Library Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes
2004-08-10

Present:
LSEB: Chun (Chair), Christensen (Chair-Elect), Barnwell (recorder), Rutter (MFS), Sack (EC). LIBRARY SENATE: Engelberg, Flynn, Frost, Ghosh, Herring, Hori, Horie, Johnson, Kellett, McMillen, Mak, Minatodani, Ouchi, Perrett, Polansky, Riedy, Sinclair, Suzuki, Tillinghast, Zastrow. TOTAL ATTENDEES: 25.

Convened:
9:07 am in Room 301 of Hamilton Library. The meeting was called to order by Chun, LSEB Chair. Chun introduced Christensen, incoming Chair of LSEB, who will convene the majority of the meeting.

Announcements (Chun):

Chun made several announcements:

- The MOU has been approved regarding Article X of the tenure and promotion procedures. Article XXIII is pending signatures. Cartwright, Carlson and Horie will be following up with UHPA and Ed Yuen.
- Thanked Tillinghast for her work on migrating and updating the LSEB web site.
- The new slate of LSEB Officers: Christensen (Chair), Flynn (Vice Chair), and Kwok (Secretary).

Memo To Manoa Faculty Senate (MFS)

A draft memo regarding library budget concerns has been distributed to libsen-l and will be sent once regular meetings resume this fall. It was moved that the memo be sent and seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Library Senate Meetings

The LSEB recommended that Library Senate meetings be held more frequently and more regularly, to enable the Senate to become more efficient, more proactive, and improve communication channels. Currently, the Library Senate constitution calls for at least 2 meetings of the full Senate per year.

Discussion: The LSEB does not anticipate changing its leadership role, and decisions will still follow according to established Library Senate procedures for voting, etc. A question was asked if this signaled a change in the function of LSEB. It was acknowledged that it could affect the functioning of both LSEB and the Library Senate, but it is anticipated that the changes would be for the better, resulting in an improved work environment.

The LSEB reiterated issues about library faculty involvement in library matters by posing questions: What do faculty control in the library? What roles do library faculty have in decision-making? What does the Board of Regents charter say?
Senate members supported this argument and recommended additional emphasis on the Senate working to develop an environment where people are ready to talk about issues and to be more comfortable with this kind of ongoing activity. Members commented on frustration with library administration. Members felt that regular meetings as a group to discuss common problems will move us toward goals of improving the library.

Members inquired how LSEB envisions input from the Library Senate. The LSEB responded by suggesting various options: resolutions; committees; importance of preserving the record of all Senate communications; review of operational policies and procedures. The LSEB also suggested that issues brought to the Senate could be discussed by LSEB first, or by full Senate membership, or whatever fits the issue. The most important thing is that an appropriate action be taken by the group in an efficient and effective way. It was emphasized that issues can go farther up the chain of command, as in MFS for example. Policy requires that all adopted MFS resolutions go to the Chancellor, President, and Board of Regents for comment and/or action.

**Evaluation Of Library Administrators**

Christensen outlined the proposed evaluation of library administrators, which was brought to the LSEB by members of the library faculty. Christensen summarized the LSEB discussions to date, and provided an overview of his preliminary research into how other libraries have handled this issue. Christensen emphasized that LSEB cannot gauge how much interest there is in pursuing this topic, and so moved that the Library Senate consider taking on the subject of evaluating library administrators. It was seconded, and the motion passed. A summary of the major questions/comments are:

- What is purpose of such an evaluation/review?
- What reviews are currently being done and by whom?
- What are the current policies on reviewing administrators?
- How to involve administration in the process? Hope was expressed that a director would want to be evaluated by faculty for purposes of improvement.
- How to protect faculty and staff and anonymity in the process?
- How does the Chancellor get information about how the library is functioning?
- There can be good communication, but with bad management things stay the same.
- A review of administrators can be a prominent, powerful way of opening channels of communication.
- The evaluation of division heads was also raised, but noted these positions are covered in the tenure/promotion process.

Several sources of additional information were raised:

- Manoa Faculty Senate (MFS) and its charter
- ARL Spec Kit
- AAUP statement on faculty governance, which recommends faculty evaluate their administrators.
- Other institutions’ procedures for the review of administrators. For example, the University of Michigan has a process in place.
- Previous survey results. Members recalled a survey that went out to staff, which identified some problems in the library, but that faculty/staff and administration did not come to a clear agreement on how to address the problems. It was also
pointed out that LSEB had been asked by administration to "do something" about the problems identified in the survey, but LSEB responded that this was the responsibility of Library Administration.

Christensen focused the discussion on whether there is a generally favorable attitude towards the idea of a formal review mechanism for library administrators. Christensen pointed out that LSEB needs a secure documented ground for moving ahead, and we need to maintain our organizational compass if we proceed. Christensen reiterated the salient point: what is the problem and what should we do? Members agreed that the Library Senate has good intentions for positive improvement and that a review of library administrators is a good thing. Members like the idea of this initiative being a positive first step and to:

- proceed with more background work
- have brainstorming sessions for people to vent frustrations.
- utilize previous survey results, as they reflect many ongoing issues
- encourage administration’s involvement
- address issues happening now
- consider faculty and administration’s roles and responsibilities
- take back responsibility for the quality of the library
- document the review/survey results, to make it ongoing, and to share it with MFS for the good of the entire campus.

Christensen summarized the discussion by stating that, in principle, we agree that this topic of evaluation of library administrators should be pursued. It was moved that the LSEB, as representing the Library Senate, gather information about the review of administrators. The motion was amended to read "In principle the Library Senate is in favor of review of library administrators and supports further investigation by the LSEB." The motion was seconded, and passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 am.

Respectfully submitted and edited by the 2004-2005 Executive Board

Jane Barnwell, LSEB Secretary
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