Library Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes
2004-10-06

Present:

Convened:
9:02 am in Hamilton Library Room 306. The meeting was called to order by Christensen, Library Senate Chair.

1. Approval of minutes

Minutes of 10 August 2004 are pending.

2. Additions to the agenda

None.

3. Announcements

Christensen made two announcements:

- The LSEB and Library Senate will be using Robert's Rules of Order for conducting meetings.
- Ruth Horie has agreed to serve as the Library Senate parliamentarian.

4. Revisions to the Library Personnel Committee Policies and Procedures

Christensen summarized the proposed change to the LPC Policies and Procedures as distributed to library faculty by the LPC/Elections Committee on 27 September 2004. In brief, it calls for the addition of the phrase "if they so desire" to the end of clause #2 of section II.E.1.b.2. The proposed revision would read: "The procedures call for: ... 2) the application to be reviewed by the department chair and the Library Personnel Committee, who make written assessments and append their recommendation if they so desire; ...."

Chopey made a motion and Riedy seconded it to approve the change. There was no discussion and there were no objections. The motion passed.

5. Review of library administration

A. Christensen summarized where the LSEB is in the process and the future course of action.
• On 10 August 2004, the Library Senate decided to pursue a review of Library Administration.
• LSEB began gathering information, including:
  - Board of Regents Administrative Rules
  - a 4 April 1997 memorandum from the Vice President/Vice Chancellor of UHM (Carol Eastman) regarding the comprehensive evaluation of deans and directors
  - input from the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs, especially Maui Community College which has a faculty administered review of administration
  - UHM Faculty Senate guidelines
  - Association of Research Libraries guidelines
  - Other professional standards and research
• LSEB believes it is important to understand the current and past UH Manoa administrative review process.
  - It provides a context for our own review
  - Allows the Senate to use existing resources and mechanisms
  - Helps the Senate determine if and why there is a need for a separate faculty-administered review
  - Helps the Senate explain its actions and purpose
• Christensen outlined the questions LSEB would like to pose to UH Manoa administration (library administration, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Chancellor), starting with Library Administration:
  - What is the current policy and procedure for UHM review of deans/directors?
  - When was the last review conducted?
  - Who participates in a UHM review? When do faculty participate?
  - If current Library Administration has been reviewed, can the library faculty/staff see the review instrument/template and the results?

Herring made a motion and Wermager seconded it to approve LSEB to proceed asking the above questions at all levels of administration, starting with Library Administration. There was no discussion and there were no objections. The motion passed.

B. Senate members discussed the role of faculty and staff in a review of administration, how the library defines administration, and the issues of evaluating a library administration which includes two librarian faculty (public and collection services division heads). It was agreed that the University Librarian and the two Associate University Librarians are central to the review. Discussion will continue.

Engleberg made a motion and Riedy seconded it to approve LSEB to begin talking with the faculty union about issues involved with reviewing a library administrative unit which includes two librarian faculty. There was no discussion and there were no objections. The motion passed.

C. Christensen emphasized two key goals: quality of service and quality of the workplace. There is a need for organizational clarity among librarian faculty and with library administration. In the past several years the library has gone through substantial organizational and operational changes, including library administration itself. There has been a lack of clarity and the Senate needs to determine if the faculty/staff and administration are in agreement about its organization and operations.
Senate members discussed two possible types of reviews: [1] a performance review of administrators (management positions) and [2] a review of the administration (as an organizational unit).

Senate members also briefly discussed the issue of tenure for administrators. Questions arose regarding who has the power to grant tenure, where and how are positions are created/allocated for administrators who have tenure, and what is the tenure review process for administrators. Discussion will continue.

Peacock thanked the LSEB for their leadership and efforts in this area, expressed a hope that our efforts do not get obstructed by the bureaucracy, and hoped that the Senate will have an evaluation tool by the end of the academic year.

Herring suggested that LSEB talk with chair of CTAHR's (Colleged of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources) faculty senate. They administered a review of their dean.

6. Next Meeting

Full Senate, November 9, 2004, 9:00-10:00, Hamilton Room 306.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 am.
Submitted by Theodore Kwok (Secretary)
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