Library Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes
2005-07-27

Present:

Convened:
9:04 am in Hamilton Library Room 113, the meeting was called to order by Christensen (Chair).

1. Approval of the 2005-06-29 minutes.

Approved.

2. Additions to the Agenda.

None.

3. Announcements.

Vote of No Confidence in the University Librarian (Diane Perushek): The University Librarian, UH Board of Regents, UH President, UH Manoa Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Manoa Faculty Senate, and the University of Hawaii Professional Assembly were notified about the results of the Vote of No Confidence in the University Librarian.

Examples and Substantiation of the Vote of No Confidence: The Library Senate Executive Board is in the process of compiling and collating examples that substantiate the Vote of No Confidence in the University Librarian. The next steps include collating the examples, Senate approval of the examples, and distribution of the examples to the Diane Perushek and other parties.

4. Report on LSEB Meeting with the University Librarian (Diane Perushek) on July 13, 2005.

The Library Senate Executive Board met with University Librarian (Diane Perushek) on July 13, 2005 to listen to her reasons for her request that the Chair of the faculty senate attend the University Librarian's Council. Board discussed with Perushek at length the advantages and disadvantages of her request.

After the University Librarian finished her presentation, the Board continued to discuss the issue. The Board decided to present three options to the Senate.

1. The LSEB chair attend the ULC
2. The University Librarian occasionally attend LSEB (in order to report on issues of Senate interest)
3. The University Librarian and LSEB utilize the already existing organization without instituting a new procedure for meeting

The Board recommended the third option because it was simply unnecessary to establish another process and layer of communication. The existing organizational structure of the Senate and the library already provide channels of communication. The University Librarian and Library Administration can at any time request to meet with the Board to discuss relevant and significant issues. The Senate Chair should not take on the responsibility of filtering, monitoring, and recomunicating issues that arise in the University Librarian's Council. It was still unclear as to the University Librarian's purpose of having the Senate Chair attend, especially since the Senate Chair could not be a decision-making member of ULC. By nature of the Senate, the Chair would have to bring every question/issue back to the full Senate for deliberation.

It was suggested that instead of burdening the Senate Chair or any faculty member to report what goes on in ULC meetings, ULC should distribute their minutes.

A motion was made to adopt the third option to use the existing structure in the library for communication and to recommend that the University Librarian's Council distribute their minutes to the library faculty and staff. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Report on LSEB Meeting with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Neal Smatresk) on July 20, 2005 regarding the Vote of No Confidence in the University Librarian.

The Senate Chair briefed the members on the Board's meeting with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Neal Smatresk). The salient points of the meeting are summarized in the following two statements. The Vice Chancellor confirmed that these statements are accurate.

1. Vice Chancellor Smatresk acknowledged that the vote expresses a serious and genuine concern on the part of library faculty.
2. Vice Chancellor Smatresk stated that he would, in response to the Senate's request, conduct an assessment of the University Librarian's performance. He did not, however, provide details about how or when the assessment would take place.

The Vice Chancellor also shared his philosophy and personal experiences of evaluations of deans and similar positions. He indicated that he likes the idea of an evaluation system for all deans, but there currently is none in place at UH Manoa. He also indicated that he would like to come to the library and speak to all levels and sectors of the library -- faculty, staff, and administrators. He also has a preference for anonymous evaluations. He also indicated that Perushek can be assessed apart from a larger process of assessing deans, especially since that larger process is not in place.

The Senate further discussed issues around the Vote of No Confidence in the University Librarian. Questions were raised about the level of understanding that the Vice Chancellor had about libraries, funding, unionized faculty, and faculty versus administrator roles. Some Senate members said that Perushek has been very good at presenting herself to her peers and to those above her, but very bad at working with
the faculty and staff of the library. It was also noted it has been over one month and she has yet to respond to the Senate regarding the Vote of No Confidence.


The Senate Chair summarized the progress made by the Board on the Review of Library Administrators. A draft of the survey form and the basic instructions have been completed. The Board consulted the literature, gathered examples, wrote numerous drafts, and conducted multiple discussions. There is still work to be done, such as the Senate review and approval of the survey/instructions and the establishment of procedures for administering the survey and for compiling the results.

The Chair introduced the survey and instructions. The purpose of the survey is to provide a framework for rating performance and to gather comments. There are 16 broad performance categories, including an overall rating. Each category has a list of behaviors intended to help think about the category and what it contains. The list is not intended to be a comprehensive list, nor are readers limited to the list of behaviors under each category. The survey is intended to collect faculty perception with substantiation. By using the "Comments" area, details and substantiation can be captured. The survey is also not intended to be the only mechanism to evaluate library administration.

The underlying principles are the whole review system has to be sustainable over time and kept simple. The Board has also tried to avoid anything that creates difficulty in interpreting the results.

The Senate membership agreed that the Board was on the right track with the survey and instructions. A motion was made to move ahead and distribute the draft survey to the full Senate for review. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Next Meeting

August 24, 2005, 9:00 a.m., Hamilton Room 113.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:12 a.m.

Submitted by Theodore Kwok, Secretary
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