UHM Library Faculty Senate Meeting  
December 18, 2012

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: 
Amy Carlson, Michael Chopey, Naomi Chow (recording), Stu Dawrs, Joan Hori, Carol Kellett, Eleanor Kleiber, Jodie Mattos, Dore Minatodani, Dongyun Ni, Sharon Ouchi, Gwen Sinclair, Dainan Skeem, Jan Sung, Nackil Sung, Mabel Suzuki, K.T. Yao

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: 
Kim Nakano

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

I. Approval of November 20, 2012 Meeting Minutes
   • Question came from the floor on the section on retention of librarians – section is presented a bit confusingly – will be renumbered/formatted; Also add note about justification to go through as a response from Geary
   • Additional corrections submitted by R. Horie via email – “Ghosh has agreed to succeed Horie as UHPA faculty representative in January 2013”
   • Minutes accepted as amended

II. Reports
   a. Chair (Dawrs)
      i. $700,000 has been received but not yet disbursed (Confirmed by K. Nakano)
      ii. Question about justifications – Dawrs sent email to Weber – confusion about procedure and whether the positions need to go up to Chancellor then formally returned
         • Justifications will not be forwarded until new UL in place
         • Dec 4th meeting – positions also involve commitment to funding – see LET Dec. 4th meeting
      iii. David Lassner wrote to Library Council (All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs ACCFSC memo to system wide access to e-resources); Kris Anderson on subcommittee working on this – will ask in January to come to senate to give us an update; Lassner would like to see how can work around system e.g., with a few faculty – perhaps adjust faculty on other campuses? Second go-around with e-resources (Pres. McClain)
   b. Vice Chair (J. Sung)
      i. Comment about adjunct faculty – visiting scholar with international faculty or other campuses – cautious—ways to get access to resources – need sponsorship by academic department
         • Dawrs – committee knows it needs to find out what people really want to access
   c. Secretary (Chow) – no report
   d. LPC (Chopey)
• Tenure and Promotion Applications: The six (6) tenure and promotion applications have been assessed by the LPC (and dept. chair where applicable) and have been sent to IUL Gregg Geary for his review. Geary will complete his review and make the dossiers available for pickup by a UHM Tenure Promotion Review Committee (TPRC) member no later than Jan. 2, 2013.

• Contract renewals: Review of renewal applications is complete; An LPC member has been assigned to each of the renewal applicants to meet with the person to review the applications with suggestions and feedback

•

e. Elections (Dawrs reports for Saeki)
• New LPC has been elected
• Rutter, Chopey, Reidy terms have ended
• Newly elected members are Flynn, Kwok, and Paseng

•

f. Manoa Faculty Senate (Minatodani & Sinclair)
  i. Manoa and UH System relationship (Minatodani)
  The senate executive committee decided to look at Manoa and UH System relationship; Sent memo out to MFS asked each of the standing committees to look at issues that are listed and to give feedback. Minatodani’s standing committee did a preliminary review of the the list – would like to take feedback on library related issues to committee, for example, systemwide access to electronic resources – anything to improve Manoa –System relationships

  ii. Classification of I and R Faculty and Teaching Responsibilities (Sinclair)
  At the last MFS meeting, Chancellor Apple addressed the Senate regarding classification of faculty – he supports the idea that there should be one classification for faculty and all faculty should teach (No distinction between I and R faculty); There are issues with some R faculty who are not productive and bring in no money, no evidence of activity (e.g., teaching) – therefore Chancellor Apple was suggesting that all faculty should be required to teach; Sinclair points out that if all faculty should teach, the Chancellor may not have thought about ramifications for specialists, extension agents, librarians, etc. (other faculty than I and R classifications). Will need to see how this evolves. Committee on Professional Matters and Committee on Research and Graduate Education are discussing; and may need to inform the Chancellor about the wider variety of faculty positions than I and R

Comments:
• According to UPHA, people in R classification cannot be called Professor, however, some research faculty want to be called professor – something may be confused and mistranslated?
• Heard different reasoning for this about researchers R positions to be more productive

• Another issue may be related to cost as well – who is responsible for what things; and where things take place, e.g., Eng 100 at community college level or reserved for Manoa?

iii. Additional Report (N. Sung)
• Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) Initiative on Instructional Innovation – Nackil Sung has volunteered from the Library and will be asking for feedback

  g. UHPA (Rutter absent - no report)

III. Old business
  a. Update on Working Group on Strategic Planning (Sinclair)

     Trying to figure out what to retain in the Library’s 2008-2012 Strategic Plan; reviewing how to arrange meetings to allow input but not take up too much time

IV. New Business
  a. Elsevier contract and library budget (Dawrs)

     Memo sent out by Dawrs on behalf of LSEB with responses from Geary (see text below in box). Background: CDMC was notified that a memo was sent out to Procurement regarding the Elsevier ScienceDirect/Freedom Collection; LSEB requested clarification on Elsevier contact language and whether there has been an increase to base before Elsevier/ScienceDirect contract is signed. Three questions were posed on: Scope of contract; Potential effect of contract if need to use current base budget to cover Elsevier contract; Status of potential Base budget increase

