UHM Library Faculty Senate Meeting  
September 18, 2012

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:  
Tokiko Bazzell, Jim Cartwright, Michael Chopey, Naomi Chow (Secretary, recording), Ross Christensen, Stu Dawrs (Chair), Carolyn Dennison, Monica Ghosh, Joan Hori, Ruth Horie, Susan Johnson, Eleanor Kleiber, Dore Minatodani, Sharon Ouchi, Sara Rutter, Nancy Sack, Asako Shiba, Gwen Sinclair, Dainan Skeem, Hisami Springer, Mabel Suzuki, Kuang-Tien Yao

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:  
Kim Nakano, Susan Weber, Gregg Geary

Convened at 10:33 a.m. in the Yap Conference Room, Hamilton Library

1. **Approval of minutes.**  

2. **Reports**  
a. **Chair** (Dawrs)  
   
   Thanked everyone for coming; Stated coming up to speed in chair role; Corrections welcome; Thanked Sara Rutter for agreeing to be UHPA Representative for the Library Senate Executive Board; Recognized Jan Sung as incoming LSEB vice chair; Naomi Chow as incoming LSEB secretary; Dore Minatodani and Gwen Sinclair for continuing as Manoa Faculty Senate representatives for the Library Senate Executive Board

   i. **ACCFSC meeting recap** (Dawrs)  
      
      Attended annual retreat of the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs  
      
      1. Discussed memo for equal access to resources by UH system  
         *http://www.hawaii.edu/accfsc/docs/20120419_memo_library%20resources.pdf* (Attachment A)  
      2. Council supports memo  
      3. President MRC Greenwood gave a brief response  
         
         a. Did not offer increase/change in funding to allow equal access to electronic resources  
         b. Expressed that hard decisions need to be made (made a reference to the UC system) and spoke of consortial arrangements with other universities to share collections  
         c. Did not seem to understand the licensing and funding requirements of commercial databases  
         d. Dawrs noted that the ACCFSC meeting was more of a quick question and answer session, did not give an opportunity for full dialogue
e. LSEB has suggested that Gregg take the issue and memo to Library council to confer

f. More comments offered by Sinclair (Immediate past LSEB chair who also attended the retreat):
   i. VCAA should look needs to determine costs
   ii. Need to identify what resources we want “equal access”, and if so, how much would it costs
   iii. Emphasis on electronic resources
   iv. Memo seems to place next decision level on the President’s office
   v. ACCFSC – will meet next week (Stu will report and check)

   g. Comment—any preliminary data or survey by library council? Perhaps library council needs to come up with documentation

h. Stu will keep Library Senate up to date

ii. LLT meetings recap
   1. 2 meetings attended by Stu – Info to pass along:
      a. One -- $700,000 from Outreach College excess tuition may be given to library, tied to 3 specific items requested by Vice Chancellor
         • Open Saturdays (to begin sometime in Oct.)
         • Spent on collection materials
         • 2nd floor Sinclair
   b. Second -- Travel funding will stay in effect till June 2013, then reassessed after that point, probably to Senate, will pull together recommendations from previous committees work (Stu to consult with Amy Carlson)

c. Secretary (Chow)
   i. Not in attendance

d. Vice Chair (J. Sung)
i. No Report

d. LPC (Chopey)
i. Information session held on tenure, promotion and contract renewal last Friday, September 14, 2012
  ii. New/Old business matter will be reported later in this meeting

