Library Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes

2011-04-12

Present:

Gwen Sinclair (vice-chair/chair elect), Stu Dawrs (Secretary), James Cartwright (Manoa Faculty Senate), Carol Kellett (Manoa Faculty Senate), Susan Johnson (LPC), David Flynn (Parliamentarian), Mike Chopey, Dore Minatodani, Joan Hori, Sharon Ouchi, Amy Carlson, Ted Kwok, Sara Rutter, Gregg Geary, Paula Mochida (Interim University Librarian), Kim Nakano (Interim Associate University Librarian), Alan Grosenheider (Interim Associate University Librarian), Jean Erhorn, Nancy Sack, Pat Polanski, Lori Ann Saeki, K.T. Yao, Elena Clariza, Ross Christensen, Mabel Suzuki, Jan Zastrow, Monica Ghosh.

TOTAL ATTENDEES: 27

TOTAL VOTING MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: 23 [NOTE: 16 voting Senate members are required for a quorum.]

Convened: 10:30 am in Hamilton Library Yap Conference Room by Sinclair (acting as chair in Paseng’s absence).

[Secretary’s note: As this was an emergency meeting of the senate, approval of April 5 minutes was delayed until next regularly scheduled senate meeting (April 26).]

1. Discussion of faculty senate response to proposed reorganization plan.

Minatodani makes motion to introduce resolution calling for Library Administration to extend the timeline of reorganization approval process, with goals of: 1) giving library administration enough time to adequately consider library faculty and staff comments before moving to the next step in the process and, 2) of submitting the document to Manoa Faculty Senate when the full senate returns at end of summer, rather than during the summer when majority of UH faculty senate is away from campus.

Cartwright moves to accept the motion.

Hori seconds.

Discussion:

Geary: Librarians not nine-month faculty, we’re eleven-month faculty; we don’t leave for the summer. Resolution also assumes that 150 people [within the library] will comment on the proposal.

Cartwright: The instructional faculty in Manoa Faculty Senate are off in summer.

Geary: But I was informed that Manoa Faculty Senate will meeting, right?

Grosenheider: Comment on second to last paragraph. The proposal is submitted to the Senate Executive Committee and not the Manoa Faculty Senate.

Minatodani: Are you saying that the intent of the timeline is that it only be reviewed by the Senate
Executive Committee and not the full Faculty Senate?

Grosenheider: According to the guidelines of submission, only the Senate Executive Committee is required to comment.

Minatodani: It would seem to me that the spirit of this is for the full Senate to review it.

Cartwright: Senate Executive Committee does not like to receive these things outside of the main meetings.

Sinclair: The “resolved” of motion under discussion says that the library senate asks library administration to adjust its timeline — should we include a date?

Minatodani: We can either speed it up or slow it down, but eleven days seems to be too short of a time. I want to give library administration enough time to respond to all comments. This proposal has significant impact on the future of the library and I would hope that the library administration will take the time necessary to review comments in a serious way. The way this timeline is constructed, Manoa Faculty Senate has no input. The point is to accommodate Manoa Faculty Senate and to give library administration time to digest and address comments.

Flynn: I began to compose comments but the time period made me stop — it would seem pointless if comments are not going to be carefully examined.

Rutter: Can library administration comment on what would be the downside to presenting the reorganization plan to Manoa Faculty Senate in the fall?

Mochida: It would mainly delay the reorganization. We’re not waiting until May 6 [deadline for library faculty and staff to submit comments] to begin reviewing comments. We’re already taking submitted comments into consideration. We’re not making changes until May 6 so that everyone is commenting on the same document. If it gets to the Senate Executive Committee and they decide they want the full senate to review, maybe accommodations have to be made.

Grosenheider: As far as the flow chart goes, time frames are set but they depend on when we submit. So we may want to ask the Senate Executive Committee who they want to consult with, and then based on their response to see when we submit.

Cartwright: If the intent is to not circumvent Manoa Faculty Senate, why not extend the timeline?

Geary: In light of what I understand from what Alan just said, there are a number of steps that don’t involve Manoa Faculty Senate. I would like to see a timeline that allows bodies outside of Manoa Faculty Senate to continue their work. I think Manoa Faculty Senate would be well served if we were to put dates on the motion.

Minatodani: Are there any requirements within this timeline that any of the consulted parties have to respond by a certain date?

Grosenheider: The submission date determines the response date. Length of time is fixed to comment once the document is submitted.

Cartwright: The timeline as set for submission to Senate Executive Council is June 22. I feel that date should be moved back until after fall semester begins. If it goes to the Senate Executive Committee in
June, there will not be time for the full Manoa Faculty Senate to receive and consider it.

Grosenheider: To clarify, the campus has set a maximum amount of time for commenting. It could go more quickly if a body chooses to take less time to comment.

Kellett: Typically, first meeting of the full Manoa Faculty Senate would be the third week of September.

Hori: If bodies respond sooner than their time allotment, does that set the timeline forward?

Grosenheider: If other bodies respond more quickly, we could move the timeline forward, but library administration controls how much time it has to address comments between submission to each body.

Cartwright: I suggest 12th of September to submit to Senate Executive Committee. My concern is that if it goes to the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs earlier, he can choose to move it to the Senate Executive Committee regardless of what we say.

Chopey: How long does Senate Executive Committee have to comment?

Grosenheider: Up to 45 days. To clarify, the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs and also Vice-Chancellor for Fiscal provide us with comments, library administration chooses whether to edit the proposal based on those comments and then submits it to the Senate Executive Committee. The Vice-Chancellor does not submit the proposal directly to the Senate Executive Committee.