On Mon, Dec 17, 2012 at 2:16 PM, Stuart Dawrs <dawrs@hawaii.edu> wrote:

Dear Senate members,

On Thursday, Dec. 13, the Collection Development and Management Committee was notified via email from library administration that the Elsevier contract had been forwarded to the University's procurement office for processing. Given that this particular contract (and its impact on the overall library budget) has been a topic of much discussion in recent months, on Friday, December 14, the Library Senate Executive Board wrote to IUL Geary, IAUL Weber, and IAUL Nakano to request further details. We further asked that these details be provided by Monday, December 17, so that we could forward them to the full senate in time for our regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, Dec. 18. Below are the questions posed by the LSEB (in black), along with IUL Geary’s responses (in red), which were received on December 14. In his introduction to the response, IUL Geary noted: “Thank you so much for sharing your concerns. Noting your urgency I am responding as quickly as possible. My responses are in red below. Please understand this is a rapid response but I am trying to be as accurate as possible. I hope this helps address your questions.”

We have invited the administrative team to attend the senate's January 15 meeting (or to schedule an alternate date, as necessary) so that we may have a broader discussion about the current status of the
Library's budget. While we understand that many senate members are currently away from the library, we intend to hold our regularly scheduled meeting tomorrow, Dec. 18, to hear each other’s concerns. If you are unable to attend this meeting but would like to submit comments to the LSEB prior to the Jan. 15 meeting, please feel free to email them to me and I will compile and forward to the libsen list-serv prior to our January 15 meeting.

All best,

Stu Dawrs, library senate chair
for the Library Senate Executive Board

Questions from LSEB and IUL Geary's responses:

1. What is the scope of the contract the library is entering? Will it continue to provide system-wide access for the same electronic resources as provided by the current contract? Yes, the Freedom Collection is included which means we will continue the same access as is now provided.

2. To what extent, if any, does this contract exceed what our base budget can accommodate? What plans are in place to cover the costs of this contract? In other words, how will this decision affect the budget moving forward? It is my understanding that our current budget has the same allocation for Science Direct as last year which is around $1.4 (I can get the exact prices from Amy next week). The new contact price for 2013 is $1,515,663.17 + state tax. The price increases 5% each year which is less that the last 5-year contract that increased at a rate of 6.5%.

3. We applaud your efforts to work with Manoa Administration to increase the Library's base budget. An unsigned Elsevier contract offered significant bargaining power. Does the signing of the contract offer any insight into the status of the base budget request? I requested and got an addition to the terms of the contract marked item 5.3, entitled Early Termination Due to Insufficient Budgetary Allotment From Government. This stipulates that upon thirty (30) days notice given to Elsevier that we do not have sufficient funds allotted in future government-approved budgets that we may terminate the agreement and pay only for the period for with the product was provided. This should continue to place pressure on the Manoa Administration to provide the funding needed to purchase SD since it could be terminated otherwise. I also requested an extension of time to pay the invoice and the ability to pay in two installments which was granted. There currently is no new signed contract since I cannot sign any contract in that amount. This is done by Procurement as was done with the previous contact. I was informed by Procurement that item 5.2 in the past contract indicates that the “The Agreement will be automatically renewed for successive one-year terms, subject to appropriate adjustments to schedule 1, unless either party gives notice to the other by 1 August prior to the end of the then current term that it does not intend to renew.” So, technically, the Agreement would continue since no notice was given by August 1, 2012. Only the new payment schedule need be amended. It is best, however, to have the new contract since it provides a savings on the inflation rate and add the termination clause (5.3).

b. Admin Team Invited to January Library Senate Meeting

An invitation to the entire library administrative team to attend the January 15, 2013 Library Faculty Senate meeting has been extended with the focus of the meeting specifically about budget. Faculty Senate expresses concerns and uncertainty as to what is going on with budget including a large deficit

Opened floor for comments

- **Comment from Carlson** – contract terms good to December 31, 2012. So terms may not carry into January 2013 – STO may prevent contact getting signed by 12/31/12
• **Question asking for clarification on Geary’s response** – is this accurate that contact continues?
  
  o Carlson – not so for this contact – BETWEEN contracts so old contract may not apply – Carlson’s past experiences would say that it does not continue – Geary says that it does – not sure – will need to find out in January
  
  o Carlson says that Kris Anderson reports that we will NOT lose access to SD if contact expires and no new contact yet, but we might not get same terms – need to renegotiate including system-wide access – companies are holding fast to deadlines for offers overall – lots of uncertainty

• **Comment** – so we don’t know if Manoa admin is giving additional money to support SD outside of current budget if not added to base budget; what questions about general budget should we frame for January – faculty positions – impact of Sen Akaka and Sen Inouye’s papers coming here

• **Comment** – do we wait to see if Manoa Admin pays for SD more? If need to renegotiate – Do we assure Manoa’s access first? Elsevier – how best to select and pay? Part of journal subscriptions for 5 years? For SD/Freedom Collection until money runs out?