e. Elections (Saeki)
i. Not in attendance

f. Manoa Faculty Senate (Sinclair, Minatodani)
i. Committee on Professional Matters (CMP) Assignment (Sinclair)
  1. Reviewed issues
     a. Parking (increase in parking rate)
     b. Departmental Personnel Committee composition and selection process of DPC
     c. Evaluation of Administrators and how it might be done differently (currently, evaluation goes just to individual, not shared elsewhere) –Would like to know how evaluations can be more meaningful and have greater impact.
     d. Faculty classifications – CPM recommended that a task force was be formed; however Gwen is unclear whether SEC decided to form a task force or leave it with CPM.
     e. Looking into a standardized process to nominate emeritus faculty
     f. There is a growing use of adjunct faculty rather than tenure track faculty (trend at other universities, want to check with VC Kathy Cutshaw’s office about UH trends)
     g. Course syllabi – there is a concern that if outcomes are listed on course syllabi, faculty will be held accountable when we don't have control over some aspects.
     h. Issue of Tenure and Post tenure review. Aim is to maintain and improve performance of tenured faculty
     i. UARC University Affiliated Research Center – need report
     j. Promotion applications may now be submitted in Hawaiian language, however, need to have translated copy if no one on DPC and Tenure Promotion Review Committee (TPRC) can read Hawaiian.

ii. General Education Committee (Minatodani)
   a. "High DFIW Course Follow Up"
      i. Implementing suggestions made two years ago following a review of classes that have a disproportionately high number of students receiving a D, F or I, or withdrawing.
   b. FS Requirement
i. Continue review of the Foundations Symbolic Reasoning requirement (FS).

ii. FS is problematic on campus in that many students do not complete it in their first year, as required, or even in their second year. This is due to limited course offerings with FS designation, and difficulty of the courses that do have FS designation.

iii. FS is also problematic in that many would like to see it replaced by a quantitative reasoning requirement. WASC will be requiring quantitative reasoning proficiency. This has UH System-wide implications in terms of articulation.

c. Information Literacy (IL) (Attachment B)
   i. Will review how Information Literacy is being taught across curriculum.
   ii. This will also be a WASC requirement.
   iii. Information literacy overlaps with library instruction interests. Dore will be soliciting participation from library faculty.

d. Committee on implementation of Institutional Learning Objectives - Vicky Lebbin to serve.

g. UHPA (Rutter)
   i. Training forum on UHPA (Rutter to attend)
   ii. Ruth Horie, UHPA Rep for UHM Library, reported on fact findings about wide ranging evaluations; and individual (confidential) questions, work continues; Horie put out a call for her replacement as UHPA rep (retiring in December) [Complete text forwarded by Ruth Horie to LSEB Secretary via email on Sept. 18, 2012 (Attachment C)]
      1. Wide range evaluations – LPC policies and procedures from faculty decision making, reflective value of faculty decision, make decisions of what works for unit, but should conform to campus procedures and UHPA requirements
      2. Can serve for peer review – valuable data about applicants to LPC, if civil service and apt reviews may be of value to LPC, so long as does not conflict
      3. Addressing negative evaluations in dossier – candidate has recourse, candidates should put down as much info and best effort with statements (negative evaluations should not totally determine outcome)
      4. Conclusion: Wide ranging evaluations do not violate collective bargaining
3. **Old business**

a. **Working Group on Strategic Planning Update** (Sinclair)

There is now a working group thanks to Gwen Sinclair – information was sent out on the Weekly Update from 9/14/12. (Attachment D) or web link: 

The working group will attend facilitation training and meet to decide the next course of actions.

b. **Wide ranging evaluations.** (Chopey)

i. Proposed document eliminating wide ranging evaluations is actually a disapproved document – not enforced– 2009 document is still in force, so will be seeking wide ranging evaluations unless senate says not to do so

**Comment**
Do wide ranging evaluations need to go into dossier, or can they go to the University Librarian (as not part of dossier that Candidate intended, but not a violation of UHPA); other evaluations do enter dossier – external, department head, etc.

**Comment**
Is there a control as to who can submit and if they are your peer?

**Response from Senate**
Safe guards are currently in place -- submitter signs names, LPC decides appropriateness of evaluations, LPC would hopefully be able to see the level and importance of evaluations

ii. Motion introduced “to strike wide ranging evaluations from tenure, promotion and contract renewal applications from the review process” [not voted on by Senate members at meeting]

**Comment** – Some folks have work relationships that do not come out in dossier; other viewpoint that it is not professional level – anyone can include any letter of support

**Comment** – Uncomfortable in making decision with only the group here— want bigger inclusion of stake holders – so that it would be on the table, people can choose to come; Seconded by another – more advance notice to make decision; was will of senate previously, but need to reassess; not in keeping with rest of campus;

**Comment** -- Need to decide today if to affect this year’s process

**Comment** – Suggestion for an electronic vote with the elections committee
Comment -- VC said could not go forward with current process as approved for external evaluators as not in keeping with campus procedures; should we take an electronic vote? Why cannot rely on revised document? Does it need to be revoted?

