UHM Library Faculty Senate Meeting  
January 15, 2013

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:
Amy Carlson, Jim Cartwright, Naomi Chow (recording), Ross Christenson, Stu Dawrs, Carolyn Dennison, Janet Drombowski, David Flynn, Monica Ghosh, Eileen Herring, Eleanor Kleiber, Jodie Mattos, Dore Minatodoni, Sharon Ouchi, Asako Shiba, Gwen Sinclair, Hisami Springer, Jan Sung, Nackil Sung, Mabel Suzuki

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:
None

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

I. Approval of minutes for December 18, 2012 Library Faculty Senate meeting
- Small changes requested by Dawrs – minutes will be changed
- Approved as amended

II. Reports

a. Chair (Dawrs)
   i. Budget update -- Deferred till later in meeting
   ii. Library Leadership Team (LLT)
      1. Library Administration will be shortly issuing a call for a committee to work on a new library travel policy (composition to include 1 administration, 1 faculty, 1 apt/civil service; up to 5 people total); Current policy does not cover travel for those on sabbatical
      2. Please consider volunteering
   iii. Library Council and System-Wide E-Resources
      1. Kris Anderson will coordinate discussions; no movement at the moment

b. Vice-Chair (J. Sung) -- No report

c. Secretary (Chow) – No report

d. Elections Chair (Saeki) – No Report

e. Library Personnel Committee (LPC) (Flynn)
   i. New LPC Members: Ted Kwok, David Flynn (Chair), Yati Paseng; Continuing members: Sharon Ouchi, Beth Tillinghanst – otherwise, no report

f. Manoa Faculty Senate (MFS) (Minatodani, Sinclair) – no report

g. University of Hawaii Professional Assembly (UHPA) – (Ghosh for Rutter)
   i. Currently, Sara Rutter is only official UHPA representative for Library; Monica Ghosh begins term at the end of January; Kris Hanselman is still reviewing “working at home issue for faculty”
III. Old Business

a. **Working Group on Strategic Planning Update** (Sinclair)
   i. No update – meeting tomorrow, last met in December

b. **Library Administration response to compiled budget questions.**
   i. As decided at the December 18th Senate meeting, LSEB Chair Dawrs called for email questions from Senate membership; Dawrs and LSEB received, compiled, and sent to Geary
   ii. Dawrs re-extended invitation to Geary to meet with Senate, but Geary is meeting with VCAA Dasenbrock at the moment; and Geary would like to answer the questions item by item, need input from Library Fiscal Officer Eric Fujiwara, and needs time to finish
   iii. Dawrs will circulate answers by email, invite to Geary/Library Administration to the February Library Senate meeting; will encourage Library wide forum/update by Library Administration
   iv. Geary announced at the January 7 LLT meeting that the Science Direct/Elsevier contract went to procurement, but was sent without Form 95 which guarantees payment. Until signed off form 95 is received, Procurement will not process further; Geary asserted at the Jan. 7 LLT meeting that he will not send through Form 95 until the library has a written promise of funding to cover it from UH Administration; Geary meeting with Vice Chancellor today; Large item in budget so rest of budget in standstill until outcome
   v. Outreach Funds – $700,000 received but need to have Library’s budgetary ceiling raised for supplementary funds ($50,000) as per legal requirements —need to have President sign off – paperwork at President’s office currently

• Comment – LSEB comment about having Elsevier contract up in the air. If the Library has a decision path – then perhaps could move forward with budget (if Geary committed to either Elsevier with only with additional funds, or no Elsevier); Concern was expressed about limited amount of time left to expend for this fiscal year; The submitted questions are not that relevant for the current situation – take some of questions off the table? Instead – what information do we really want to know/information to address current budget situation; what kinds of questions for this fiscal year – how to spend the money before the fiscal year is done, how to address the $300,000 deficit. Will we be able to expend our discretionary funds with the time left in the fiscal year?
• Dawrs did field a question from Geary as well about what to focus upon – need to consult with Senate; Need to figure out what we need to do for the next 6 months. Suggestion of update of what we’re doing for the next 6 months (also was suggested at LLT meeting held yesterday).
• Comment – there have been mixed signals about budget; e.g., mandate to renew Science Direct “big deal” for serials; but if we
don’t get the money, can we really say no? Perhaps this confusion can be resolved with today’s meeting with VC

- Comment – we should be planning to next year NOW. Money this year will probably not be able to be SPENT on time, not even for encumbering; the expenditures will be pushed till next fiscal year – this year is very different; there may be no moneys for pre-payment leftover if budget deficit is true. Need to plan for the next two years, really; Question – who is responsible for pre-planning for next two years? CDMC, LLT, Fiscal – mixed – need to be planning for next year now.

