Library Faculty Senate Meeting
20 March 2012

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT (25): James Adamson, Amy Carlson, Jim Cartwright (MFS), Mike Chopey (LPC), Naomi Chow, Ross Christensen, Carolyn Dennison, David Flynn (UHPA), Eileen Herring (Secretary), Ruth Horie (UHPA), Susan Johnson, Carol Kellett, Vicky Lebbin, Jodie Mattos, Dore Minatodani (MFS), Sharon Ouchi, Pat Polansky, Nancy Sack (Elections), Asako Shiba, Gwen Sinclair (Chair), Dainan Skeem, Hisami Springer, Jan Sung, Nackil Sung, Mabel Suzuki

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT (3): Gregg Geary, Alan Grosenheider, Kim Nakano

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

1. Minutes Approval

The minutes for the 21 February 2012 meeting were approved with corrections.

2. Reports

a) Chair (Sinclair):

   i) Vice Chair Appointment - Sinclair announced that Allen Riedy has agreed to serve the remainder of Polansky’s term as Vice Chair.

   ii) Meeting with Grosenheider about Faculty Service - As requested at the February Library Faculty Senate meeting, Sinclair met with Grosenheider regarding faculty service. She learned that he currently meets with all prospective employees in order to provide all of them with uniform information. He discusses expectations and service is mentioned in the discussion. In addition, department heads often review faculty service expectations. Other options were discussed. The LSEB discussed this issue as it relates to service to the Senate. It was decided that, in order to provide consistent information about the Senate, the Secretary would send an email to all new library faculty welcoming them to the Senate. In addition, the Chair will meet with new faculty to provide information about Senate service.

   iii) Meeting with Geary about Reorganization - Pursuant to the retraction of the reorganization proposal and the Library Faculty Senate’s memo, Geary met with Sinclair to discuss how the Administration and Senate can work together to enable the Library to move forward. Geary expressed concerns about lack of faculty participation in administration committees and was looking for ideas for incentives to help faculty serve on some of the more time consuming committees. LSEB discussed this issue and there was consensus that the Library’s priorities need to be determined before committees are formed and volunteers were solicited; faculty interest in serving would...
stem from shared views on Library priorities.

iv) ACCFSC Meet 16 March 2012 - Sinclair attended the ACCFSC meeting. Johnsrud’s office presented the “15 to Finish” campaign; if students enroll in 15 units instead of 12 each semester, they would be able to obtain their undergraduate degree in four years. The ACCFSC members felt that students may have other obligations that necessitate enrolling in fewer units; they requested that UH administration provide additional data on why students do not currently take more units. Stephanie Kim provided an update on upcoming legislation that potentially affects UH; one that is particularly significant is the elimination of the Candidates Advisory Council that was created by the Legislature during the previous administration. Robert Kajiwara, Chair of the Library Council, took up the issue of providing more library resources on a system-wide basis; he informed the group that the Council is a policy making body. While it has coordinated system-wide consortial purchases, it has no financial resources of its own. The Council has not in the past been successful at getting any system-wide funding. Sinclair asked if it would be possible for UH Manoa to have a faculty representative in the Council. Currently UHM representatives are administrative while many of the other library directors are faculty. Kajiwara was open to discussing the possibility and Geary said that he would ask that the Council add a UH Manoa faculty representative as a voting member. David Lassner gave a presentation reviewing current ITS projects. Additional details on these topics can be found in the ACCFSC Web site at http://www.hawaii.edu/accfsc/ when the minutes become available.

b) Secretary (Herring): Herring reported that there were four volunteers to work on the Web site task force: Carolyn Dennison, Carol Kellett, Asako Shiba, and Nackil Sung. Herring met with the group and explained some of the problems that she had encountered. The group will explore a variety of options and expect to have a proposal before the new Secretary’s term begins in September.

c) Elections (Sack): No report

d) Library Personnel Committee (Chopey): No report.

f) Manoa Faculty Senate (Minatodani): The current senators, Minatodani and Cartwright, thanked all the library faculty who ran for the open senate seat. Cartwright serves on the MFS through the end of May. Sinclair has been elected as a new representative to the Manoa Faculty Senate (MFS).

WASC is proposing five ‘graduation proficiencies’ for undergraduates, one of which is information literacy. If they are adopted, UH Manoa will need to develop strategies to achieve them. The information literacy proficiency could be an opportunity for the Library to be more involved in the curriculum.

g) University of Hawaii Professional Assembly (Horie): Horie reminded the Senators that the Library needs two new UHPA representatives. Rutter has indicated that she is interested.
UHPA will be following up with Library administration on the recent LET item regarding the annual review of faculty job descriptions by department heads. Grosenheider explained that he would like to work with the Library Faculty Senate on an annual review process so that position descriptions reflect the work that is actually being done. The library has been exempt from the campus annual review of academic department faculty workload. Lebbin asked how she could obtain a copy of her position description. Grosenheider responded that it would have been part of the recruitment announcement for her position.

