Library Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes
2006-04-19

Present:
LSEB: Carlson, Flynn (chair), Johnson, Mattos, Minatodani, Rutter, Sack (recorder).
TOTAL ATTENDEES: 20

Convened:
1:20 p.m. in Hamilton Library Room 113 by Flynn (chair).

1. Approval of the March 15, 2006 minutes

The minutes were approved.

2. Reports of officers and standing committees

Flynn requested clarification from OHR regarding two questions he had been asked about the 360-evaluation of the UL: who will read the comments and how/whether members of the library will be notified of the results. He has not yet received a response.

Flynn also asked the UL and the AUL-IT if they wished to review the comments of the senate evaluation with a senate committee. He received no response, so he will destroy the comments at the end of this meeting.

Flynn apprised the senate that LSEB met twice since the last senate meeting. Flynn had prepared a list of finished and unfinished senate business, which LSEB reviewed. That review prompted a memo to the UL to invite her to today's meeting. Because of a schedule conflict, Paula Mochida is here, instead, to answer questions about human resources and organizational planning.

Flynn announced that the All-Campus Committee of Faculty Senate Chairs met on March 17 and would meet again tomorrow. He also acknowledged Susan Johnson as interim vice-chair of the library senate.

Mattos announced that LPC would soon present a proposed amendment to its policies and procedures.

Rutter announced that the Manoa Faculty Senate flood resolution would not be going forward, due to lack of support within the library.

There were no other officer or committee reports.

3. Human resources/organizational planning updates
Paula Mochida addressed questions forwarded to her by the board.

a. Update on the status of the reorganization
The Archives and Manuscripts Dept. reorganization plans from last fall went out, were returned, and are now in Ann Marcia's office because minor corrections (typos, rewording) need to be made. The final version will go out again next week. Flynn reminded the group that last August library administration presented reorganization plans involving division-level and administrative E/M changes. The status of those proposed changes is unknown. It is on those proposed changes that LSEB seeks clarification and dialogue.

b. Status of the collection development officer.
This week the UL gave Mochida a draft job description. Although Mochida hasn't had a chance to read it yet, she understands it is a faculty position. The senate suggested that input be solicited from CDMC.

c. Clarification of Paula Mochida's responsibilities.
Mochida's position as interim AUL for administration and public services is experimental and clarification on the "AUL for administration" component of her responsibilities remains unavailable. Mochida is busy familiarizing herself with the library's planning, budgeting, and personnel issues. Because Public Services runs smoothly on its own, library-wide concerns, e.g., flood recovery, have become a big part of Mochida's work. She sees part of her job as building bridges, and wanted to know if the senate thinks she should or should not be doing something particular in that area.

d. Organizational chart
Flynn explained that the published organizational chart does not accurately reflect reality. He added that Perushek had said that the process of changing the official chart is long and involved, but that an internal chart could be provided. That hasn't happened yet. A Q&A session ensued between senators and Mochida. It was noted that some reporting lines have become fuzzy and it was requested again that an organizational chart that actually reflects the organization be made available on the new intranet.

e. Progress report on filling faculty vacancies.
The UL is requiring a 2-month waiting period before advertising faculty positions. Asked about the justification, Mochida indicated uncertainty as to how that decision was made.

f. Collection services division head position
Mochida announced that Schwarzwalder has been talking with Collection Services department heads about his taking responsibility for Collection Services as well as IT and facilities. Mochida said he has some experience in technical services and can provide insight into how technology can facilitate processing. During Q&A, Mochida clarified that this assignment would be for one year with reviews at 3 and 6 months, and that it might provide time needed to consider fully what the best arrangement is for the division. The senate recognized that Collection Services operations have significant library-wide impact and suggested that discussion about changes in its management be brought openly before the whole organization.

Mochida asked whether the senate preferred an AUL for Collection Services or for Collection Development. Senators answered that consensus has not been reached on
that type of decision. This provided a segue into agenda item number 4.

**4. LSEB motion recommending faculty-led review of the organizational structure and peer models**

Flynn read the LSEB recommendation to form an ad hoc senate committee to review the organizational structure of the library and to investigate other models. Mochida supported the idea and added that she would like to work with that group. She said admin is reactive to the current situation and is not looking at our overall structure. A number of models are available—we need to determine what will work best here.

**7. New business**

None.

**8. Adjournment**

As there was no longer a quorum, the meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Submitted by Nancy Sack, secretary
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