Library Senate  
Meeting Minutes  
August 21, 2012

In attendance: Mike Chopey, Naomi Chow, Stu Dawrs, Carolyn Dennison, Monica Ghosh, Ruth Horie, Susan Johnson, Eleanor Kleiber, Dore Minatodani (secretary pro tem), Dongyun Ni, Sharon Ouchi, Yati Paseng, Pat Polansky, Sara Rutter, Nancy Sack, Asako Shiba, Gwen Sinclair (chair), Dainan Skeem, Jan Sung, Nackil Sung

Also in attendance: Gregg Geary, Kim Nakano, Susan Weber

Meeting was called to order at 10:30.

**Election of Dore Minatodani as secretary pro-tem.**  
Approved.

**Approval of minutes of July 17, 2012 Library Senate meeting.**  
Minutes approved.

**Chair's report.**

LLT meetings: Discussed research commons. Nakano will hold a library forum on her findings.

Year-end report, attached. Sinclair noted that it was a very busy year, and that librarians are lucky to have their own senate, while other departments on campus do not, and that the senate is robust and active. Sinclair thanked officers Eileen Herring (secretary), Allen Riedy (vice chair), Pat Polansky (former chair), Allie Jordan (chair of Elections Committee), Nancy Sack (chair of Elections Committee), Lori Ann Saeki (chair of Elections Committee), Dore Minatodani (MFS), David Flynn (UHPA), Sara Rutter (UHPA), Ruth Horie (UHPA and parliamentarian), Mike Chopey (chair of LPC), Susan Johnson (chair of LPC). Sinclair welcomed incoming officers Stu Dawrs, chair; Jan Sung, vice chair; Naomi Chow, secretary.

**Vice-chair's report.**  
Not in attendance.

**Secretary's report.**  
Not in attendance.

**Elections committee report.**  
Not in attendance.

**LPC report.**  
No report.
MFS report.
No report.

UHPA report.

Rutter and Horie had a discussion with Kris Hanselman regarding a faculty position question that came from LSEB. A report will come out later.

UHPA members may opt out of the $5 per month allocation to UHPA’s Political Action Fund. See the UHPA website for the form. The deadline to submit the form is September 14, 2012. http://www.uhpa.org/

Horie is serving a two-year term until April 30, 2014, but will be retiring in December, and asked everyone to consider volunteering to serve the remainder of her term.

LPC Policies and Procedures.

Current LPC policies and procedures are dated May 2, 2008. (While the Library Senate voted in 2009 to make changes to the LPC policies and procedures, those changes were asked to be re-worded by Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel Bev McCreary. LPC responded and still needs to make some changes. So the LPC policies and procedures in effect now are those dated May 2, 2008.)

For the upcoming reviews of tenure and promotion applications, the May 2, 2008 policies and procedures pose one particular problem, regarding how external evaluations are solicited. We must make changes to those procedures now because we are in violation of campus procedures. See Mike Chopey’s e-mail dated August 14, 2012 for details (attached).

Discussion:

Question: If there is a review process, and both the dean and chair are involved in securing external review process, shouldn't it be one or the other?
Chopey: Yes, that is how it normally is done, but we have the option of doing it in other ways.

Question: Is the matter relating to "soliciting" or "securing" the evaluations?
Chopey: The language is "securing."

Question: So this affects the candidate less than it affects the department chair, the dean, and the chair of LPC?
Chopey: Some people wouldn't mind if those others are involved; some might.

Question: Is there a standard across campus?
Chopey: In some departments, whole department is on the DPC. In most departments, candidates supply names, the department supplies names, and the chair, the dean or the DPC chooses an equal number of evaluators from each list. Library has been doing this differently.

Sinclair: LSEB suggested that it makes the most sense that the department head should supply additional names.

Johnson moved that in the interest of expedience for the current year, LPC adopt suggestion #3 from Chopey’s 8/14 e-mail:

"Dept. chair (i.e. Dept. head) asks candidate to supply 3-5 names; Dept. head chooses 2-3 of them; Dept. head identifies 2-3 others; Dept. head solicits evaluations from all"

Discussion: Need to have measures for department head.

Amendment proposed, seconded and approved:

"In a case where a department head applies for tenure or promotion, the LPC will provide the additional names for that candidate and the evaluations will be solicited by the LPC."

