Library Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes
2011-04-05

Present:

Yati Paseng (chair), Gwen Sinclair (vice-chair/chair elect), Stu Dawrs (Secretary), James Cartwright (Manoa Faculty Senate), Carol Kellett (Manoa Faculty Senate), Ruth Horie (UHPA), Dore Minatodani, Joan Hori, Ross Christensen, Ted Kwok, Jean Erhorn, Jodie Mattos, Sharon Ouchi, K.T. Yao, Susan Johnson, Hisami Springer, Pat Polansky, Soonyoung Chang, David Brier, Jan Zastrow, Jan Sung, Jude Yang, Naomi Chow, James Adamson, Amy Carlson, Eileen Herring, Beth Tillinghast, John Char, Mabel Suzuki, Mike Chopey, Monica Ghosh, Alan Grosenheider (Interim Associate University Librarian), Paula Mochida (Interim University Librarian), Salim Mohammed, Nancy Sack, Allie Jordan.

TOTAL ATTENDEES: 35

TOTAL VOTING MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: 31 [NOTE: 16 voting Senate members are required for a quorum.]

Convened: 10:30 am in Hamilton Library Yap Conference Room by Paseng.


2. Presentation on library reorganization proposal by Interim University Librarian Paula Mochida and Associate Interim University Librarian Alan Grosenheider.

Paseng: Issues a friendly reminder of the need to adhere to Roberts Rules of Order.

Mochida: [Review of timeline, past and present, and summary of dept. head units in the proposed reorganization.] It’s already been a little over a year since we began with a couple of faculty retreats with the department heads of the library last year, in which we had brainstorming sessions about possible configurations of the library departments and also for the roles of two assistant and associate ULs that we didn’t at that time have in place. They were on the org chart but we didn’t have warm bodies in those positions, so we talked about different ideas for what they might do. We followed that with all-library staff meetings that if you recall we broke up into groups of faculty, invited faculty to two meetings, we had two for service staff and one for APTs since there are only 26 APTs. And we did SWOT exercises during those sessions, looking at the library’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. And it was very eye-opening to get the opinions, comments and ideas from our civil service and APT staff. They were very forthcoming during those presentations. The whole
timeline is actually in two parts: The informal—which is the internal process—and then the formal process is when it goes out of the library. It’s still in as of today, or up until today, the informal process of consulting with the library staff; we began last July — let me backtrack, sorry, so we had the open sessions for the library staff in April; in May there were I believe at least two meetings while I was out of town in which I asked the L.E.T. [Library Executive Team] to go ahead and have their own brainstorming sessions about possible scenarios for the reorganization. That was intentional because I wanted to give them the opportunity to come up with ideas without me influencing them at all. So they came up with ideas and when I returned I looked at those ideas and we began to narrow in on a variation of one particular kind of idea about how we would use the two AUL positions and how we might begin grouping departments. With that in mind, and it was a moving target, it was a work in progress, we began meeting with departments July of last year. And it took us about two months to complete meeting with every single department, and with individual department heads that would be affected by the proposed reorganization as we were envisioning it at that time. There have been adjustments along the way, as adjustments have been made within our LET discussions, we have met again with either departments or with department heads or with individuals who might be impacted to get their reaction, their input, their ideas on those ideas as they developed. You know, I swear I thought we would complete this by September, October, November, December, but every week something would come up and we’d go “Oh, we need to think about this idea again,” or “This group is concerned about that, what’s the impact, what’s the domino effect?” So each one of the ideas that we gathered from all of you and all of our staff that we’d come to seriously consider, couldn’t be considered in isolation; it rippled through as we had to check here and check there, multiple times. So before I knew it, it was December, January, there were still loose ends, still good ideas, still reconsiderations until the early part of this year. And although we formally completed meeting with every department in September, the reviews and the additional talks took us through as recently as last week, we were talking with specific individuals about roles, about impacts and things like that. And as recently as yesterday we were still making word-smithing changes in the narrative. And although Alan has already uploaded the document to for the staff and the URL is on the edge of the handout he gave you with the timeline; I asked him to wait until this meeting before we actually publish it, just in case there’s one more last minute thing that occurs. So with this meeting today we are rolling out the narrative documents, which are available for all of you on the Intranet to read. We’ll have two open meetings tomorrow, at 10 a.m. and 2 p.m., in a larger room, where everyone is invited to come at whichever time is convenient — it will be a repeat of today, to announce briefly the timeline and where we are with things. And then everyone will have until April 21 submit something in writing to us, that will become part of the official documentation, it will be your opportunity to officially respond to the proposed reorganization.
We will take those into consideration, but hopefully within a week’s time after that date, we will have a final document to send out on its formal process of review through the Manoa administration. A year ago in April I actually started that formal process because I needed to inform Vice-Chancellor Dasenbrock, who I report to, about our intent to reorganize. So he’s been informed about it for the last year. I have not had any detailed reports to him, I’ve just let him know where we are and why it’s been taking longer than I had initially projected to him, and he’s been OK with that. He’s always said, “Just take as long as you feel is needed to do the consultations in house,” knowing that we have a large organization. So let me quickly go over the official process: So when we do submit this out of the library, hopefully on the week of May 2, it will be headed for the chancellor’s office, but it will first go to the Manoa Human Resources Office, they take a look at it; the Budget Office—and this is just pro forma, it’s the way it’s always done—they take a look at costs and we say there are actually no costs. And then it will go to the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, where it then will also be shared with the SEC [Senate Executive Committee] of the Manoa Faculty Senate, and it will also be shared with the unions for their consultation. At each stage, at each review, there is a predetermined period of time that the others will be given to review and respond with their comments. And after each of those levels of response, we will have an opportunity to look at it to see if we agree to revise it in some way based on a question asked or a suggestion made. We are hoping by August that the documentation has gone through all of its stages of consultation and that we are able to submit the final document to the chancellor’s office for her approval. And that might take several weeks or up to a month. If everything goes smoothly and on schedule, we’re hoping that by September 1st or shortly thereafter, we have a reorganization proposal that has been approved and can go into effect. So that’s the timeline.

