VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT (18): Mike Chopey (LPC), Ross Christensen, Stu Dawrs, Carolyn Dennison, Eileen Herring (Secretary), Joan Hori, Ruth Horie (UHPA), Susan Johnson, Carol Kellett, Dore Minatodani (MFS), Sharon Ouchi, Pat Polansky (Vice-Chair), Nancy Sack (Elections), Asako Shiba, Gwen Sinclair (Chair), Hisami Springer, Nackil Sung, Mabel Suzuki

Convened at 10:35 a.m. in the Yap Conference Room, Hamilton Library

1. Minutes Approval

The minutes for the 17 January 2012 meeting were approved.

2. Reports

a) Chair (Sinclair): Sinclair attended the ACCFSC meeting. President Greenwood attended the meeting for the first time; she felt that the role of the ACCFSC should be consultative in areas of academic concern. UH administration responded to the previously raised issue of administrator salaries by stating that they are on a par with UH peer institutions as are most of UH faculty salaries. System wide access to library resources was discussed; the main impediment to expanding access to all campus was identified as significantly increased costs; it was suggested that the Council invite Interim University Librarian Geary to a meeting to address the group about these issues. On some campuses, non-faculty are responsible for student transcript evaluation; ACCFSC recommended that faculty need to be involved at some point in all of these evaluations. Dasenbrock reviewed common course numbering problems; course numbers within a discipline should mean the same thing across all UH campuses; renumbering creates problems for some academic departments so he recommended beginning with the easy ones first. Additional details on these topics can be found in the ACCFSC Web site at [http://www.hawaii.edu/accfsc/](http://www.hawaii.edu/accfsc/) when the minutes become available.

b) Vice Chair (Polansky): No report

c) Secretary (Herring): Herring reported extensive updating of member lists on the Library Faculty Senate Web pages and listservs had been completed. Herring explained that problems with the Web site have arisen because not all elected secretaries have had the software and/or skills to maintain the Web site. She asked for volunteers to form a task force to investigate other alternatives to hand-coded Web sites and to examine workflow for archiving Library Faculty Senate materials. N. Sung and Shiba volunteered to be on the task force. (Dennison later volunteered as well.)

d) Elections (Sack): Sinclair welcomed Sack as the new Chair of the Elections Committee.
e) **Library Personnel Committee (Chopey):** LPC will be following up on the one contract renewal for the year and they are planning informational sessions in May/June as well as the usual sessions in September. The VCAA’s office has returned the most recently approved LPC Policies and Procedures (2010) with requests for changes; most are simple, but some need clarification and a meeting will be scheduled with Assistant VCAA McCreary. The changes will require a new vote by the Senate so this year’s tenure and promotion process will continue under the old policies and procedures (2008). When Grosenheider and the LPC meet with Assistant VCAA McCreary, Grosenheider’s request for criteria for evaluating collegiality and civility will also be on the agenda. Grosenheider also asked the LPC to advise on best practices for hiring procedures, but Chopey suggested that this was outside the LPC purview.

f) **Manoa Faculty Senate (Minatodani):** It was reported at the Manoa Faculty Senate that a new graduate program in Marine Biology had been approved; the Library had been consulted during the planning for the program. There will also be three new Education certificate programs available; this does not appear to involve any course changes or require additional information resources. The Committee on Administration and Budget (CAB) reported that it had recommended against the proposed library reorganization plan. The Parking Office presented a report about the increases in parking rates, the cost of building additional parking spaces, and development of incentives for not driving to campus. There will be a committee meeting about the idea of having one faculty classification and both Minatodani and Cartwright will attend that meeting. The Senate was reminded that Cartwright’s term is ending soon and the Library will need a new representative to the Manoa Faculty Senate.

g) **University of Hawaii Professional Assembly (Horie):** UH has settled several data breach lawsuits and, as a result, free credit monitoring and identity theft consultation services will be provided. Both UHPA representatives, Horie and Flynn, will not be running again so candidates will be needed for these positions.

3. Old Business

a) **Reorganization proposal:** Both UHPA and the Manoa Faculty Senate have provided the University with formal comments opposing the proposed library reorganization plan. Minatodani moved that the Senate send a memo, the text of which she had previously sent by email, to Interim University Librarian Geary asking him to withdraw the reorganization proposal. The motion was seconded and passed. The text of the memo to be sent by the Library Faculty Senate Chair to the Interim University Librarian is as follows:

   On February 14 and 15 respectively, UHPA and the Manoa Faculty Senate expressed their opposition to the Library’s proposed reorganization. Each cited multiple reasons for their position, but both cited a need for better consideration of faculty input in the process. Without minimizing the importance of the other reasons cited, the Library Senate urges Library administration to withdraw the reorganization proposal, and to work with librarians to find an effective
way to identify the Library’s problems and to take meaningful steps toward addressing those problems.

