Library Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes
2005-05-18

Present:

Convened:
9:05 am in Hamilton Library Room 113, the meeting was called to order by Christensen (Chair).

1. Approval of the 2005-05-04 minutes.

Approved.

2. Additions to the Agenda.

Status of Acquisitions Department Relocation (See item #4 below).

3. Announcement.


Christensen briefed the Senate on the content of the Board's May 16, 2005 meeting. Purpose of the meeting was to discuss procedure for conducting the vote of no confidence and to ensure the procedure is sound. It was concluded that even though five working days notice were given, thus making the May 11 meeting a regular meeting, an opportunity for review of the action should be provided at this May 18, 2005 meeting. The review summarizes actions taken and progress to this point:

- May 11, 2005 the full Senate voted to conduct a vote of no confidence in the University Librarian.
- It was determined that the vote would be by ballot, administered by the Elections Committee.
- The date of the vote was left undetermined.
- The Senate examined a draft of a resolution document for the vote, suggested revisions, and decided to reexamine the draft at the May 18 full Senate meeting.

The Board also discussed the content and purpose of the resolution draft. This discussion included considerations of the voting procedure, the draft, and the planned evaluation of library administrators. Several LSEB members felt that the formal review should be conducted prior to the vote, giving three reasons:

- The formal review would provide evidence to support the vote.
- The review would provide Senate members with a clear view of the faculty
perspective on the University Librarian's performance.
• Conducting the review first would minimize the possibility of having a vote subsequently followed by a review that might not strongly support the vote.

During the discussion there were comments that some LSEB and Senate members prefer conducting the vote without a connection to the formal review. Reasons for not doing review prior to vote include:

• The review is a separate, ongoing activity not necessarily connected to the current situation.
• The review won't necessarily support the vote.
• The vote in itself sends a strong message and doesn't require additional support.
• If additional support is needed, the previous Senate Statement of Concerns and meetings with the University Librarian provide sufficient support for the vote.

Because these issues and concerns may not be completely resolved, the LSEB suggests that the Senate discuss them further. Christensen asked Senate members if they have any questions.

Discussion.

The Senate discussed a number of issues extensively, primarily focusing on whether or not to wait on conducting the vote of no confidence until after the Senate implements the evaluation of administrators initiative. It was asked how long it would take to conduct an evaluation. Board members responded that it is hard to tell. The Board is close to a final draft of the evaluation instrument itself, but there are many other issues and procedures for the Board and Senate to discuss and make decisions on. The Senate has not yet determined how to handle evaluation data, scoring systems, comments, or even have a common understanding/expectation of such an evaluation.

A motion was made and seconded that the vote of no confidence occur before the evaluation of library administrators.

A motion was made to table the just said motion in favor of first discussing the vote of no confidence statement. The motion was not seconded and failed.

The motion that the vote of no confidence occur before the evaluation of library administrators was called to question. The Senate verified that there was a quorum (22 voting members). 18 in favor, 4 opposed, 0 abstentions. Motion passed.


A motion was made and seconded to take the vote of no confidence with a very short statement. Discussion included comments that the vote of no confidence itself is a forceful statement. There were also some corrections of typos and minor revisions of formatting and phrasing.

A motion was made and seconded for friendly amendment to take the first four paragraphs and the final paragraph and delete the detail in between. Discussion was minimal and the motion was called to question. 22 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. Motion passed.
The Senate voted on the motion to take the vote of no confidence with a very short statement. 21 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. Motion passed.

It was suggested that the vote of no confidence should be completed as soon as possible within one month and reaffirmed that the vote will be two weeks long.

4. Status of the Acquisitions Department Relocation

It was mentioned that there might soon be a resolution to the Acquisitions Department relocation issue. The Acquisitions Department has met with Bruner and Schwarzwalder where room 306 was offered to them. Acquisitions sent a report to Bruner on Friday, May 13, 2005 indicating that room 306 was acceptable if several concerns were met, including matters such as installing enough phones and enclosing the areas north and west of room 306.

5. Next Meeting

TBA

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:41 a.m.

Submitted by Theodore Kwok, Secretary
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