Before I go over the very broad table of departments and where they might be reconfigured, I want to acknowledge the work that Jean Erhorn has put into the written documentation. She had to listen in on all of our discussions, take notes, understand why we were doing this and how we were going to go about doing it and put that all into writing for us. We’ve had many many revisions of that, including again as of last week and even yesterday, that she has been responsible for.

I also want to acknowledge Alan Grosenheider, who spent hours and hours working on the revised organizational charts themselves, because we had to account for every single position in the library, and there are over 160 of those positions.

Cartwright: A comment—you have here that the proposal as modified will be submitted to SEC on the 7th of June ...
Mochida: That’s a target date...

Cartwright: ...by that point the different faculty senate committees are usually not functioning throughout the summer. SEC usually sends this out to different committees. I don’t know whether that’s going to have time to go through SEC in order for you to have an August decision...

Mochida: Oh yes, thank you for pointing that out. We’ll check on that, thank you.

Mochida: Are there any other questions on the timeline? OK. On the other sides of the handout then, are a listing of ... we actually have 14 library departments within the library; we’ve added a 15th, that is the Industrial Relations Center, which I’ll remind you is a organized research unit administratively under the library.

We are reducing in the proposal 14 departments to five departments. The five departments are the Hamilton Learning and Research Services Department, the Department of Content Discovery and Delivery, the Special Research Collections, Regional Collections and the Sinclair Learning and Research and Services Department. There will be an Office of Library Information Technology, that will work directly with the proposed Associate Dean—because we are in proposal requesting a change in titles from University Librarian to Dean and from Associate University Librarian to Associate Dean—and will not be a department per se but will be an office working directly with the Associate Dean for Academic Services and Library Information Technology. The two Associate Deans being proposed are one for Distinctive Collections and Library Administration—the distinctive collections would include Special Research Collections and Regional Collections. The second associate dean would be responsible for Content Discovery and Delivery, the Hamilton and Sinclair Research Services Departments, as well as the Office of Library Information Technology.

