Library Faculty Senate Meeting
17 April 2012

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT (25): Jim Cartwright (MFS), Mike Chopey (LPC), Ross Christensen, Stu Daws, Carolyn Dennison, Monica Ghosh, Eileen Herring (Secretary), Joan Hori, Ruth Horie (UHPA), Susan Johnson, Eleanor Kleiber, Dore Minatodani (MFS), Sharon Ouchi, Pat Polansky, Allen Riedy, Sara Rutter, Nancy Sack (Elections), Asako Shiba, Gwen Sinclair (Chair), Hisami Springer, Jan Sung, Nackil Sung, Mabel Suzuki, KT Yao

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT (2): Alan Grosenheider, Kim Nakano

Convened at 10:30 a.m. in the Yap Conference Room, Hamilton Library

1. Approval of minutes
The minutes for the 30 March 2012 meeting were approved as amended.

2. Reports
   a) Chair (Sinclair): No report.
   
   b) Vice Chair (Riedy): No report.
   
   c) Secretary (Herring):
      i) Herring reported that the Web site task force had provided a preliminary report. Some points needed clarification and Herring is expecting an expanded report in the near future.
      ii) The LSEB approved the text for the email which the Secretary will send to new faculty regarding Senate membership. The approved text is appended at the end of these minutes.
   
   d) Elections (Sack):
      i) Shortly there will be an election to fill the vacancy in the Elections Committee.
      ii) Sack reported that so far there were only two nominations for the Manoa Faculty Senate task force on faculty classification.
      iii) The election for LSEB officers will follow the one for the Elections Committee.
   
   e) Library Personnel Committee (Rutter): No report until after the June meeting with Beverly McCreary and Alan Grosenheider.
   
   f) Manoa Faculty Senate (Cartwright and Minatodani): No report.
   
   g) University of Hawaii Professional Assembly (Horie): Horie reminded the Senators that the Library needs two new UHPA representatives. Members were also reminded that the UHPA annual meeting would take place on 27 April at 2 p.m. in the Kapiolani Community College dining room. The meeting generally consists of approval of minutes of the previous meetings, committee reports, and announcements, with time for questions from the floor.
3. Old Business

a) Public service issues: Minatodani sent an email on 13 April that contained many questions regarding public services. One of her concerns is that some of these issues have been raised in the Public Service Heads meetings, but have not been discussed with the faculty at large. She asked the Library Faculty Senate members if there was interest in scheduling additional meetings to discuss these questions. There were several major points made and questions asked in the discussion that followed. These included:

- Some questioned whether this was an appropriate discussion for the Senate or should be handled by the Library Department Heads group. Several members felt that this was a library-wide and academic policy issue and therefore should be discussed by the Library Faculty Senate members. Others pointed out that it would be desirable to obtain a broad range of opinions in the discussion.
- There were a number of questions regarding the purpose and timing of the discussion. Some members expressed a desire to find out how the various public service departments were moving forward after the withdrawal of the reorganization proposal. The question was raised about the functionality of having two divisions – public services and collection services. Some members felt that the meetings should discuss organizational issues.
- There were also questions and suggestions regarding the format of any meetings that might take place. It was suggested that there could be a series of meetings that would involve both information sharing and brainstorming about organizational effectiveness.

The LSEB will discuss possible ways to move forward with this discussion.

b) Response to library administration’s recruitment best practices proposal:
The comments by the members revolved around two major themes: inclusion of non-faculty in screening committees and the inclusion/role of department heads in screening committees.

i) Inclusion of non-faculty in screening committees
For some positions in some departments, it is important to include non-faculty members in the screening committees because they have the most expertise about the requirements of the position. Sinclair gave the example of including the maps civil service position and the GIS APT position in the screening committee for the GIS librarian.

While in some cases it might be beneficial to include specific non-faculty members, several members felt that it should not be a requirement since civil service and APT library staff do not have an in-depth understanding of the tenure and promotion process. They may not be very knowledgeable about the librarian aspects of the position responsibilities. Ghosh asserted that no other UH Manoa department includes civil service or APT positions in their faculty screening committees.
In departments where there is only one librarian, inclusion of civil service and/or APT staff provides the only representation for the department being impacted. J. Sung gave her screening committee as a case in point.

Rutter felt that staff members should always be included in screening committees because they provide a different perspective than library faculty. In addition, it provides an opportunity for staff or outside faculty to become more aware of what is involved in librarianship. She suggested it could serve as a tool for improving communication between library faculty and library staff.

There was general agreement that the most important criterion for being included in the screening committee should be knowledge of the position and its requirements rather than diversity for diversity’s sake.

**ii) Inclusion/role of department heads in screen committees**

Several people made the comments to the effect that the home department of the position needs to be adequately represented on screening committees. The department head often has or should have the best overall view of the department and of the requirements of the position. In addition, some members felt that the department head should be included as part of their role as leader of the department. The point was made that the department head also benefits from participation in the discussions with the candidates.

