UHM Library Faculty Senate Meeting  
October 16, 2012

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:
Kristen Anderson, Michael Chopey, Naomi Chow (Secretary, recording), Ross Christensen, Stu Dawrs, Monica Ghosh, Joan Hori, Ruth Horie, Jodie Mattos, Dore Minatodani, Sharon Ouchi, Royahati Paseng, Patricia Polanksy, Sara Rutter, Asako Shiba, Hisami Springer, Jan Sung, Nackil Sung

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:
Kim Nakano, Claire Schultz,

Meeting convened with quorum at 10:35 a.m. in the Yap Room, Hamilton Library

1. Approval of minutes.

Minutes approved for September 18, 2012

2. Reports
   a. Chair (Dawrs) – held till later in the meeting
   b. Vice Chair (J. Sung) - no report
   c. Secretary (Chow)- no report
   d. Library Personnel Committee (Chopey)
      1. Tenure and promotion applications deadline was Monday, 11/15/12. 12 applications altogether. Will finish review by mid-December
   e. Elections (Saeki) – no report / absent
   f. Manoa Faculty Senate (Minatodani)
      1. Information Literacy Committee – there are a couple of volunteers from library
      2. Manoa Faculty Senate & Congress meet tomorrow (10/17/12)--Vote of No-confidence on agenda
   g. University of Hawaii Professional Assembly (Rutter)
      1. Rutter attended forum on Saturday (10/13/12)
         1. Discussed political endorsements by UHPA
         2. UHPA needs private email addresses for information
         3. Cannot use Hawaii.edu servers for personal business
         4. Financial planning programs info sent out to private email
         5. Comment – UHPA survey on feedback about political endorsements—status? Rutter to find out (including opting out?)
         6. Comment – also interested in results in survey – want to know faculty sentiment (general, if not specific results)

3. Old business
   a. Update on Working Group on Strategic Planning (Dawrs)
1. Co-chairs are Gwen Sinclair, Jerrold Shiroma; 5 members did training with Donna Ching; group has met once; decided not to just abandon old plan – assess and review old plan. Ideally will recommend to assess annually. First step -- looking at work done post strategic plan – subcommittees tasked with various reports – see status, then see if need additions to plan. Meet again at end of month, regular meeting scheduled, divided up work.

4. **New Business**
   
a. **Hiring freeze for vacant faculty and staff positions** *(Dawrs)*
   1. Dawrs presented draft memo (see copy of memo)
      1. Background-Chair has conferred with LSEB
      2. Sent list of questions to Geary
      3. Answers sent by Geary
         1. Scitech Librarian position underway
         2. Hold on other open positions
         3. Hold on retirement positions
         4. Reasoning – hold on decisions for permanent University Librarian
         5. Access Services -- 4 positions are being pursued to be reestablished and filled due to Saturday library reopening (including the return of 2 abolished positions)
         6. 4.5 apt positions being funded by empty faculty positions
   2. Dawrs read draft that was also distributed via email – brought up by LSEB
      1. Discussion/Comments
         1. Spell out acronyms
         2. Library faculty positions only? Or all positions in library?
         3. Another LLT member did not hear interpretation of freeze for civil service or that apt positions might disappear
         4. Another LLT member did not hear anything in APT or civil service hiring freeze – concern about its inclusion in memo
         5. Suggestion to strike the APT and civil service wording for now until clarification about APT/civil service
         6. Department freeze vs. official UHM freeze (no money in budget vs UHM freeze)
         7. Move to strike “civil service and APT”
         8. 2nded, no discussion, all in favor – passed
         9. Geary working on trying to get money added to base— cannot hire anyone till addition to base
         10. Base monies is different than deferring to new UL appointment
         11. Retirement savings? No – need to pay off leave of retirees before salary monies available
         12. But from report by from Geary saying will *not* hire even if base budget increased – why new UL needed to fill positions already established?
         13. Clarify – unused vacation, not sick leave for retirees
         14. Memo – is sharing our concern – not demanding hiring
b. Request for establishment of Library Administration-Faculty Senate consultative process in cases where administration is considering either an internal reassignment to fill a position, or a re-assignment of a position to another department within the library. (Dawrs)
1. Dawrs read memo (also distributed by email previously)
2. 2 drafts one only faculty, other APT and civil service included
3. Opened discussion
   1. Need to make motion for draft number 2 since two items sent (can only be one) – 2nd motion
   2. Comment – what prompted draft and request? Personnel and department have already been consulted? Why does Senate want to be involved? Is it necessary?
   3. Suggestion to add “advice of faculty and LSAG” – add a different voice to add to discussion
   4. Department head role in advocate for own staff
   5. Institutional “creep” – things unintentionally changed
   6. Move to insert “Library Senate and Library Staff Advisory Group” into memo; seconded
   7. Discussion – uncomfortable doing this with civil service staff – more comfortable with just faculty
   8. Not speaking to matter at hand at the moment
   9. Vote on amendment/insertion – does not pass
10. Other discussion on this – move to change “where a faculty vacancy arises” strike out other information
11. Vote on amendment – passes
12. Motion passes

