Library Faculty Senate  
19 March 2013  
Hamilton Library, Yap Room

Voting Members: Michael Chopey, Naomi Chow (recording), Ross Christensen, Carolyn Dennison, Janet Dombrowski, David Flynn, Monica Ghosh, Susan Johnson, Eleanor Kleiber, Dore Minatodani, Patricia Polanksy, Sara Rutter, Asako Shiba, Gwen Sinclair, Jan Sung, Mabel Suzuki

Non-Voting Members: n/a

Meeting convened with quorum at 10:40 a.m.

I. Approval of minutes for February 19, 2013 Library Faculty Senate meeting  
   Approved

II. Reports
   a. Chair (Vice Chair Sung sitting in for Dawrs)
      Chow reported on Dawrs’ March 12, 2013 LSEB LLT report on the Inouye Papers project proposal that included 2 positions at APT level, and the possibility that the Sinclair Student Success Center (SCC) might change reporting to the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education (Ron Cambra), who falls under the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Reed Dasenbrock).

      Update: Sinclair reports that in speaking with IUL Geary, the 2 Inouye paper position responsibilities would require librarian-level rather than APT classification. Also, the SCC discussions are just beginning stages.

   b. Vice-Chair (Sung) -- no report

   c. Secretary (Chow) -- no report

   d. Library Personnel Committee (LPC) (Flynn)
      LPC met on February 1, 2013. LPC will continue to work on the LPC policies and procedures document in order to be aligned with UHM Campus agreements. LPC is seeking clarification from UHPA regarding some points of proposed changes. It will bring the proposed revised document to Senate for approval

   e. Elections (Saeki) (absent)

   f. Manoa Faculty Senate (MFS) (Sinclair)
      David Flynn is the newly elected Library Senator to the Manoa Faculty Senate.

      Next MFS meeting will be on 3/20/13; agenda topics include supporting diversity (all types), encouraging in all manifestations; designations for emeritus faculty status – how to evaluate and apply for; committee on professional matters trying to schedule meeting with the Chancellor and SEC clarifying faculty classification
g. **University of Hawaii Professional Assembly (UHPA)** (Ghosh)
Send comments about NEA vote to Rutter or Ghosh or president of UHPA.

Comment – What are Ghosh’s thoughts on NEA decision? Response from Ghosh—she attended the UHPA information sessions that discussed the pros and cons on NEA affiliation. The argument for disaffiliation expressed that the insurance and other membership benefits are not worthwhile considering the monetary costs of affiliation; NEA seems to emphasize more K-12, not so much higher education; the argument for continued affiliation said that the association as well as the benefits are worthwhile, and that discontinuation would create a problem of continuity of for those UHPA members with NEA insurance and benefits.

Comment – What about professional benefits for work? NEA does lobby for higher education.

III. **Old Business**

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

The working group has finished drafting the vision, mission, values, and is working on plan to bring the drafts to various constituencies for feedback. The group is also requesting an extension beyond the original deadline of May 2013.

Comment – Does senate need to vote on an extension? Response – a deadline was on the original motion

Suggestion – Request official extension closer to deadline to have a better estimate of the amount of time still required

IV. **New Business**

a. Update on Travel Policy revisions. (Chow read statement, passed out draft criteria)

- **Statement**
  “We are in the midst of working through the policies and procedures. We are recommending that the three units travel be separated as they are governed by different contractual rules. We are creating separate documents of policies and procedures for each group.

**Policy:** We will be recommending amended criteria based on "Criteria for Travel Support for Librarians and Staff" from 2005. The faculty librarian traveler would submit a self-assigned criteria level applying the definitions as outlined in the criteria document.