Comment --Document waiting approval on does not include wide ranging evaluations, so do we need to have a vote on excluding wide ranging evaluations? Yes, according to senate members for this year’s tenure and promotion contract renewal applications

Comment – Current policy requires wide-ranging evaluations; revised policy is not completed/approved; can we vote to suspend a standing policy? Possible problems with applications.

Comment- Are we allowed to vote on this today? Chair LPC would need to vet up and down the chain of command on campus – not sure if it would be approved – need to write a memo, cc Jim Cardash, Beverly mcCreary – not sure what response would be; in favor of electronic voting

Comment -- Add to motion that removing the requirement for wide ranging evaluations for this year would depend upon going through process for approval before it could be implemented

Amendment Proposed:
Whereas library senate has already voted to strike wide ranging evaluations from the library personnel committee policies and procedures for contract renewal, tenure, and promotion applications, the senate proposes striking the wide ranging evaluations from contract renewal, tenure, and promotion applications for this year 2012-13

Comment. – Can this be done in a timely manner? Is it feasible? Senate document changes and amendments need more lead time and more length review

Vote Taken: Majority rules for the amendment –passes

Comment-- Amendment is subject to verification that this action is in compliance with overarching library senate bylaws and policies

Comment – Found on senate website – “Need 5 days ahead and then 2/3rds vote of senate”. So strike out 2nd amend – so need electronic vote –

Withdrawn: Previous amendment vote.

[Lost quorum at 12:08 noon so notes were discontinued on this topic]
4. New Business

a. **Update on Special Salary Adjustments** (Geary)

   (Attachment E covers New Business sections a – c; Complete Text of Letter sent by Interim University Librarian Gregg Geary to LSEB Secretary)

   Library facing $1.8 mill deficit; This affects standing of project; Info was not accurate and well informed; Well intended but not well-timed; SSAs required to not have negative on departmental resources; Recommendation to not have SSA at this time forwarded to Vice Chancellor; Recommend monies to support other continued efforts; Revisit SSA when budget better

b. **Interim Assistant University Librarian for Information Technology** (Geary)

   Current budgetary situation impact on interim AUL IT position – Geary has asked Kim Nakano keep overview for a while, then Geary to oversee directly the departments and efforts. Appointments would take away from Primo implementation and Scholar Open Access – would need to fill the person’s gap – Decision is to hold on AUL for IT until new administrator (UL) in place – should be soon. Decision to hold has no bearing on candidates. Related to fiscal prudence. Nakano to stay on until Geary finished with heavy travel schedule in October

c. **Travel** (Geary)

   Decision for essential travel only for administration; does not affect faculty travel—e.g., GWLA and ARL is very beneficial, so that will continue; otherwise try to cut costs and contain costs, but cancel some travel (UL), cancelled to PRDLA and Hong Kong; denied funding for Kim Nakano’s travel request, and Susan Weber will have no travel during AUL appointment – monies will go to faculty travel

Geary thanked the Senate and invited everyone to attend the upcoming library forum with Chancellor Tom Apple.