Sack: Suggested it was unfair that LPC select external reviewers only in the case of department heads.

Motion as amended was approved, with one vote against.

Chopey: It was suggested in LSEB that wide-ranging evaluations are an issue, and they are still part of the current LPC policies and procedures. Chopey checked to see if there was any correspondence on file from campus administration or UHPA with regard to wide-ranging evaluations but didn’t find any evidence that the practice was in violation of any rules. Apparently the decision to eliminate wide-ranging evaluations was a Library Senate initiative, not a response to an external mandate. The Library Senate had decided that the practice of wide-ranging evaluations allowed material not from candidate to be placed in the candidate’s dossier.

Horie: Main objections to the wide-ranging evaluations came from TPRCs, who had never heard of such a procedure in other departments.

Paseng: The problem was not with the solicitation of the evaluations, but what LPC then did with the evaluations. It is unusual to put them in the dossier.

Ghosh: Wide-ranging evaluations can be comprised entirely of someone’s personal opinion. Evaluations should be substantiated. The recent practice and use of wide-
ranging evaluations were not keeping with the original intent of the wide-ranging evaluations.

Johnson: The practice of wide-ranging evaluations is very unusual. Other units on campus don’t do this. Candidate should have control over what goes in to her or his dossier.

Chopey: We’ve already decided that wide-ranging evaluations are not a good idea. The question today is, because the LPC policies and procedures in effect prescribe the solicitation of wide-ranging evaluations, what do we do this year?

Dawrs: Makes little sense to argue that wide-ranging evaluations violate a candidate’s right to control dossier, when the external evaluations do just that.

Sinclair: Suggest that since the issue of wide-ranging evaluations is not on the agenda, we defer the issue.

Reorganization

Geary: Since retraction of reorganization proposal, library administration wants to "regularize things." Since some units were operating as though the reorganization occurred, this is a problem, where reporting lines are concerned. Anyone can operate or work together in any way they want, but when you change reporting lines, this is a problem.

Library administration clarified reporting lines, and all reporting lines will match the existing organization chart.

Composition of screening committees.

Geary: Thanks the Senate for responses to question raised about best practices for screening committees and apologizes for the delay. Text of his statement is attached.

Sinclair: Should we revise the "best practices" document? Geary: Yes library administration will revise and clean up.

Travel funding.

Geary: Thanks Sinclair for notes on discussion on travel funding (quorum was not met at the meeting at which this was discussed, so there were no minutes).

Background: Former AUL Alan Grosenheider proposed a travel funding system where librarians would be allocated $1,000 per biennium for travel funding, and untenured tenure track librarians would be allocated $2,000 per biennium. Grosenheider had apparently drafted a travel funding document, which library
administration had been trying to implement, but which had not yet been reviewed by Library Senate. Geary asked for Senate input on the following.

Issue: When does the 2 year period start?

Chopey: He had asked Grosenheider how to calculate the 2 year period for a new hire. Grosenheider said that the biennium is static and applies to everyone, regardless of when they were hired. So someone hired a week before the end of the biennium would have access to the full biennium’s allocation for him or her.

Going by that interpretation, the current biennium is: July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2013.

Dawrs: Recalled that the original discussion [??]

Horie: Noted that the $1,000 per year was not always the case.

Ghosh: Can someone roll over their unused allocation into a third year?
Answer: No.

Ghosh: What would happen if everyone asked for their travel money at the beginning of the biennium?
Answer: The library would have to find a way to fund those requests.

Weber: What about temporary or non-tenure track librarians?

Sinclair: It could be argued that part-time librarians needed support to advance their careers.

Minatodani: The library should emphasize support for tenure-track librarians.

Polansky: The library should go back to Randy Hensley’s (former head of Public Services division) criteria for levels of support, which would give more support for higher levels of participation at conferences (giving a paper or chairing a committee would be given more support than attendance without participation).

Ghosh: That system of criteria undermines the idea of supporting newer librarians, who would less likely be chairing a committee.

Dawrs: Recalled that the policy proposed by Grosenheider was that funding would be available to all faculty, regardless of FTE or tenure-track status.

Decision: Library administration will re-draft the document for Senate review, taking into consideration Hensley’s criteria for support.

