Library Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes
2005-03-16

Present:
LSEB: Cartwright, Christensen (chair), Flynn, Kwok (recorder), Rutter, Schultz.

Convened:
9:03 am in Hamilton Library Room 113, the meeting was called to order by Christensen (Chair).

1. University Librarian's (Diane Perushek) response to the Library Faculty Senate Summary Statement in the UHM Library Senate Statement of Concerns.

Christensen thanked Perushek for coming to respond to the Senate's Summary Statement. The format of the meeting will be to have Perushek speak, followed by discussion.

Perushek indicated that she had prepared a statement. She began by reading the Summary Statement:

The University Librarian administers the library with a hierarchical, non-collegial approach that does not adequately identify or address the needs of the organization, faculty, staff, or researchers.

Perushek said that this is a serious matter that has been raised and appreciates the opportunity to discuss it. It touches at the heart of decision making and communication. She hopes that we can make the library a better organization and welcomes the opportunity for discussion. She assumes that this is referring to non-flood related activities. She indicated that she inherited a hierarchical structure in the library and that it fits the classic pyramid structure of other units on campus -- a dean, department head, and faculty. She also often asks for recommendations through division heads and department heads. She said it is hard to tell if it is effective. On the other hand, it would also be hard to read 150 opinions.

Perushek said that she sometimes accepts short deadlines from UH Administration. For example with the AJA digitization project, she accepted it because the Chancellor gave money for it.

She has also scheduled meetings with small groups of library faculty to skirt the hierarchy. She said she also formed the Library Departmental Council which includes all departments, is well-attended, and jointly run. She is also in constant touch with deans and faculty.
She said that shared governance is the underlying concern. She commented by referring to the two general conclusions in AAUP’s (American Association of University Professors) "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities," that:

. . . joint effort seem clearly warranted: (1) important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all the institutional components, and (2) differences in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand.

She indicated that she is not interested in recrimination, that it is hard to deal with anonymous information, and that it is important to work towards improving communication. Perushek closed her opening remarks by asking two questions:

1. What do you want changed for the betterment of the institution?
2. How do we set priorities?

Discussion

**Topic - Priorities**

Hori asked Perushek how she sets priorities for herself as the University Librarian and for the library?

Perushek said she does this through observation of needs and through comparisons with the activities of other libraries nationally. She also commented that she does not want to be on the bleeding edge of information technology. She indicated that the Strategic Plan was important to her, that everyone including civil service has had input, and that the University Librarian’s Council set the priorities.

Hori followed up by asking how do the priorities of the Chancellor fit into hers?

Perushek said if she thinks it is a good idea, she will propose it to the library. But also indicated that she has said no to some of the Chancellor's proposals. For example, she did not accept the proposal for the university library to take over all the departmental libraries on campus.

**Topic - Communication**

Polansky mentioned that during John Haak's years, there was a less hierarchical atmosphere. He always walked around and talked to people. He had a sense of what was going on. He had an open door policy. These important aspects have been lost since Perushek came on. People feel distanced. She observed that Perushek is always talking to the same people, and when this happens it is hard to feel you are participating or have a say in what is going on.

Regarding the open door policy, Perushek said that has changed.

**Topic - Faculty Initiative versus Workload**

Bruner indicated that he is a relatively new person and that he is distressed at the lack of cooperation when calling for people to volunteer or to serve on committees, especially the experienced people haven't helped. He feels that things are designed to
sabotage people’s agendas. He apologized for being so negative, but he said that he came from a 4th tier institution that was 10 years ahead of UH. He also said that people here feel that they have absolute veto power.

Polansky pointed out that UH and the library has suffered well over 10 years of budget cuts and has been severely downsized. Many faculty and staff don’t have time to volunteer. Many have stepped up to the plate and have been doing the work of 2-3 people.

Schwarzwalder said that he keeps up with over 100 people nationally and that this is the norm and we are not unusual. He mentioned that we are a third world library regarding information technology.

Perushek commented that it appears that more than just her will change in this process.

**Topic - Management versus Faculty Positions for Division Heads**

Lebbin commented that the library's hierarchical structure is actually relatively flat. Faculty do not supervise each other -- the division and department heads are not higher in the administrative hierarchy than other faculty. By Perushek asking the Chancellor to add more AULs to serve as division heads, the organizational structure will change and the library will become more hierarchical.