**Comments:**

**Comment:** Are there any salary savings that could be applied towards the $1.8 million deficit?

**Response** (Geary): Have figured for salary savings – Geary will supply the figures, however, library has hired new librarians so projected savings are not permanent, though there will be retirements in December. Challenges currently -- changeover with new fiscal officer (learning curve and communication, expectations of what administrations need and what can we really afford). Data can be provided. Library’s Fiscal Officer, Eric Fujiwara, could be asked to share presentation that was made to LDC with Library Senate (and similar presentation to Cutshaw was made by Geary). We thought things were okay – now we know that we are not—clear case to address budget situation (Library administration to UH administration)
Comment: Faculty are the most important resource, problems with salary compression; support and funding is needed

Response (Geary): Cannot spend what we do not have at the moment, so need to cut back (Gregg will send memo shared with Senate to entire library). Faculty Travel is important – trying to protect that monies --- limit administrative travel funding – continue under current procedures through June 30 2013, then revisit – current procedures was actually a proposal that was implemented though never formally approved. See what options are available for deciding distribution of faculty travel funds, for example, using a hierarchy instead of flat rate distribution. Continuing with the procedures for now so that plans that have been made will not be affected for this fiscal year.

Comment: New travel fund distribution proposal will come forward. Will be worked upon. Dawrs will collate previous committees/taskforce recommendations on faculty travel.

Meeting adjourned at 12:08 p.m.

Next Meeting: October 16, 2012 in the Yap Conference Room, Hamilton Library
Attachment A
ACCFSC Memo on UH System Equal Access to Electronic Resources
All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (ACCFSC) Memo for equal access to resources by UH system

[Will insert PDF document from web]
http://www.hawaii.edu/accfsc/docs/20120419_memo_library%20resources.pdf
Aloha library faculty,

I received an invitation (forwarded below) to serve on the Institutional Learning Objectives Implementation Committee. I do not plan to serve on this committee. Are any of you interested? Here is why I think the library has an interest here, and why a member of the library faculty would be a good addition to the implementation committee:

1. There is a small reference to the library in the ILOs, and there is probably an opportunity to include the library in other interpretations of the ILOs. The ILOs will ultimately be assessed at the institutional level, and if a library component is included, there will need to be institutional support for the library's role here.

2. Indirectly related, but destined to intersect in the context of overall assessment - The draft WASC graduation proficiencies include information literacy and this also has potential for library involvement.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please let me know and I will check on whether I can recommend a substitute when I decline. The folks in the original ILO working group (on which I served last year) were great - they kept the interests of students in mind at all times, and are genuinely interested in improving the educational experience for UH students.

If you have any questions, please feel free to e-mail or call me (x62852). Please let me know within the next two days if you are interested.

Dore

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: Kristin Herrick <uhmfs@hawaii.edu>
Date: Wed, Aug 29, 2012 at 10:00 AM
Subject: Institutional Learning Objectives Implementation Committee
To: Debora Halbert <halbert@hawaii.edu>, Amy Schiffner <amyls@hawaii.edu>, "Dore A.
Aloha:

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) would like to nominate you to represent the faculty on the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs's Institutional Learning Objectives Implementation Committee.

As former members of the ILO Task Force, you'll remember that the Senate passed the Institutional Learning Objectives in May 2012. The ILO Implementation Committee will represent the faculty's interest in working towards implementation of these objectives.

Myrtle Yamada, with the OVCAA, provided a brief description of an event that our ILO faculty representatives will be asked to attend below:

A WASC staff member will be in Honolulu next month and has offered to talk to us about the new WASC requirements. She's only available on 9/20. One of the new WASC requirements centers around the meaning and integrity of the undergraduate degree which ties into our ILOs. So, we'd like to arrange a work session with the WASC staff member and as many members of the ILO implementation committee as possible. We're hoping to find a time when as many of the committee members can attend the session, hence the need for the names of the committee members. If you can get me the names by the the first week of class that would be great. Even a partial list of members would be helpful.

Please confirm whether you are willing and able to serve in this capacity so that I can pass your names along to Myrtle as soon as possible.

Let me know if I can help in any way.