Department heads will be something we will work on later, as we get closer to an approval or after the approval. So nothing has been determined just yet.

Christensen: So we’ll have until the 21st, and to provide comments, and then will those comments be included in the proposal as it moves forward?

Mochida: Documented and included.

Grosenheider: To clarify, when it goes out on the timeline, when the PDF goes out of the library, at that point the written comments will be attached to it. Everything that’s written gets included.

Mochida: And the written comments have to be identified, they can’t be
anonymous.

Hori: Regarding the comments from the staff; they’re going to be added to the proposal, but will they be perhaps incorporated into the proposal—will the proposal be changed? You only have a week between the comments and sending it out to another level. If you get lots of comments, what are you going to do? Are you going to really consider them or ...

Grosenheider: The formal proposal that we’re targeting to leave May 2 is to incorporate comments as appropriate. It’s not necessarily that everything will be incorporated, but as appropriate. If there are so many comments that it’s going to take us a while for us to figure it out, then everything shifts. These are our target dates, and if they get pushed for some reason, then the timeline will be revised.

Sack: I just wanted to know what the difference is between a department and an office.

Mochida: A department will have a department head, within that department they will be working together on common functional responsibilities. The office in this particular case will not have a department head, but will work directly with the Associate Dean for Library Information Technology. We decided to do that because Information Technology impacts, it effects and it supports all of us across the library. And we felt that it needed to be taken to a higher level so that the final decisions are made at the executive level and not by a department head or heads. And it’s requiring more and more that we work outside of our own campus, with the other campuses. So the responsibilities have increased; we felt we would still need the expertise of members of the current systems office and DNS; that we would create more of an office structure and have it headed by the Associate Dean.

Ghosh: The Office of Library Information Technology would that be Systems and DNS ...

Mochida: But they’re going to be reconfigured as well. I don’t want to get into that level of detail now [at this meeting] ... you’ll see that in the documentation.

Grosenheider: I’m going to go over now the documents that are on the Intranet, which is the reorganization proposal.

Herring: So this plus comments is the proposal that goes out?

Grosenheider: And then at each stage, comments will be added to it. So it will grow over time.

Dawrs: I had one more question about the timeline here – what’s being posted
on the Intranet is the draft proposal yes? There's a line here that says the UL consults with potentially affected parties, and that that occurred on March 8, but this is the draft proposal, yes?

Mochida: This is the proposal, but it’s kind of a draft because we’re still at this stage open to comments from the staff in a written format. We’ve been consulting to this stage on the draft as its been developing over the past months.

Dawrs: My point would be that this is the first draft proposal that we’ve seen ...

Mochida: The first written proposal ...

Dawrs: ... and previous to this we’ve had meetings where we’ve discussed things but those have always been characterized as not formal consultations ...

Mochida: They were consultations that we’ve been documenting as part of our informal, internal process. Not on the whole reorganization...

Dawrs: My point being that I’ve never seen a draft proposal before, so this would seem to be the first consultation that you’re having ... we weren’t given any kind of a draft to look at until today, so I’m not sure that this timeline is completely accurate.

Johnson: I’m wondering who the affected library departments were that you had this meeting of sorts on the 8th?

Grosenheider: That was the last department that we met with, after a very long process.

Christensen: To get back to Stu’s comment. I don’t know how important this is, but the titling here [on the timeline] ... I would not characterize the stage that we’re at right now as informal. This is in my view, and if we look at the flowchart. This is the first formal step, where you’re now beginning the formal process, with a proposal, which is still subject to change depending on comments; so it’s always a kind of draft because it’s always subject to change. So now this is the first formal step, consulting with the affected parties—that’s everyone in the library in this case—and then incorporating those comments formally into the proposal process. So all the stuff that happened before was good, it was information gathering, it was discussion, but it wasn’t really part of the formal process. But I would say that we are in the formal process now.

Grosenheider: [Begins powerpoint presentation, outlining documents that are posted on the Intranet.]