Strategic planning.
One person volunteered so far for the strategic planning group. Need more volunteers.

**Passing of the gavel**

Passed the gavel to Stu Dawrs.

Meeting adjourned at 12:12pm.

The following documents, referenced in the minutes, are attached:
- Library Senate Chair’s year-end report
- Mike Chopey’s e-mail dated August 14, 2012
- Gregg Geary’s statement regarding composition of screening committees
Chair’s recap of the Library Senate for 2011-2012

September

Transmitted results of poll on reorganization to Manoa Faculty Senate in lieu of submitting comments to Library Administration due to lack of time.

October

A vacancy in the position of Secretary arose due to Zastrow's leaving the university.

November

Eileen Herring agreed to serve out the remainder of Zastrow's term as secretary.

VCAA Reed Dasenbrock met with LSEB to ascertain whether the reorg should be put on hold due to Paula Mochida’s impending retirement. LSEB was later taken to task for responding to him without consulting with the full Senate on this question. As a result, a poll was conducted on the question and transmitted to the VCAA, UHPA, and MFS.

Due to Dasenbrock’s announcement that Gregg Geary would be named interim UL without prior consultation with the faculty, the LSEB formally conveyed the Senate’s objection to the lack of consultation and drew up a proposed procedure to allow faculty input into the selection of an interim UL. The Chancellor declined to reconsider Geary's appointment as interim UL. Therefore, the Senate submitted testimony stating our objection to the lack of consultation to the BOR in conjunction with the BOR’s notice of Geary’s appointment.

January

The LSEB was made aware that a number of APTs had been omitted from the list of associate members. LSEB obtained a complete list of APTs and updated the list and added the missing members to the libsen-l list.

The Senate voted to change its bylaws to eliminate the position of Parliamentarian. The rationale was that the Parliamentarian is supposed to be neutral and is not supposed to state positions or participate in voting. It is not fair to ask a faculty member to be disenfranchised thus, so the position was abolished and the duties will be assumed by the chair.

The Senate had meetings with the MFS CAB and UHPA regarding the reorganization proposal. MFS subsequently voted to disapprove of the reorganization proposal. UHPA also conveyed its opposition to the Library Administration.

February
Pat Polansky resigned as vice-chair and Allen Riedy was appointed to serve out the remainder of her term.

The Senate voted to send a letter to the interim University Librarian asking that the reorganization proposal be withdrawn. The Library Administration later retracted the reorganization proposal.

March

An ad-hoc committee was formed at Eileen Herring’s behest to develop a proposal to migrate the Senate web site to a platform that would be easier for future secretaries to update.

April

The secretary prepared a letter to be sent to new faculty hires informing them about participation in the Senate.

The Senate voted to waive the MLIS as one of the minimum qualifications for the Congressional Papers Archivist.

May

LSEB initiated planning for a forum to discuss public services issues and conducted a poll of faculty about public services.

June

The Senate met with VCAA Reed Dasenbrock to discuss the composition of a Search Advisory Committee for the University Librarian.

July

The Senate co-sponsored two planning forums with the Library Staff Advisory Group. Although initially conceived as a forum for public services issues, the concept was enlarged at the recommendation of facilitator Donna Ching. Participation was good and included representation from faculty, civil service, and APTs in all divisions. The group will continue to work with the interim UL on next steps.

The Senate submitted the names of nominees for the Search Advisory Committee for the University Librarian and comments on the position description to the VCAA.

The University Librarian expanded the membership of the Library Leadership Team (formerly Library Executive Team) to include the Library Senate chair.
August

The LSEB was directed by the Senate to draft a charge for a Working Group on Strategic Planning, and it was approved by the Senate.

Thank-yous

Eileen Herring: I am grateful that you agreed to serve as Secretary in what turned out to be an extremely eventful year with many emergency meetings. Thank you for your excellent minutes and your thoughtful contributions to our discussions. Thanks also for initiating the move of the Senate web site to a new platform.

Allen Riedy: Thank you for agreeing to serve out the remainder of Pat Polansky’s term as vice-chair. Thanks to Pat for her service on the Board and her frank discussions of parliamentary procedure and service requirements.