c. The All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs and system-wide access to databases and other electronic materials. (Dawrs)
1. LSEB suggest that individual chairs ask constituents to come up with a list of what really want to see intrasystem – to come up with a possible cost so President and Chancellors to see potential financial impact
2. Wait to see if something comes back or move forward?
3. Comment – Library Council has met to discuss; may need to be bumped up a level, problem – no money on the system level; total cost for entire system access to entire materials -- $14-$15 million (double what Manoa pays now).
4. Comment – Suggest talk with ULC first (University Library Council) – memo was sent by K. Anderson on how to respond to access to stuff
5. Comment – Speak with Geary about what occurred with ULC – work together
6. Comment – LSEB idea – ask someone to solicit suggestions about exactly what they want access to – may already have access? Or come up with list of 5 things that are wanted, then get cost estimates to see what it might cost
7. Comment – Elsevier Freedom Collection ---yes, will need cut if don’t get $1.8 million, cut from 2200 down to 50-100 titles and would lose system wide access – each library would be on its own – and medical libraries will lose other titles.
8. Comment – Kris Anderson will send standard letter to LSEB/Dawrs (May be use the letter as an example of costs)
9. Dawrs got advice needed (lost quorum)

Meeting adjourned at ~12:00 p.m.

Next Meeting: November 20, 2012 in the Yap Conference Room, Hamilton Library
Draft Memo to Library Administration Re Consultation Process

Draft 1:
In recognition of the library faculty senate's advisory role to Library Administration, the senate requests that a consultative process be established and enacted in those instances where a faculty vacancy arises and the Library Administration is considering either an internal reassignment to fill that position, or a re-assignment of that position to another department within the library. While the senate recognizes that the Administration's right to take such actions unilaterally is defined by the current collective bargaining agreement, senate members feel that the Administration will greatly benefit from advice of faculty when it comes to avoiding potential unintended consequences inherent in shifting positions or personnel from one department to another.

Draft 2:
In recognition of the library faculty senate's advisory role to Library Administration, the senate requests that a consultative process be established and enacted in those instances where a vacancy arises (whether it be faculty, civil service or APT) and the Library Administration is considering either an internal reassignment to fill that position, or a re-assignment of that position to another department within the library. While the senate recognizes that the Administration's right to take such actions unilaterally is defined by the current collective bargaining agreement, senate members feel that the Administration will greatly benefit from advice of faculty when it comes to avoiding potential unintended consequences inherent in shifting positions or personnel from one department to another.

Draft Memo to Library Administration Re Hiring Freeze

The Senate would like to express its concern regarding the recently announced hiring freeze for current and future faculty, civil service, and APT vacancies. While the Senate recognizes the difficult financial situation of the Library, it also recognizes that an across-the-board freeze will hamper the ability of departments to do their work. We urge the Library Administration to carefully consider the impact of this decision, in terms of both library function and library-wide staff morale. If the administration determines that postponing hiring for a position can be sustained, we urge that departments be permitted to employ casual/temporary hires to ensure that essential work is performed.

One of the hallmarks of the interim library administration has been an openness to consultation, marked by inclusion of representatives of the Library Senate and LSAG in LLT meetings. We therefore further urge Library Administration to consider this request in conjunction with the Library Senate's request for the establishment of a consultative process for consideration of disposition of positions.