A couple of notes about the organizational charts: There are totals for each
chart of how many employees are paid for by which fund group and also on chart one there’s a grand total for the entire organization. There are a couple different categories that have been included, so I just want to mention what those are to alleviate any confusion: There’s General, that refers to those people paid from allocations from the state, from tuition, from stimulus funds—those are permanent positions. There are “B Special”; those are positions that we have been authorized to hire using special revolving funds. For instance our fees and our coin op helps to support three positions within the library; those are funded differently from most in the library so they have to be noted. There’s “Authorized Temporary Positions” that are generally funded; there are three of those and all three are in the industrial relations center—so those are general funds allocated by the state, but are temporary positions. And then we have four positions that were allocated by the legislature that are still pending establishment: We received them from the legislature along with a couple others that were hired, but there were four that we didn’t get to hire because of the budget cuts and then the chancellor swept the positions and the money. But we’re going to hold onto the position numbers until someone tells us to give them up, as a reminder that we still have those positions out there and would like to have them back. So they’re just floating at the bottom of chart one as a reminder for us. Now what the charts do not include is positions that are temporary, that are specially funded. So for instance within the Systems Office, that’s the easiest one to talk about: There are several people in the Systems Office who are funded through Voyager. So those positions are temporary and funded in such a way that they do not show up on the organizational chart. That’s just the way campus HR requires it.

The other thing I’ll let you know is that we abolished a few civil service positions in the last few years—that was about two years, again with the budget cuts. Again, we left the numbers on the chart where they were, and I’ve indicated them with a double asterisk as abolished. Again, that’s to make it easier to request them back in the future, and as a reminder that we used to have positions there. So until someone tells us to take them off the chart, I’ll leave them there. So even though there are no warm bodies and the positions don’t exist, they’re still on the chart.

Minatodani: Wait, so the org charts don’t include positions filled by actual people but they do include positions that we don’t have, that are not filled?

Grosenheider: Yes, and I recognize the irony.

Mochida: We’re not making this up; this is what we were told to do.

Grosenheider: And I guess that’s the other thing: When you go back to your offices and you look on the Intranet and you pull these up and you have any questions, feel free to contact me and I’ll walk you thorough it.
Minatodani: I have another question about the org charts. So the positions that actually exist within the library, like the Voyager positions, I understand that you’re required to not have those present on the org charts. Are they accounted for anywhere in this description, in the narrative? The Voyager positions for example are really important...

Grosenheider: The functional statements will describe the functions that happen within Systems, for example.

Minatodani: But you don’t refer to the position numbers of the actual people?

Grosenheider: No.

[Grosenheider goes on to explain the finer points of reading reporting lines on organizational charts].

Something new, that was added last year, are organizational codes. Each unit on the organizational chart, each box in other words, has a unique code attached to it, and those can be used to track personelle costs as well as operational costs. And so for those units that don’t currently have a code, I indicated that with question marks. Because those aren’t assigned until the proposal is approved, it’s something that we can’t have until the end of the process.

The other item that’s on the Intranet is a spreadsheet that includes every position that’s effected in some manner by this reorganization. [spreadsheet has been sorted by bargaining unit first and then by department.]

[Grosenheider summarizes deadlines again.]

Sack: What are the criteria that determines what comments are “as appropriate” to be incorporated into the document?

Mochida: For things that come from the HR office or the budget office, sometimes for reorganization proposals there is something legal, or something that you have to make sure that you indicate within the documentation. So those kinds of changes would need to be incorporated. Other kinds of comments that come in during this process are expressions of concern or disagreements, I would consult with the library administrative team and Reid Dasenbrock, the vice-chancellor, on what of those we want to incorporate or change within our proposal.

Sack: So we’ll see the redacted comments, not the submitted comments?

Grosenheider: The submitted comments; the submitted comments will go with the document.

Mochida: All comments that come in will be attached to the document, but we
will incorporate those comments or suggestions or concerns as we deem appropriate at our level, or are required to by the requirements of HR, or the budget office.

Cartwright: By “incorporated” you don’t mean into the overall dossier so to speak, but incorporated into the actual proposal; all of the comments will accompany the document?

Mochida: Yes, that’s correct.

Ghosh: I have a question about the timeline: Is there something in the University framework that requires the two-week limit we’ve been given to comment? It seems a little short.