Dore Minatodani: Thank you for serving as one of our Manoa Faculty Senate representatives. In many ways, you shaped much of what the Senate accomplished during the year. Dore worked on most of the polls that were conducted and lent her expert writing skills to most of our undertakings. Although LSEB’s correspondence is issued under the chair’s signature, Dore and other LSEB members actually drafted much of that correspondence. She also pushed the Senate to consider a number of issues outside the immediate concerns of the reorganization and appointment of the interim UL.

Allie Jordan, Nancy Sack, and Lori Ann Saeki all served as chair of the Elections Committee during a year where we conducted an extraordinary number of elections and polls. I thank them all for handling their duties capably, and I congratulate them for the unusually high voter turnout during our elections.

David Flynn served as the UHPA rep on LSEB. I appreciated his contributions to our discussions and his advice on Robert’s rules of order.

Sara Rutter stepped in to replace him and has continued to be a valued board member. I especially appreciate her work on the library planning initiative. She also served as LPC co-chair until we determined that standing committees cannot have co-chairs.

Ruth Horie, in addition to being one of our UHPA representatives, also served as parliamentarian until that position was abolished. I appreciate your guidance on parliamentary procedure and willingness to continue serving as a UHPA rep.

Mike Chopey currently serves as LPC chair. Susan Johnson served as LPC chair during 2011. Thank you both for serving as chair and participating in LSEB.
Thanks to the membership for attending meetings: no meetings canceled due to lack of quorum! Thanks also for voting and participating in numerous polls.

Welcome to new LSEB officers: Chair Stu Dawrs, vice-chair/chair-elect Jan Sung, and secretary Naomi Chow!
Dear Library Senate,

As you might know, the "Library Personnel Committee Policies and Procedures" document that was approved by the Library Senate on August 9, 2010 was returned to Alan Grosenheider by Assistant Vice Chancellor Beverly McCreary in June 2011 with rewording suggestions to make some sections that were not compliant with Manoa's administrative procedures and guidelines for T&P compliant, and to clarify the wording regarding the review process in a few places. LPC has been working with AVC McCreary to arrive at wording that will be acceptable to University administration the next time the document is sent to them and UHPA for review, and we expect to have the reworded document available for Senate review and possible further revision and eventual approval by the Senate before the end of this year.

In the meantime, the LPC Policies & Procedures document that is currently in force is still the 2008 version posted on the Senate web page at http://www.hawaii.edu/libsen/lpcREv2008.pdf. However, the LPC learned in a meeting with AVC McCreary in May of this year that we will need to change our procedures for soliciting external evaluations, and that we will need to do so effective this year (i.e., we will not be allowed to follow the procedures that are set out in our 2008 document).

When we begin discussion of the next draft of our LPC P&P document in the Senate this fall, we will have plenty of time to discuss the various ways we can bring our procedures for soliciting external evaluations into compliance with the approved campus procedure, but since this is a time-sensitive issue (the letters to external evaluators should go out as soon as possible, hopefully by the end of August even, if possible), the LSEB has asked me to present some background on this so that we can hopefully approve a temporary ad hoc procedure to follow for this fall's applications.

So here's the background ...

Our current LPC P&P document says:

The candidate may supply names of external (non-Library) evaluators (normally from three to five) to the Administration Office for solicitation of letters of evaluation. (Cf. the current University criteria and guidelines on the tenure and promotion process). In all cases, letters to external evaluators will be sent out in the name of the chair of the Library Personnel Committee and marked as confidential.
We have been advised that our procedures need to specify that:

a) the applicant may supply names of potential external evaluators, normally 3-5;
b) the LPC [or Department head or University Librarian] is responsible for securing letters from 2-3 of the evaluators suggested by the applicant and an equal number of letters from other evaluators proposed by the Department head, the LPC, or the Interim;
c) the two lists of names should be maintained as part of the application;
d) when the letters are received, a notation should be made about which list each letter came from;
e) applicants should not contact possible external evaluators;
f) an external evaluator should be an individual whose personal relationship to the applicant is such that he or she can judge the applicant’s work objectively; an external evaluator should not be a person whom the applicant would consider a friend or someone who has worked closely with the applicant.