Thanks,

Kristin

Kristin Herrick, Administrative Coordinator
Manoa Faculty Senate | University of Hawaii at Manoa
2500 Campus Road | Hawaii Hall 208 | Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Ph: (808) 956-7725 | Fax: (808) 956-9813 | uhmfs@hawaii.edu
Website: http://www.hawaii.edu/uhmfs/

This message may contain confidential information and is intended only for the individual(s) named. Please do not forward, copy or otherwise transmit or disseminate this e-mail or any of its' contents to any person other than the named sender and recipients. Notify the sender immediately by email if you have received this email by mistake and delete this email from your system.
LPC chair Mike Chopey asked UHPA faculty representative Ruth Horie to contact UHPA for an opinion about wide ranging-evaluations and external evaluations in the LPC policies and procedures.

Ruth spoke on the phone with associate executive director Jim Kardash on Aug. 22, 2012 and made the following report to Mike and Sara.

The LPC policies and procedures resulted from a faculty decision making process and reflect the values of the faculty in the unit.
Faculty should feel free to set policies and procedures that make sense for them in the unit.
The policies and procedures should conform with campus procedures and collective bargaining.
The policies and procedures govern the actions of the LPC, not the department head or the University Librarian.
Wide-ranging evaluations can serve as peer review and can provide valuable data to the LPC.
If the faculty have determined that evaluations of candidates by civil service and APT employees are of value, then as long as the procedure to solicit such evaluations does not conflict with campus procedures or collective bargaining, then they may be solicited.

The method of identifying additional external reviewers and soliciting evaluations from them should be determined by the faculty through their policies and procedures, within the parameters of the campus procedures.

If negative evaluations included in the dossier lead to a negative review, the candidate has recourse.
Successful outcomes have been achieved, even with negative evaluations.
UHPA is available for consultation and assistance.”
Attachment D
Library Working Group on Strategic Planning

From the UHM Library’s Weekly Update for September 14, 2012

****************************************************************************

The following individuals have joined the Library Working Group on Strategic Planning:

Melissa Arakawa
Sheila Ayson
Naomi Chow
Stu Dawrs
Carol Fukumoto
Claire Schultz
Jerrold Shiroma
Gwen Sinclair

The working group's charge is to "coordinate and implement a strategic planning process for Library Services, to update or create a new strategic plan. The new or revised strategic plan should be completed by the end of the Spring semester of 2013." We are pleased to have representatives from all three Library divisions and from faculty, APTs, and civil service staff. Chow, Fukumoto, Schultz, Shiroma, and Sinclair will attend Donna Ching's "Facilitative Skills for Collaborative Leaders" workshop on Oct. 1-2. We will provide more information as the group refines its scope and determines its course of action. The group will happily accept additional volunteers. Please contact Gwen Sinclair with questions or to volunteer.

******************************************************************************
Dear Library Ohana,

As many of you have heard, the Library currently faces a projected $1.8 million deficit. While such numbers flex and change over time, this number is so large and so significant we cannot escape the fact that we must do all we can to manage our funds carefully while I continue to work with the UH Administration to improve our base budget.

Because of this situation I am compelled to reevaluate previous decisions and commitments made without the knowledge of our current fiscal situation.

1. Special Salary Adjustments. In April, Alan Grosenhieder developed a plan, which I approved, to solicit special salary adjustment applications from among the faculty. These applications were to be based on equity. At the time I asked if we could afford such a plan and was informed that we could. I have since learned that information was not accurate and well informed. I have taken steps to ensure that I will receive more careful appraisals of our budget situation in the future.

While I firmly believe our desire to address salary inequities was well intended it was very poorly timed. Both the forms for each application, and the faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement, [specifically R-18, Memorandum of Understanding on the Procedures for Special Salary Adjustments and Bonus Payments] make clear that any special salary adjustment must not have a negative impact on department resources. I cannot in good conscience sign such a statement knowing what I now know about our budget situation. Therefore, I will be forwarding to the Chancellor my recommendation that no special salary adjustments be made at this time.

With our current deficit situation, every expense comes at the cost of not doing something else. Funding special salary adjustments at the present time will result in cuts to other vital library operations such as student help, support for collections, faulty travel, and staffing.