Perushek said that she saw how Hensley and Diercks had to function as division heads. She felt that there were inequities in their salaries -- that there were faculty in their respective divisions who were paid more than the division heads. She expressed her perspective that most libraries are more efficient if they have AULs as division heads. She said that it also affects the division heads ability to write evaluations for tenure and promotion. She indicated that she spoke mostly to Hensley about this. She sees the division head as a high pressure position. She is also looking to the future and her ability to fill the position. She said she has had no takers from within the library.

Cartwright commented that there is an alternative to making division heads managerial positions. He suggested that a person in such a position does not need to be an administrator, but rather a communicator. He pointed out that it takes time to make decisions that involve consultation. It is not convenient, but it does provide unity.

Lebbin commented that there are many salary inequities within the library. Also, that other libraries do not necessarily have faculty status. You have to value faculty status and tenure. UH had severe budget cuts and the library has replaced hardly any faculty positions that were lost, but now library administration want AULs. Why aren't we fighting for faculty positions.

Christensen added that ARL statistics show that UH Library's paraprofessional numbers are extremely low.

Ehrhorn indicated that the library got back two positions -- archivist and electronic resources librarian.

Perushek says she asks for positions every year.

Lebbin said that it would be disappointing if the library gets additional management
positions, but not others such as for faculty, especially to replace lost and temporary positions.

Bruner commented on the failed democracies of Athens and Poland and that faculty don't want any accountability except to themselves.

Horie asked Perushek to clarify her wanting to compensate AULs more than others and where would the money come from?

Perushek indicated that she has asked for both the position and the funding.

Schwarzwalder commented that the union and the faculty must take up the issue of long-term temporary positions. He also asked what do we want? What would a collegial model look like on a daily basis?

**Topic - Planning and Morale**

Flynn briefly responded to Bruner saying that faculty are not sheep. Faculty should run the library, instead of taking marching orders. Regarding the strategic plan, it was not a wide enough forum to get everyone on board.

Schwarzwalder asked what the process would look like ideally.

Flynn said that there are 56 librarians -- it's a small group. Hold discussions and get a buy-in from everyone. The way it currently functions with information flowing through department heads, there is no inter-departmental communication.

Minatodani commented that there has been a critical collapse of morale in the library. The faculty and staff have gone through a lot -- Haak left, new and renovated buildings, new library system, and a relatively new administration. There were high expectations of the university librarian for a vision and direction, but we have yet to see a strong articulation of direction.

Minatodani responded to Bruner's comment that faculty are self-centered. There has been a steady decline in funding and morale. Faculty are not causal, but reactive. It is unfair to blame the faculty for the problems.

**Topic - Personnel**

Riedy raised the issue of the Asia Collection not being consulted on a recent vacancy in their department that was filled by Library Administration.

Perushek said that she had no idea that Asia Collection was not consulted. She also mentioned that it was expensive to interview candidates.

Chun emphasized that we are not talking about the person [who is in the position], rather she wanted to know how was the decision made.

Perushek asked that she meet with the Asia Collection separately.

**Topic - Decision Making and Committees**

Bruner asked, what is the purpose of Public Services Head or Library Departmental
Council, if it is not to share ideas?

Sinclair commented on how we could make things better. The various meetings and committees, such as LDC, don't seem to exist for joint decision making. Decision making is taking place in people's offices. It seems that the meetings are only to share information.

Schwarzwalder took exception to Sinclair's comments and said there have been many task forces, such as OpenURL, ILLIAD, and the Web Redesign groups that have defined their own processes.

Christensen commented that there is room for discussion in the library on how decision making and policy setting is handled in the library. He used collection development and management as an example. Collection development and management in the library is currently a mess. Looking at the documents that indicate how UH and shared governance works -- we are faculty, BOR rules do identify areas of primary responsibility for academic policy and decision making. It is faculty who are responsible for scholarly output. Faculty determine matters such as the curriculum, not administrators. It is important to determine within the library the areas of primary responsibility. There is a role for administration to play and for faculty to play. For example, collection development should take place within a faculty administered unit.

Christensen continued by saying that CDMC has languished and not met for over 10 months. It used to be a vibrant committee. There is also an artificial division between CDMC and ECC based on library material format. The division is unnecessary. ECC is currently administered and co-chaired by Schwarzwalder and Bruner. Why?

Perushke suggested that we might want to change the charge of these committees (CDMC and ECC).

Conclusion

Christensen suggested that we examine the use of shared governance in the library. What implications has it for the library? How to implement in the library? Such an examination may produce fruitful discussion and organizational clarity.

Perushke suggested that we continue the meetings

A motion was made, seconded, and approved to adjourn.

2. Next Meeting

March 23, 2005

3. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:07 a.m.

Submitted by Theodore Kwok, Secretary
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