Library Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes
2005-12-15

Present:
  LSEB: Cartwright, Flynn (chair), Frost, Minatodani, Peacock, Riedy, Rutter, Sack (recorder), Schultz.
  TOTAL ATTENDEES: 24.
  Guests and associate members: Marylyn Lee, Bob Schwarwalder, Eileen Yara; Karen Cross and Kem Lowry of the Program on Conflict Resolution.

Convened:
  9:05 am in Hamilton Library Room 113; the meeting was called to order by Flynn (chair). The first order of business was agenda item 3.

1. Approval of the 2005-11-23 minutes.

   Approved.

2. Reports of Officers and Standing Committees

   Flynn reported that LSEB met on November 30 to discuss Vice Chancellor Smatresk's recommendation for mediated facilitation in the wake of the vote of no confidence.

   Riedy reported that the Staff Development Committee would work with the UL to resurrect regular library forums.

   There were no other officer or committee reports.

3. Response to conflict resolution proposal from VCAA

   Flynn introduced Karen Cross and Kem Lowry of the Program on Conflict Resolution (PCR). Lowry said that he and Cross had made an assessment of what the VCAA called "library issues." Their goal was to determine the potential for conflict resolution activities, not to judge the merits of the dispute. In their opinion, conflict resolution was not appropriate in our case. Cross and Lowry then took questions.

   Q: What is the difference between the informal conflict resolution that PCR does and the recommendation of the VCAA?
   A: The VCAA is interested in protocols for future optimal work, not a resolution or reconciliation.

   Q: What is the PCR's experience with other units on campus?
   A: In one case, PCR held an all-day session with small groups to discuss the unit's current situation. Several participants later received training in conflict resolution and designed a year-long process that enabled them
to get beyond some problems. Other processes have been more successful but that one struck Lowry as being most similar to the image he has of our situation.

Schwarzwalder stated that the UL, the head of Collection Services, and he all endorse the process recommended by the VCAA.

Q: Is willingness on the part of the library faculty sufficient for a positive outcome or is enthusiasm needed? If so, to what extent?
A: More than one process is possible. The process for the library could be finding practical ways of dealing with a charged situation without betraying one's values. It is not necessary to be passionate; it is okay to have a conditional commitment and at each stage, decide whether or not it is working. Success, however, does require some minimal level of belief in the process.

Q: Could the situation be exacerbated as a result of such a process? (Some individuals may feel vulnerable.)
A: There are ways to get around that problem, e.g., ideas can be submitted anonymously.

Q: Could you clarify your recommendation to the VCAA?
A: It was not a recommendation but rather an assessment in which we told the chancellor that the library faculty are "not ready for what we [Lowry and Cross] do."

Q: What does "ready" mean?
A: The library faculty need to explore their options.

Q: What does moving ahead mean? Could you clarify what the VCAA has recommended?
A: There are several different processes, e.g.,
Elaboration of and agreement on values, principles, and protocols
Strategic problem solving to arrive at specific, concrete actions
Appreciative inquiry-building on what has worked well
What the library would do would be designed by us for our own circumstances.

Before they left, Cross and Lowry stated that they would be happy to provide additional information if that would help library faculty decide their course of action.

Schwarzwalder recommended that library faculty read the information provided by the PCR (now on the senate website) and reiterated that he, Perushek, and Bruner endorse the process.

A motion was made and seconded to invite Kem Lowry and Karen Cross of the Program on Conflict Resolution (PCR) to give us additional, specific, programs wherein we as faculty can progress in more clearly defining our concerns in library governance, and further, that the decision be made by written ballot. That motion was amended to add two more choices to the ballot: to accept the vice-chancellor's recommendation; and to ask the vice-chancellor to remove the university librarian. The amendment passed 15-4. The amended motion passed by voice vote.

**4. Decision regarding written comments from evaluation of library administrators**

Decision postponed.
5. New Business

Postponed.

7. Next Meeting


8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Submitted by Nancy Sack, Secretary
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