Several members made the point that, when included in the selection committee, the department head is only one voice and generally does not have excessive influence on the outcome of the process. In addition, some departments do not have permanent department heads and thus do not have long enough time in position to have the opportunity to influence many librarian position recommendations. Minatodani supported the idea that some long-term department heads have a definite influence and gave Karen Peacock as an example.

It was suggested that department interviews should be included in a routine, codified selection process. Comments from members of the department would be forwarded to the selection committee for inclusion in their deliberations.

A comment was made that these best practices had been developed in libraries with significantly more librarians. In our library, it is often impractical to leave the department head out of the screening committee because they may be the only other faculty member in the department.

**c) Primo:** The discussion revolved around what role, if any, the Library Faculty Senate can or should have regarding implementation of Primo. Minatodani expressed a concern that librarians are receiving conflicting information from a variety of sources. Several other librarians agreed that this was a significant concern. After discussion, it was generally agreed that this is not currently a Library Faculty Senate issue. The LSEB will ensure that library faculty receive information on who to contact in the various Voyager committees that will be involved in the Primo implementation. Sinclair noted
that there is a kick off meeting scheduled in the near future and the information shared at that time may resolve some issues.

4. New business

a) Request for exception to MQs for Congressional Archivist: The request for exception was brought to the Library Faculty Senate by Cartwright because the Congressional Archivist position is a Librarian (B) position and the MQs for that classification include an MLIS, MLS, or equivalent non-U.S. degree. Cartwright explained that archival training does not always result in a traditional library degree. For example, at the University of Michigan, the Masters of Science in Information program offers specializations in Library and Information Science (LIS), but also in Archives and Records Management (ARM) and Preservation of Information (PI) among others.

Grosenheider explained that the procedure for requesting an exception has two steps. The first step is for the Library Faculty Senate to make a recommendation to the Library Administration. The Senate could approve an exception, disapprove an exception, or approve the exception with the requirement that the successful candidate complete the requirements for an MLIS by the time he or she applies for tenure, so that the person would have the degree if granted tenure. The second step is for the Administration to take the recommendation to the Vice Chancellor.

Chopey made the following motion which was seconded:

*The Library Senate supports the request for exception to the MQs for Congressional Archivist.*

Grosenheider pointed out that whether or not the exception was supported, the locus of tenure for this position would be the Library as a whole as it is for all other Library faculty and that it is important to consider how the exception might affect the candidate’s success in the tenure process. He also mentioned that JABSOM uses this same process when a successful candidate for a position could have a PhD instead of an MD.

In the following discussion, both Hori and Herring expressed concerns about not seeing the actual job description and how that might relate to other library public service functions. Hori also asked what aspects of librarianship might not be included in archival degree programs.

Sung made a motion to amend the motion making the following addition:

*If the successful candidate does not have an MLIS or MLS degree that they be required to acquire one before granting of tenure.*

The amendment was seconded. There was concern expressed that it might not be realistic for a new faculty member to obtain an MLIS before tenure. Sack pointed out that this requirement may restrict the pool of candidates and deny the library the opportunity to hire an otherwise excellent archivist.
A vote was taken on the amendment and it failed to carry.

Discussion continued on the original motion. Concerns were again raised on whether an archivist without an MLIS could be successful in the current tenure and promotion process. Cartwright pointed out that the person could be promoted if s/he had a second masters degree just as is the case for a candidate with an MLIS.

A vote was taken on the main motion and it carried. The Chair will advise Library Administration of the recommendation.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Submitted by Eileen Herring
Aloha <name>,

Welcome to the University of Hawaii at Manoa Library and to the Library Faculty Senate! As a new library faculty member, you are automatically a member of our Senate. As you will read in the Library Senate’s constitution, “The Library Senate and its Library Senate Executive Board, standing committees, and various ad hoc committees function as forums for professional discourse and consideration of such policies which have Library-wide concern and relate directly to the intellectual life and educational process of the University.”

We look forward to your participation in committees and working groups, and contributions in discussion and debate.

The Senate meets every month and an email reminder is sent out approximately one week before the meeting. The schedule of upcoming meetings as well as links to the Constitution, minutes, and correspondence are available on the Library Faculty Senate Web site at http://www.hawaii.edu/libsen/

There are two very low volume listservs for library faculty:

- libfac-l – this list is for voting (faculty) members of the Library Faculty Senate only. The regular voting members of the Library Senate are all library faculty who: (1) hold Board of Regents appointments, (2) hold positions that are half-time or more, and (3) hold appointments that are no shorter than four months.
- libsen-l – this list includes non-voting members of the Library Faculty Senate. The University Librarian, the Associate University Librarians, librarians with less than half-time appointments, and APT (Administrative, Professional and Technical) staff are non-voting members of the Library Senate.

Shortly, you will receive email notifications of your addition to these lists.

If you have any questions about the Library Faculty Senate, please do not hesitate to talk to me or one of the other officers of the Senate.

As a library faculty member at the University of Hawaii at Manoa, you are also automatically a member of the Manoa Faculty Congress. Information about the Congress and the Manoa Faculty Senate can be found at http://www.hawaii.edu/uhmfs/about/index.html

Sincerely,

<secretary's name>