Library Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes
2005-04-06

Present:

Convened:
9:12 am in Hamilton Library Room 113, the meeting was called to order by Christensen (Chair).

1. Library Senate Vote on Revising the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (ACCFSC) Charter.

Christensen briefed the Senate about the ACCFSC and the reasons for the revision of the Charter. On March 18, 2005, the ACCFSC approved the proposed revision for ratification by the University of Hawaii faculty senates. The revision was necessitated by the establishment of a system-wide university administration, which included the creation of the President's office.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the revision of the ACCFSC Charter. No discussion. The motion passed unanimously.


Approved


Christensen indicated that the purpose of this agenda item was to give Senate members an opportunity to bring issues to the Senate and LSEB in preparation for a formal Senate action regarding personnel actions in the library. In the last full Senate meeting, Allen Riedy, Head of the Asia Collection, raised the issue of Library Administration's non-consultation in filling an area specialist librarian position with an internal transfer. At that meeting University Librarian Perushek asked to discuss the issue with Asia Collection members separately. Subsequently, Asia Collection members informed LSEB that this is a personnel management issue of interest to the library as a whole and Asia Collection's situation is just an example. Christensen commented that this is an opportunity to address other personnel issues at the same time, such as how we fill positions and how that process works. The floor was opened for discussion,

Senate members offered a number of examples where the Library Administration has not acted in a consultative manner and making unilateral decisions, not following
policies where such policies exist, and not conducted the analysis to justify changes in past practices. Examples of personnel issues include:

- How are search committees are formed?
- How are vacancies filled? How is it determined that a vacancy will be filled by a search committee process versus an appointment/internal transfer by the University Librarian.
- How are division head positions filled?
- How is it determined that a certain percentage of a person's work will be other than 100% in the department? For example, 80% in Asia Collection and 20% in Collection Services. Where is the analysis that shows less than 100% is needed for a particular position?
- How are duties distributed when personnel retire/resign?
- Why is Library Administration requesting management positions without consultation with the faculty?

Christensen commented that where there are no policies, we should request policies be established.

Splitting one's work between two units in the library sets a precedent for a certain type of model that has not been discussed in the library. It was noted that this is not only a situation with faculty, but also with the library technicians splitting responsibilities across departments. There has been no explanation, no consultation, and no analysis for such actions. Such actions need to be thought out because there are broad implications in management, workload, tenure, and promotion. Again, there is a lack of communication on the part of Library Administration.

It was pointed out that there has been a pattern of creating vague and ill-defined positions residing outside the library's departmental organizational structure. Many of these positions have split or multiple responsibilities across the organization.

Another example of a personnel issue of concern is the collection development officer position. It was reported that Perushek said that the collection development officer will define his/her own role. Senate members said collection development is dysfunctional and in a state of disarray. It is a mistake and unfair to bring in a collection development officer into this environment and to define his/her own role. A new collection development officer will have a better chance of success if the library clearly defines how collection development decisions are made, how operations and the organization function, and what the expectations of the collection development officer are.

In another example, a librarian was seeking funding for an electronic resource and Perushek said to talk with Bruner. However, why Bruner? He is not in charge of the budget nor does he supervise collection development. An additional question was raised why Bruner and Schwarwalder co-chair ECC?

The Senate discussed CDMC's charge, but many selectors have never seen it. Some members who were on CDMC a year ago remember it. It was also commented that there should never have been a separation by format in CDMC and ECC. Moreover, of the twelve members of ECC, only two are full-time collection development librarians from the UHM Library, and the two co-chairs have no collection development responsibilities. CDMC was a much more vibrant and responsible committee when it was faculty driven. It was commented that ECC was originally formed to spend the money that the Chancellor gave the library to purchase electronic resources. It was
suggested we should dissolve ECC and reform CDMC.

It was reiterated that the library needs clarity on the issues of filling positions and on the issues of how responsibilities within positions are defined. "Rot" and "decay" expressed the sentiment in the library about how things have been managed in the library.

Christensen briefly reviewed the status of Senate initiatives:

1. Process for reviewing library administration
2. Vote of no confidence in the University Librarian
3. List of Senate concerns were compiled
4. Meeting with the University Librarian regarding the list of Senate concerns (of which the top concerns were a hierarchical structure and a non-consultative management).
5. Revision of the Library Senate Constitution and By-Laws. We need an alternative to a hierarchical and a non-consultative management -- one based on shared Governance and grounded in the UH Board of Regents form of governance.
6. Ongoing development of review instrument. The Senate will have an opportunity for input. The review process may provide for faculty/staff input more frequently than annually.

Senate members questioned: What are we going to do? What are our next steps? Christensen responded that the Senate needs to identify problems. There needs to be an analysis of the problems that are brought to Library Administration with solutions and requests. Personnel and collection development are two good examples of issues that need to be addressed. Members also commented that the Senate needs to document the problems in the library, perhaps in a resolution. Other members expressed, what if nothing happens? Board members said if we don't get satisfaction, it goes into the review/evaluation and on to university administration. We can ask for action!

Senate members commented that this is why, for example, in the area of collection development, the faculty should have a strong voice. Members expressed frustration that CDMC has not been convened. We are all faculty. We should convene ourselves. It was also pointed out that Library Administration has a difficult time dealing with more than one issue at a time. The Senate needs to break up all the issues into smaller blocks for them.

The question was raised, what does the Senate want LSEB to do first? Discussion focused on what to handle first -- personnel or collection development. Members commented that the library is dysfunctional and fractured. There are faculty and staff floating in various capacities. We have administration trying to add two management positions. There are serious building management issues to address, especially in the areas of health and safety. There are all the personnel issues mentioned earlier.

It was decided that personnel will be addressed first, then collection development and CDMC. Meanwhile, Senate members will try to convene CDMC.

A Senate member commented that the Senate can be more proactive regarding personnel issues and policies. To whom can comments be sent? Christensen said to send all comments to the Senate Chair. Christensen commented that the faculty can take action to create the kind of workplace we want. It needs faculty effort.
4. Next Meeting

April 20, 2005

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:29 a.m.

Submitted by Theodore Kwok, Secretary
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