The LSEB hopes to get a consensus opinion from the Senate voting membership at our meeting next week on these questions for this fall's applications:

1) to whom should the applicant supply his or her list of names of potential external evaluators;
2) who will select the names from that list, supply an equal number of additional names, and secure the evaluations;

These are some possible scenarios that I think would be compliant with the 2012-2013 Manoa administrative procedures and the wording in the September 2012 Manoa "Criteria and Guidelines for Faculty Tenure/Promotion Application":

1) Interim UL asks candidate to supply 3-5 names; chooses 2-3 of them; Interim UL identifies 2-3 others; solicits evaluations from all.

2) DPC (i.e., LPC) asks candidate to supply 3-5 names; LPC chooses 2-3 of them; LPC identifies 2-3 others; LPC chair solicits evaluations from all.

3) Dept. chair (i.e. Dept. head) asks candidate to supply 3-5 names; Dept. head chooses 2-3 of them; Dept. head identifies 2-3 others; Dept. head solicits evaluations from all.

4) Interim UL asks candidate to supply 3-5 names; Interim UL supplies 3-5 names of other evaluators; Interim UL passes on names to LPC; LPC chooses 2-3 of the candidate's choices and 2-3 others; LPC chair solicits evaluations from all.
5) Dept. chair (i.e. Dept. head) asks candidate to supply 3-5 names; Dept. head supplies 3-5 names of other evaluators; Dept. head passes on names to LPC, LPC chooses 2-3 of the candidate's choices and 2-3 others; LPC chair solicits evaluations from all.

For your reference, here is the relevant text from p. 19 of the September 2012 Manoa "Criteria and Guidelines for Faculty Tenure/Promotion Application" (available at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcaa/faculty/tenure_promotion_contract_renewal/pdf/2012-2013_criteria_guidelines.pdf) and also please read Section IV of the attached 2012-2013 administrative procedures and timetable.

Solicitation of external evaluations by Department Chair, Chair of Department Personnel Committee, or Dean/Director. Departments should seek external evaluations of each applicant's work. An evaluator should be at, or above the rank aspired to by the applicant. External evaluators should be professionally capable to assess the applicant’s work objectively and comment on its significance in the discipline.

Normally, the applicant is asked to provide in writing three to five names and addresses of respected scholars in related fields who are not at the University of Hawai‘i, Mānoa. Applicants should not contact possible external evaluators. It is the obligation of the Department to secure external evaluations. It is recommended that the Department Chair, in consultation with the Chair of the Department Personnel Committee, should secure letters from 2-3 of these people and a comparable number of letters from known scholars proposed by the Department who can evaluate the applicant’s work.

Please let me know if there's anything I've overlooked or if you have any questions about the rest of the 2008 LPC P&P that are currently in force (but don't ask me about the status of "wide-ranging evaluations" yet ... I'll be sending a separate e-mail about that.)

Thank you,
Mike Chopey
2012 LPC Chair
Memorandum

To: Library Faculty Senate
From: Gregg S. Geary, Interim University Librarian
RE: Best practices for Faculty Selection Committees
Date: August 21, 2012

Response to Input from the Library Faculty Senate regarding:

1. Department Heads serving on Faculty Selection Committees for candidates that will serve in their departments: The Library Administration concurs with the majority of responses from Senate members that it is desirable for Department Heads to serve on Library Faculty Selection Committees. While the Administration noted that some other libraries may find it preferable not to include Department Heads on the selection committees that engage in the recruitment and hiring process, the Library Administration agrees with the comments expressed by Senate members that our size, procedures, and the need for the leader of the Department to have input in process at this level are compelling reasons to do otherwise. We find that the Department Head is uniquely poised to understand the needs of their department and should be directly involved in the selection process. The Library Administration therefore supports the continuation of our past practice of including the Department Head on the Faculty Selection Committee for candidates in their department.

2. Inclusion of APT or Civil Service Staff on Faculty Selection Committees. The Library Administration concurs with the majority of responses from Senate members that it is desirable to have APT or Civil Service members on Faculty Selection Committees. Many of the comments note the Library’s unique situation in the University of having two-thirds of our staff composed of APT and Civil Service staff and that our Library faculty must work closely with these personnel. Therefore, the Library Administration agrees that the APT and Civil Service staff provide a needed perspective in the recruitment and hiring process for faculty positions. The Administration would also submit that there is precedence for this practice in the Institute for Astronomy (IfA) which has included APT and/or Civil Service personnel in their Faculty Selection process.