Cartwright and Kellett: Suggest Aug. 29 as submission date to Senate Executive Committee.

Johnson: If library administration feels eleven days is enough time to address faculty and staff comments, then who am I to say; but if I were you I’d probably want to give yourselves more time.

Grosenheider: The timeline is flexible in terms of when administration submits to each body. These submission dates are targets.

Mochida: We’re not going to rush through this. This timeline is already nine months behind schedule, and we will adjust as necessary.

Minatodani proposes an amendment to her resolution, to include Aug. 29 date for submission to Senate Executive Committee.

[Voice vote on amendment is unanimous.]

Geary: In light of what we’ve heard from Alan, do we need the fifth “whereas”? Eleven days is an artificial deadline.

Flynn: I think this whereas is essential to the resolution.

Chopey: I think Dore’s resolution is responding to a published document, which says eleven days.

[Voice vote to pass resolution as amended; resolution is passed. See Addendum 1 below for text of resolution.]

Kellett: Question — being part of the minority that is nowhere on any reorg. chart, why am I not included?
Mochida: Because you’re in a temporary position funded by special funds not mandated by any statute. We were told not to include these type of positions.

[Sinclair circulates list of 18 discussion questions regarding reorg., which was generated by LSEB. See Addendum 2 below for text of questions.]

Johnson: One of the things I was wondering is how we can find out who position numbers correspond to.

Grosenheider: These are positions potentially affected by proposed reorganization.

Zastrow: I found no one from Sinclair is on this list.

Grosenheider: This list is those positions that are affected in some way. In Sinclair there is no change in positions; the reporting structure has not changed.

Cartwright moves that Library Senate meet again in seven days, on Tuesday, 19th of April, to discuss 18 questions, as well as any that may be added.

Motion accepted.

Motion to adjourn. 16 in favor, 2 opposed.

Meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

Submitted by Stu Dawrs

Addendum 1:

RESOLUTION ON THE LIBRARY REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL TIMELINE

Whereas the University of Hawaii at Manoa Library's administration issued its draft proposal for reorganization on April 5, 14 months after initiating the process, and

Whereas the Library's faculty and staff were asked to submit comments on the draft proposal within 16 days, by April 21, and

Whereas in response to faculty and staff requests for
more time to comment, the deadline was extended another 15 days to May 6, and

Whereas the UHM Library's administration gave itself 11 days to read and incorporate comments into its reorganization proposal, by May 17, and

Whereas the Library Senate recognizes that 11 days is likely an insufficient amount of time to read comments representing over 150 people and to incorporate said comments into the reorganization proposal in a meaningful way, and

Whereas the deadline to submit the proposal to the Manoa Faculty Senate, June 22, falls after the spring semester has ended and most faculty are off duty, and therefore ensures that either: 1) the proposal will not be reviewed until the Senate reconvenes in the fall, thereby rendering the current timeline unjustifiably rushed; or 2) the proposal will be reviewed by the Senate Executive Committee in the full Senate's stead, thereby bypassing a significant part of the review process, then be it

Resolved, the Library Senate asks that to foster deliberate and thoughtful dialog between itself and Library and campus faculty and staff, the Library
Administration change the date the proposal be presented to the Manoa Faculty Senate’s Senate Executive Committee to the last Monday in August, August 29, and consider adjusting its internal deadline for incorporating and addressing Library faculty and staff comments in its proposal, as it deems appropriate.

Date: April 12, 2011

Addendum 2:

Library Senate 4/12/11

Reorganization discussion questions

1. Do we agree with the constitution of the departments, and the exclusion of some faculty members and functions from the department structure?
2. Do we agree that "There will be few changes in individual faculty and staff responsibilities"?
3. Do we agree that the reorganization will improve our ability to provide services to users?
4. Do we agree that the reorganization will result in cost savings?
5. Do we agree that a reorganization is necessary to achieve, or will achieve, streamlining and efficiencies?
6. Does the reorganization group similar functions?
7. Is the reorganization necessary to enable greater flexibility and facilitate cross-training?
8. Do we agree with the reporting structures indicated on the new organization charts?
9. Is there a “management gap?” If so, will the reorganization address the gap?
10. Do we agree that the elimination of division heads and consolidation into fewer departments does anything to fill the "management gap" or eliminate "...confusion at both the University and UHPA levels" re the fact that division heads, as faculty appointees, "operated as super department heads but have not had the 'authority' bestowed on traditional university faculty department heads"?
11. Do we agree that the only other option besides a library-wide reorg is "Doing nothing is always an alternative"?
12. Do we agree that all other reorg options have been fully considered?
13. Regarding the comments, should LSEB not only send them to library admin. for attachment to the document itself, but also attempt to speak directly to the SEC and/or other external bodies? (UHPA, Manoa admin or etc.)?
14. Are we OK with a reorg moving forward with no defined post-reorg assessment plans?
15. Are the "hoped" for positive results, otherwise not defined, strong enough arguments for a library wide reorganization?
16. Are there any other issues related to the reorganization proposal that this list of questions does not
address that LSEB's response should address? [this is intended to open discussion to other possibilities, since Tuesday's motion specified this list of questions]

17. Does the proposal effectively address its stated goals, as articulated in the narrative?

18. Does the Senate agree that a significant underlying cause of the library's difficulties is insufficient resources, i.e. the library is trying to do too much with too little, and if so, does the Senate agree that this proposal 1) does nothing specifically to address this, and 2) exacerbates the problem by adding programs without explicitly removing any?