- Comment – How long is Geary’s appointment – through end of June. Hopefully will be willing/able to planning on future budget? Need to push for continued planning for the near future (1-2 years)

- Dawrs – Geary will be contacting Dawrs about outcome of the meeting with the Vice Chancellor. Dawrs will share this information with Senate membership

- Comment – concern about holding pattern with budget. We may lose money if not spent (will funds be swept)? Or overspend because have deficit. Is there anything productive that can come out of the Senate body to help get things moving? Are we moving past this agenda item and instead in a holding pattern?

- Comment – can we get someone outside of the library to help us with the logjam? Can we as the Senate reach out to someone to move forward? Recommend that we think about an option to get someone outside of the library to help us work through this

- Comment – not sure the problem is within the Library, but perhaps that the chancellor and the president may be not aware of seriousness of situation – moneys, expenditure ceiling

- Comment – then whom should we ask for help? Response – we would need to go to the VCAA office – response – wait until after today’s meeting—could have immediate problem resolved today (Science Direct/Elsevier) – University Library and upper UH Administration coming to an understanding to break the logjam—suggest waiting until after the meeting

- Comment – people do want information – hope for information about meeting today comes forth and shared; Comment – if Dawrs could let Geary know that there is anxiety with faculty and selectors will expenditures and planning for spending this year’s budget

- Dawrs – these issues have been raised in the LLT meetings; Geary does appear to be aware of it; Dawrs has also spoken with Geary about perceived communication problems within library admin.

- Comment – Suggestion – where would we cut if we need to cut to make up for the shortfall? Would individual departments offer what there could be cut, would this help with stalemate?
c. Compiled Questions for Senate Meeting with UL Candidates

- After the December 18, 2012 Senate meeting, an email call for questions was sent to the membership; then a poll was conducted to rank questions
- Ranked order list sent out by Dawrs (see attachment)
- LSEB discussion thought to target a maximum of 6 questions in ranked order
- Dawrs wants to go over the process and make sure it’s okay
  - Questions 3-9 from poll list
  - Brief introduction to what Library senate is – consultative body for faculty
  - Dawrs to ask questions (Jan to do Feb questions)
- Comment – questions are quite complex – may not get through all the questions. Multipart questions may be hard for someone to receive verbally – can the candidate be given the questions on paper for own review?
- Comment – can the candidates be given the questions in advance? Probably not possible to send due to timeframe – Senate agreed to hand each candidate the questions (1-6); Discussion about how many questions to ask on paper per candidate; Discussion about whether to paraphrase? Discussion about whether to give question only verbally – to see what the person can get out and comprehend and address (interview process). Suggest getting vote on whether to offer questions on paper (not all may agree).
- Comment – what is the purpose of the meeting? A little less formal and more comfortable?
- Comment – email query was to make sure that we have question on hand – now seems to be more formal – was it originally supposed to be an open forum? Length of time?
- Comment – we should decide whether the same process should be a process that is uniformly applied to all three candidates or more open forum. Meet and greet or interview opportunity?
- Response from search committee member --- not considered interview situation; feel strongly that we should offer time to let candidate to ask questions to us. Communication with person rather than pure grilling.
- Question—does Library Senate provide feedback as a body?
- Feedback will be given directly to VC Dasenbrock.
- Michelle Tom – every meeting with every group – will be given form to give feedback to Dasenbrock – comment – can this be publically shared?
- J. Sung will check on question about feedback
- Dawrs – do we want to have questions? Formal? Informal? Written? Oral?
- Discussion about how to proceed
• Start with first question, LSEB chair to moderate, see how things flow—have a discussion, then go onto next question if needed; at 30 minutes then open up to questions to candidate
• Move to do what Dawrs outlined – The library faculty senate chair or vice chair will moderate the session, introduce the library senate, introduce the questions as outlined in the survey, after 30 minutes turn floor over to the candidate for her/his questions. Seconded; discussion – no? By a show of hands – motion was approved
• Move the question on shared governance further up on the priority to the third question on the list; seconded; comment – shared governance is one that only senate can ask this question – so important to move up; By show of hands, motion was approved – carries.
• Move that we take what is now the third question on shared governance and make it the second question on the list/ seconded; discussion? Why move up? To make sure it is covered in the amount of time that is given for the forum – bump up the unique question. Comment – there is a big difference between 10% and 18% in faculty senate poll of questions. Comment – perhaps need to move higher up to make sure addressed – By show of hands, motion was approved.

IV. Move to end senate meeting – seconded and approved
   a. Meeting adjourned 11:54 a.m.

V. Next meeting: February 19, 2013, 10:30 a.m. Hamilton Library Yap Room