• **Comment** – personnel budget was not originally addressed by Gregg with Elsevier portion of budget – has he begun to look at this now? Could he address personnel now? Could the overall budgeting method that John Awakuni used (based budget on past costs)? Departments have been asked for planning costs --- how does this work with the budget process? Guiding principle?

• **Question** -- how to decide what is covered by what part of budget

• **Response/comment from Nakano** -- questions coming up now are good to bring up at the January 2013 meeting; keep in mind the admin team is new – no experience – working way through this as well --- need to have frank conversations together – Joan brought up good point – what’s our guiding principle? What to cut, what absolutely not cut? Trying to see what the departments and divisions need.

• **Question** -- Nakano asked if no involvement with budget during work with Paula Mochida
o **Response from Nakano** – Budget was reviewed by Alan Grosenheider and Paula Mochida with John Awakuni; did not include Geary and Nakano; we’re all in this together – all trying to work it out

c. **Budget/Fiscal Questions for January 2013 Senate Meeting (Dawrs)**

Senate was asked what questions regarding the Library’s budget could be brought forth in the spirit of shared governance for the January 15, 2013 meeting from Senate?

- **Comment** – Suggest use starting point of previous budgets – but come up with some questions previous to Jan. 15th meeting – want clarification for information that is not consistent from statement to statement – e.g., personnel separate than then signing contact – some confusion

- **Question** – what would be helpful to ask for bring to table?

  o **Suggestion from Nakano** – look at operational costs; plans, where do you stand as a department? How to prioritize – Gregg is looking for prioritization to come upwards from departments and divisions – list come upwards from departments to division chairs – so prioritize to then send up to Admin.

  ◾ **Response from Senate member** -- impression that Gregg leaving up to next UL – everything – including 4 librarian positions—in Cataloging – however, for Cataloging as a department, the answer is that the replacement of positions are first priority

  o **Follow up question from Nakano**– of all the things your department and division needs – what is the most important things that you need?

    ◾ **Question** – Review from own department self interest vs. library as a whole? – need larger projected budget – overall --- need proposed budget – are we being asked to give input on proposed budget? Narrow or library overall? – Would like an Explanation of categories

    ◾ **Comment** – Geary has said several times that it is the UL’s purview to decide what the priority is (and the new UL especially) – purview of UL to decide priority with input from faculty

    ◾ **Response from Nakano**-- says has different view with side conversations with Gregg
Comment—LSEB chair has confusion with distinguishing consultative vs. informational meetings and how to proceed with information/questions brought forth from admin
  ▪ Suggestion -- Clarify with Geary about what kind of feedback/guidance is wanted from Senate

Question for January Meeting -- What budget streams with what type of restrictions does the Library budget contain -- what monies are available and is there flexibility to move monies around or allocate for various purposes? Help to understand parameters of overall budget

Question about original conversation with Chancellor and Vice Chancellor about “not renewing Elsevier is NOT an option” – does that mean Geary was ordered to renew? Or was it a statement that UHM Admin will not let the library go without the funding to get to renewed? Has understanding has changed/morphed over time
  ▪ Carlson reports that at Dec. 4th meeting, Elsevier contract was a directive to renew from Manoa Admin.
  ▪ Comment – if we do not get $1.5 million added, then our budget would be decimated? – no monies for other things e.g., student assistants, etc.

Comment – everyone is new Eric, Gregg, etc. Eric is working with the same planning budget with line items that John Awakuni used. He has that precise budget and hasn’t presented it in a larger forum – it has been suggested that it could be presented to larger forum. Materials budget has been given full allocation on the planning budget – but there has not been monies allocated to selectors and gathering plan
  ▪ Question – does this planning budget show personnel?
  ▪ Carlson – yes it does; original plan did not include personnel – problematic; now seems that it does include personnel --- Geary says will need to provide more information to Vice Chancellor

Comment -- Only 6 months left to spend – it takes a while – are there plans/ awareness by admin urgent need to begin to spend current allocation?
  ▪ Carlson agrees– disbursement takes 3-4 months to cut a check

- Dawrs calls for Senate members to think of questions and write down and send to LSEB Chair to compile all the questions – Stu and LSEB to categorize and organize, forward to admin before Jan. 15th.
- **Action Item**: LSEB to gather, compile, organize, send questions to send to Admin with 1 week lead time to January Faculty Senate meeting date; Faculty senate members should send their questions to Dawrs by January 5th

- **Suggestion** – might Senate might want to put together potential questions for UL candidates – are UL interviews before Jan. 15th?
  - Response from UL search committee member (J. Sung) – each library department group can come up with questions to query UL candidates? How we present our problems is important.
  - Faculty senate will have separate meeting with UL candidates – so Dawrs will also compile questions for this
  - **Action Item** – LSEB to compile questions for UL candidates

Meeting adjourned at 11:54 a.m.

**Next Meeting: January 15, 2013**