3. Old Business

a) Reorganization Proposal and Current Organization: The Library Faculty Senate is interested in understanding how the Library administration is going to reconcile the current official library organizational chart with the actual current working relationships. Geary responded that this issue is an important one for discussion. Geary introduced an action form (print copy distributed) that he would like to use in order to provide clarity to communication between administration and the Senate. The form incorporates a 30-day response time so that the Senate would have time to meet about any item that is brought up for discussion. The ideas presented using the form do not necessarily have to lead to actions, but when they do, the form can also serve as documentation of the discussion. Geary would like to use this process to discuss the issues that have resulted from the withdrawal of the reorganization plan. It could be used to move forward on parts of the reorganization proposal. Geary reiterated that organizational realignment was not one of his priorities; his priorities are funding, space, and technology.

Grosenheider explained that the form would be used to discuss changes in policies, procedures and practices, such as input on a position description for a Public Services Division Head. Minatodani reminded the group that the many faculty members felt that the broader planning issues regarding the priorities for positions needed discussion before a position description could be discussed. It was also pointed out that this form or template did not help us address the mismatch between our current reality and our official organization chart. One example is the composition of the various administration advisory groups such as the inclusion of faculty positions on the Library Executive Team.

Both Lebbin and Christensen felt that having more structure for the communication and decision making processes would be an improvement. Christensen also pointed out that not all issues that might require committees to be formed are actually Senate issues. Some are operational concerns that would have a different line of communication and should involve non-faculty. He suggested that the Library Senate could use a system similar to the one used by the Manoa Faculty Senate where the Senate solicits volunteers for those committees that are non-operational.

b) Faculty Classification (Minatodani): The Manoa Faculty Senate has been discussing asking the SEC to organize a multi-year task force to look into the issues of faculty classifications. This issue arose in the MFS because the current I (Instruction) and R (Research) classification
descriptions do not reflect the current institutional reality. It was also felt that there might have been inappropriate applications of the S (Specialist) classification. Because this is a complex, long-term issue with significant implications for all faculty, the MFS felt that the members should be separate from the regular Senate membership. While library faculty classifications may not be changed, it seems likely that all classifications would be included in the review. For that reason, among others, library faculty should be included on this committee. Although the committee has not yet been approved or formed, the LSEB felt that it would be prudent to have a process in place by which representatives could be elected if necessary.

Sinclair presented the LSEB motion for electing a Senate representative to the Task Force on Faculty Classification. Cartwright stressed the necessity of preparing to have more than one representative available for the Task Force. The motion was amended to include the concept of having an election with ranked results in case more than one representative was needed. The final motion read as follows:

The Senate Elections Committee shall conduct an election (with ranked results) for a Senate representative on the Manoa Faculty Senate task force on faculty classification (in the event the committee is created). The pool of candidates for the election will be created through nominations and self-nominations. Senators who wish to nominate another Senator should confirm the candidate’s willingness to serve prior to submitting his or her name as a nominee.

The amended motion was seconded and passed.

4. New business

a) Faculty Hiring Procedures: Grosenheider had sent a message to heads of departments with vacant positions that outlined some procedural changes regarding the composition of screening committees. Grosenheider distributed a proposal using the new template outlining these changes (printed copies distributed). There was general discussion about how the procedures for selecting screening committee members had changed over the years. It was decided that this would be discussed at the next meeting and the Senate would respond by the reply date of 20 April 2012.

As a follow up, Sinclair raised the issue of recent modifications to position descriptions. Grosenheider explained that library administration wanted to normalize some of the language for all open positions. Sinclair pointed out that the following items had been moved from “desirable qualifications” (DQs) to “minimum qualifications” (MQs):

- Ability to multitask and manage detail.
- Evidence of strong oral and written communication skills.
- Evidence of strong critical thinking skills.
- Potential for leadership in a collaborative and collegial setting.
• Productive attitude and enthusiasm for an innovative and changing environment.

Grosenheider stated that these were expected of all librarians so they were moved into the MQs for all positions. This prompted a discussion of how the MQs are used in screening and ranking applicants. The point was made that MQs don’t get ranked on a continuum as the DQs do; they are generally yes/no criteria. There are practical repercussions to making a qualification an MQ rather than a DQ especially because we need to be able to complete the state form for documenting the screening committees recommendation.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

Submitted by Eileen Herring