance with UHPA within twenty days of the incident (see UHPA form). This would be a good learning experience. UHPA learns more about language of workload with grievances addressing these concerns. Note that sometimes a grievance is settled informally. Stress that this is not the preferred way to get what you want, but it can help.

10. LPC issue raised regarding expedited tenure for library administrator(s) as well as the recommendation for LPC not to review the case.

JN: Administrators (who are not members of BU07) getting tenure is a decision of the Board of Regents. Departments have been asked to review these cases, and some have gone forward while others have abated. In the current contract, administrators are limited to tenure-track positions. Librarians have a library, so they should be eligible within previous seven years; after seven years the position is open. Urges faculty to be more assertive over tenure-track positions. LPC can reserve the right to take every case on its own merits, but it puts departments/LPC in a conundrum.

Carlson thanked Musto for his participation. Discussion with Musto ended at 10:55 am.

Chun then opened the floor for general Library Senate announcements and new business:

Flynn reminded group that LSEB has completed a lot of work previously on the workload issue. Cartwright noted proportional figures need to be looked at, as well as historical figures and figures regarding both librarians and support staff. Chun suggested the workload task force look at such data as well as the librarians’ workload language of the institutions shown as UHM peer institutions, and furthermore suggested everyone take a look at the JBL survey Musto referred to.

**ACTION:** Task force volunteers include Carlson, Flynn, Horie, and Peacock.

Chun provided a brief update on the two emergency meetings held on 3 and 5 February. The motion proposed at these meetings regarding memos to campus constituencies about the budget crisis was read and vote tallies reiterated. Minutes of these meetings will be available soon on the Library Senate web site.

**ACTION:** Copies of the final text of the 3 memos will be sent by Chun to Library Senate members via e-mail.

Chun reminded members to try to attend Manoa Faculty Senate meeting on Wednesday February 18, as Jean Ehrhorn is expected to be on the agenda.

**ACTION:** Barnwell will send e-mail reminder as well, encouraging attendance and participation.

Peacock asked if LSEB was successful in attempt to secure a copy of the memo from Perushek to Chancellor Engelert. Chun responded in the negative.

**ACTION:** Chun will provide copies of her summary notes from meeting with Perushek to Library Senate, via e-mail.

General discussion of budget figures used in the memos followed. Anderson noted that CDMC used the $4.7 million figure originally because Administration had said to take electronic resources off the table for potential cancellation. Herring noted numbers are fluid, and are primarily used to illustrate the enormity of the situation and this should be kept in mind.
Anderson provided brief update from first meeting of the Serials Review Committee. All selectors are encouraged to conduct surveys and produce core lists of critical journal titles. Special attention needs to be paid to areas where research activities have changed in emphases.

Chun noted the Chancellor’s office did get phone calls in response to the Ka Leo article on the library budget.

Barnard announced the Elections Committee will be conducting another election soon. Watch your e-mail!

Hori provided an update from LPC, which is still working on procedural revisions. LPC would like guidance on expedited tenure case. Peacock suggested LPC recuse itself from reviewing the case. Herring remarked that the case involves a job that does not meet the criteria of Librarian V. Horie stressed the contract only applies to BU07 employees, which does not include administrators. Zastrow suggested we save our ire for other issues. Minatodani countered that it is important that we choose not to participate in a process which is flawed.

Peacock made a motion as follows, seconded by Horie:

**It is moved that the Library Senate Personnel Committee (LPC) not participate in any personnel process for expedited tenure for administrative hires who are not in BU07.**

Motion carries with 28 YES votes.

Herring asked who will communicate this to the Library Administration, proposing it should be LSEB and not LPC. Horie will request the return of the wide-ranging evaluations already submitted to the Personnel office so that they may be destroyed. Carlson suggested a formal memo from LSEB should be sent to Perushek with cc to Ehrhorn and Ishiki.

Chun provided brief update of status of MOU and conversation with Ed Yuen earlier this morning.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.