We submit this request with the goal in mind of re-establishing with Library administration a relationship that is grounded in the principles of shared governance and mutual respect.

b) Nina Horio Award: Sinclair recommended that the Senate solicit nominations for this award annually and that an ad hoc committee of the Senate be formed to evaluate the nominations and solicit funds if necessary. Polansky asked about the current lack of funds and Herring explained that some of the original amount had been used to set up a fund for purchasing books on cancer. No vote was taken, but there was general agreement with this approach.

4. New business

a) Faculty service

i. Obligatory or voluntary? This topic was put on the agenda as a result of a discussion at the recent LSEB meeting. The main points made in the ensuing discussion were:

• service is our responsibility as faculty members
• shared governance is not optional and the Library Faculty Senate is our voice in the process
• not all faculty members have the skills to execute the positions to which they may be elected
• the Library is unique in that individual library departments do not have their own Department Personnel Committees to participate in the tenure and promotion process; this is done by the library-wide LPC which is a part of the Library Faculty Senate
• our tenure and promotion guidelines include service as a significant activity to be evaluated
• service on the LPC is not voluntary, but there are guidelines for exceptions to the service requirement
• at some point in the past, the procedure for electing officers included asking their permission to be nominated; it is unclear when this changed

The question was raised whether or not this had been an repeated problem; if not, was there really a need for constitution or by-laws changes to address it. There did not appear to be any consensus on whether or not action was required.

ii. How should service expectations be conveyed to new hires?
Sinclair explained that in the existing procedure, Grosenheider discusses tenure and promotion with newly hired librarians. Hori thought that some department heads might be discussing service with new librarians, but that the information presented was probably not consistent among departments. Minatodani made the point that perhaps the AUL was not the appropriate person to be handling this particular communication. Dennison reported that, during the interview process, Grosenheider made it clear that review was done by faculty peers (i.e., function of the LPC) rather than Library administration. Sinclair will
consult Grosenheider about how faculty service is discussed with prospective and new faculty and whether discussing faculty service should be added to the new hire checklist as a responsibility of the department head, or whether meeting with the Library Senate chair should be added.

**iii. Methods of selecting chairs for Senate standing committees:**
Sinclair explained that Library Faculty Senate documents are silent on how to resolve situations when no committee member is willing to Chair a committee. Because these committees have important functions, this issue is not just one of fairness. The person who is Chair needs to be willing to accept the responsibilities and to do them well. In the ensuing discussion, it seemed that this has been an occasional issue, but may not be significant enough to warrant further discussion at this time. Herring encouraged all library faculty members to acknowledge the workload that comes with these responsibilities and to assist their fellow department members as much as possible.

**b) Primo purchase:** The Chair of the UH Library Council sent a memo last week acknowledging the lack on consultation on the purchase of the ExLibris discovery layer, PRIMO. Because this issue has serious potential workload impacts for library faculty, Sinclair asked the Senate whether or not it wanted to formulate an official comment on the issue. Minatodani pointed out that UH Manoa library faculty have been made aware of the ongoing discussions at the Council, but had failed to provide input at that time. Sack stated that one-way communication is not shared governance and that memos are an ineffective response to this situation.

It was suggested that since the contract has already been signed, the Senate should focus its discussion on the overwhelming impact that implementation could have on both technical service and public service faculty and staff. In addition, serious concerns were expressed about the apparent lack of planning for implementation by library administration. Two specific issues that were raised were the possible impact on links in Hawaii Voyager and LibGuides, and the apparent problems that ExLibris is having integrating its product with databases from some vendors, particularly EBSCO. Chopey identified the lack of a UH Manoa library faculty representative on the UH Library Council as a problem since our library administrators do not have close contact with our patrons. Since our administrators are distanced from the day-to-day operations of the Library, it is even more imperative that they consult with the relevant library faculty.

Several Senate members asked if it would be possible for individual campuses to opt out of the PRIMO implementation. Dawrs reported that in a presentation at the Pacific Rim Digital Library Alliance meeting, the University of Auckland Library had done a presentation about their experiences with PRIMO. As a result of user complaints, they changed their implementation of PRIMO to being optional for the user. (PowerPoint available at [http://www.prdla.org/2011/11/invisible-histories-collections-off-the-map/](http://www.prdla.org/2011/11/invisible-histories-collections-off-the-map/)) As a result of the discussion, the sense of the group was that the Senate members have inadequate information to formulate a comment. Given the need for more complete and accurate information, Sinclair will ask Nakano to meet with the Senate about the PRIMO implementation and also ask for arrangements to have virtual
presentations by other PRIMO libraries about their implementation experiences.

c) **Public services issues:** This item was deferred due to lack of time.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Submitted by Eileen Herring