Mochida: I think as it goes to the different departments, to HR department and etc. ...

Grosenheider: I think she’s asking about within the library ...

Mochida: Yes, I know that, but I think they have about a two-week turnaround, so that’s where ...

Ghosh: I’m just a little worried about the timing, in that it’s going over the summer...

Mochida: So it could be, Jim’s comment that the faculty senate committees are off duty, that that could affect the timeframe.

Ghosh: I’m just wondering what the rush is of the two-week response rate?

Mochida: That rush comes not so much from us but from Manoa administration. They’ve set all of these reorganization proposals into a tighter time-frame and process, in order to push things through so that they don’t go on for another year longer. They’re really trying to complete them within four-month periods of time.

Hori: To follow up on Monica’s comment: You will check with the faculty senate on their schedule, but should there be a reason to delay the process, we would really appreciate more time. You’ve had months, and we have seen pieces, but no one has ever seen the whole reorganization process. And we may want to meet—we definitely want to think—but we may want to meet with our departments or divisions or whatever. There may be individual comments, departmental comments, divisional comments, faculty senate comments. So it could take us a while to organize ... I think we’d really appreciate more time to look at this proposal, because we’re going to have to go through that documentation, and that’s going to take a while.
Mochida: It won’t take you that long, it just took a long time to put it together.

Joan: But we have other things to do as well ...

Mochida: But I think knowing from your reactions, I think most of you will be meeting over the course of a week or so and coming up with comments in a timely manner.

Kellett: I would just like to add a comment of my experience of my experience on the Manoa faculty senate, it’s been my experience that when it gets to the Manoa chancellor’s level, she will not want to wait, so SEC acts during the summer break for the Manoa Faculty Senate. That’s their role, so SEC may have to provide comments rather than having a standing committee within the faculty senate look at it.

Ghosh: I would really urge you to extend the two-week deadline.

Mochida: We’ll consider it, but I would urge you to start right away, or as soon as possible. When I was brought in to the review of the IRC, I was given less than a week. They don’t want people dilly-dallying, they want people to get to it. I know that all of you are busy; I have to constantly adjust my schedule. I’m late this morning because I was up preparing letters to the legislators this morning in light of the ongoing bills that are seriously considering, sweeping millions of dollars in special funds that will directly impact us. I had to do that knowing I had an interview this morning, I’ve got an MET to go to, I’ve got sessions this afternoon ... people who have been trying to meet with me know how tight that’s been. So I’m constantly doing that, and I ask that you try your best to do this so that we don’t delay it any longer than it’s been delayed. I do appreciate that all of you have been very patient with us this last year as we’ve gone through this process. So we’ll talk about it a little bit more but I urge you to not wait for us to respond because each day that goes by lessens the amount of time, and I’d really prefer not to postpone that response any longer.

Grosenheider: [continues powerpoint, discussing theories regarding phases of transition within organizations, and how different people deal with cycles of change.]

Sack: I had one more question: You’re eliminating nine or ten department heads, with the department heads receiving a stipend of $300 a month, you’ll be realizing somewhere between $2,500 and $3,000 per month in savings. Has there been any thought toward putting that in the travel fund or what are you planning to do with that?

Mochida: We haven’t discussed that yet.

Grosenheider: [plans to create a new committee to look at staff development]
and training, to replace former staff development committee; one of the things he plans to do is look at travel funding. Will also be calling for volunteers for library assessment committee.]

Sack: Is this reorganization going to be assessed in some way? And if it is assessed negatively, is there any process for ammending it?

Grosenheider: A regular review of our organization probably wouldn’t be a bad thing. Jean I think mentioned that in looking back over the years we do it every eight years, whether it be a minor or a major reorg, and that might be a little long. Doing an organizational review more frequently than that might be a good idea, and the result would be another reorg. That’s how you would correct — if this one gets approved, then the next time we review it it would change through the same process.

3. **Next meeting:** Scheduled as an emergency meeting of the library senate on 4/12/11, 10:30 a.m. Yap Room.

**Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.**

Submitted by Stu Dawrs