I deeply regret this situation. I know that it will disappoint many of our faculty who were hoping to have some slight adjustment to their salary to provide greater equity among the various ranks. I hope that when our fiscal house is in better order we may be able to revisit special salary adjustments, but now is clearly not that time.

2. Assistant University Librarian for Information Technology (AUL for IT). Similarly, I have given much thought and consideration to the issue of filling the interim position of AUL for IT in light of our current budgetary situation. Instead of appointing another temporary Interim Assistant University Librarian for Information Technology for the remainder of my short term, I have decided to ask Kim Nakano to continue for part of the term, and then I will take over direct supervision of the departments when she is no longer interim AUL. I now lay out before you these considerations upon which I base my decision.

I have two fine candidates who have applied to become the interim position of AUL for IT. I would be most happy and comfortable working with either one. In fact, I work with both of them
now on important projects that benefit the Library. In addition to their regular duties, James Adamson has been instrumental in moving the PRIMO implementation forward and Beth Tillinghast has spearheaded our Open Access activities and grown our Institutional Repository.

Appointing either of the candidates to this temporary AUL appointment will create a gap in their respective department that would need to be filled. Some may think that either one could continue to fill their faculty functions while serving as the AUL for IT but because the AUL position is an executive position this is not possible. Executives should not fill the duties that would otherwise be performed by faculty. Creating a temporary faculty/staff position to backfill either of the candidates would require a significant expense. All this would be done primarily to maintain administrative operations and that for only a temporary period. Since the job announcement for the permanent University Librarian has been published it is only a matter of time before a new Administrator will be in place. When that person comes on board next year he or she will surely want to begin the process of seeking permanent executives for his or her administration.

Since Kim Nakano, the current Interim AUL for IT, did not have a set date as to when she would step down I am currently in discussion with her to see if she could stay until I complete my busy travel schedule in October, 2012. After she steps down any reports that would go to the Interim AUL for IT will report directly to the University Librarian.

Please understand that this decision has absolutely no bearing on the candidates who applied for the interim AUL for IT position. I have the highest regard for both of them and would encourage them to apply for the permanent position if they so choose. This decision is based on fiscal prudence alone. I have spoken to both candidates about this decision to inform them fully of my reasoning on it and both understand my position. I know that there will be some disappointment in this decision and I accept that responsibility. But I believe that after weighing all the options this decision is in the best interest of the Library.

3. Travel. In light of the aforementioned budget situation I am limiting Administrative travel to essential travel only. This decision does not affect faculty travel. I consider essential travel that which supports and benefits the Library above and beyond the cost of the travel itself. For example, our association with GWLA results in significant savings in through consortial purchases and the development of new products and services for our Library and its patrons. Therefore, I believe is important that we continue to attend those meetings. Likewise, our affiliation with ARL results in marked benefits to the Library. To provide maximum savings I will use personal travel vouchers to reduce the cost of airfare and, in the instance of the ARL meeting in Washington D.C. I will be using my brother’s car for transportation and will be staying with acquaintances in the D.C. area rather than staying at the conference hotel.

In contrast, I believe my planned trip to the PRDLA meeting in Beijing, China does not result is a similar benefit to the Library so I have cancelled that trip. Similarly, I have been invited to, and planned to attend, The University of Hong Kong Libraries Centenary Anniversary Conference, 8 November 2012. While attendance at this function would be very nice, I do not feel the benefit to the Library outweighs the cost. As a result I have canceled that trip as well. In addition, Kim
Nakano requested travel to the Association of Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) conference for which I have denied funding and Susan Weber will not be asking for any administrative funds for travel during her interim appointment.

These actions will result in thousands of dollars in savings which can be put toward other essential operations including faculty and staff travel.

I am very hopeful that our budget situation will improve. I am most encouraged by the new Chancellor, Tom Apple’s, support for the library. I know you will want to attend his upcoming Library Forum presentation where you can learn first-hand about his view of the Library as the heart of the University. My vision is that our careful stewardship of our current limited resources will develop the trust necessary for the UH Administration to support our efforts with the funds required to accomplish our mission properly.