Library Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes
2009-04-14

Present:
LSEB: Lebbin (Chair), Christensen, Flynn, Horie, Rutter, Saeki

TOTAL ATTENDEES: 23
TOTAL VOTING MEMBERS: 23
NOTE: 18 voting Senate members are required for a quorum.

Convened:
10:08 pm in Hamilton Library Yap Conference Room by Lebbin (Chair).

1. Minutes of 10 March 2009 meeting approved.

2. Reports

LPC

Revisions approved by the Library Senate at the March 10 meeting were incorporated into the Policies & Procedures document. The revised P&P will need to be approved by University Administration in the fall.

Chair

The Elections Committee is organizing a special elections for Manoa Faculty Senate representative to replace Rutter, who declined the position as she will be serving as Library Senate Chair.

3. LPC Policies & Procedures

LPC proposed revisions to expectations used for evaluation during five-year review of library faculty serving as department head.

Section VI.H.3. Where no deficiencies are identified

When the Chair of the Library Personnel Committee determines that the professional activities of the Department Head being evaluated meet the expectations established by the Library Senate as described in this document, the Library policy document adopted Feb. 4, 1997, called Department Head Administrative Responsibilities, she/he will so inform the faculty member and the University Librarian and the review is concluded.

Section VI.H.4. Where deficiencies are identified

When the Chair of the Library Personnel Committee determines that the professional activities of the Department Head being evaluated do not meet the expectations established by the Library Senate as described in this document, the Library policy document adopted Feb. 4, 1997, called Department Head Administrative Responsibilities, the Chair of the Library Personnel Committee shall specify in writing the
deficiencies that have been identified. If the faculty member does not contest the Chair’s assessment, the faculty member, Chair of the Library Personnel Committee, and the University Librarian shall confer to create a Professional Development Plan which addresses the deficiencies. The final plan shall be in writing and signed by the faculty member, Chair of the Library Personnel Committee, and the University Librarian.

MOTION: Flynn moved to adopt proposed revisions to sections VI.H.3 and VI.H.4.

MOTION APPROVED by unanimous vote of the Senate.

4. UHM Prioritization Process

Lebbin opened the floor for discussion.

Riedy expressed concerns that the Asia Department was not allowed to categorize its own programs. When Asia sent in their prioritized list of programs, IUL Mochida "insisted" that the department recategorize its programs according to her recommendations. After the department resubmitted its report, an additional program was added without consultation with the department.

Minatodani added that Special Collections was also asked to change how they divided their programs. She pointed out that Sinclair had not been required to add the music or video collections nor AV center operations.

Sinclair expressed concern that the process was only used to confirm administration’s existing desired direction for the Library.

Minatodani confirmed that the scoring done by departments did not really factor into the committee’s decision because they were not comparable between departments (comparing apples to oranges).

Ghosh expressed concern that IUL Mochida's recommendations have moved on to the University level without consultation with Library departments

- Minatodani pointed out that that was built into the process, not necessarily the Library’s fault. The question that concerns her is what will come back from University administration and how much latitude the Library and its departments will have to make decisions.

Horie expressed concern that prioritization does not overlook core functions such as cataloging and acquisitions.

Chow asked for clarification if the process was for a programmatic review or to address the immediate budget crisis. Christensen said it’s a grey area: the program review was intended to be long-term, but with the recent budget crisis the two have been tied together.

Lebbin expressed concern that discussion as to what the program review will accomplish has been missing. Is the program review designed to save money? To develop more effective or efficient use of resources?

Johnson said she did not foresee further consultation from Library Administration without outside feedback.

MOTION: Horie moved that the Library Senate request LSEB convey to the Interim University Librarian a summary of concerns raised regarding the prioritization process and offering our expectation of meaningful shared governance on this and related matters.

Motion seconded by Engelberg.

MOTION APPROVED by unanimous vote of the Senate.
The meeting was adjourned at 11:32 am

Next Senate meeting: May 12, 2009, at 10 am.

Submitted by Lori Ann Saeki
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