**Procedures:** The travel requests would be submitted via the normal, currently established routes of librarian to department chair to division head. The proposed process could include a review by Faculty Senate, such as by a subcommittee, to review the criteria level for funding level request being applied (not the appropriateness of the travel -- that
would be negotiated by the traveler and the department chair and division head). The requests are then forwarded to Library Admin. Then, Library Admin reviews the request, assigns funds as delineated by the criteria, and posts by intranet, an ongoing list of travel. Separately, as part of transparency, the intranet travel list would include all library travel including Administrative or Administrative-related travel, and APT/Civil Service.

**Travel Task Force Question:** Would Library Senate like to be involved in the process, as the proposed review by sub-committee, in the spirit of checks and balances in shared governance?"

- Draft Criteria (see Addendum to minutes)

**Discussion** -- Does senate need review of travel requests? Or does intranet posting make process transparent enough? Applying criteria and intranet. Is posting on the intranet possible? (legally?) Find out if University makes this type of information publically available for other departments outside of the Library.

**Comment** – No need to additional joint review process

**Comment** -- Polansky – Taskforce also recommends that travel policy be reviewed annually.

**Comment** – Question about how different bargaining units are treated – what is “required” training? How is it defined? Should there be separate criteria and policies and procedures? At what level of administration does the “required” get approved? Concerns expressed about travel funding levels for APT positions, and how this level may be changing as more APT positions are established in the Library. Chow will get bring these concerns, comments and questions to the taskforce. The Travel Taskforce will report back to Senate

b. **University librarian transition:** What are the senate's top concerns and how should they be communicated to the incoming UL?

**Suggestion** – funding for professional travel? More support?

**Suggestion** -- open and vacant positions for all library staff (faculty, staff, administrative); retirement planning, issue of prioritization of positions

**Emailed suggestion** – correcting salary inequities of current librarians

**Suggestion** – discussion of collections – clear vision on how UL pictures collections moving forward – aligned with mission of university?

**Suggestion** – examining descriptions and responsibilities of vacant AUL positions – does it meet what we need as an organization?

**Comment** – Should the senate first decide whether it wants to share information with the UL? If so, should we focus upon shared governance,
and senate-focused issues, how Senate ideally plays an advisory role with Library Administration

**Motion made** – “Move that Library Senate come up with some things that are of concern related to itself to present to the University Librarian” Seconded, opened floor for discussion

**Suggestion** – Perhaps look at the process in terms of timing, for example, invite the new UL to a Senate meeting and communicate some issues, and see what the reaction is, however, after allowing UL to settle in a bit

**Suggestion** – Present a prioritized united front. Do not necessarily need to get on the UL’s calendar. Perhaps prioritized list might not be possible? Hard to get agreement.

**Suggestion** – Welcome basket, in person welcome, and offer support

**Comment** – Support the idea of what things we think we need (e.g., top five things that we need)

**Suggestion** – Suggest first Senate meeting as meet and greet and welcome, “let’s begin a dialogue” – and focus upon role as a Senate body

**Suggestion** – come up with concerns, however, first thing is to make sure that UL understand shared governance in light of UHM system – first thing to discuss relationship between Senate and UL – basically consultative, not adversarial. How does consultation get worked into communication processes?

**Suggestion** – invite UL to first meeting to find out what we are all about; shared governance and consultation

**Comment**: Motion on table does not preclude a friendly invitation to UL. Want to come up with list of concerns to present at some time

**Comment**: Perhaps create broad list of concerns (not as demands) but as discussion points.

**Vote on motion; Motion passed.**

**Action Item**: LSEB to work on pulling together concerns and information

Meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Next Meeting: April 16, 2013 10:30 a.m. Hamilton Library, Yap Room
Criteria for Travel Support for Librarians and Staff [DRAFT]

I. All support is predicated on availability of funds and the ability to authorize travel support (absence of restrictions from University or state levels).

II. Travel support and official leave will be granted based on a combination of the following factors, subject to the availability of funds:
   A. Staff development of contract renewal librarians.
      Example: training/development support for newly recruited librarians and other staff as determined by University Librarian during hiring process. This could include registration, per diem and airfare for conference or workshop attendance. Priority will be given to travel requests from new librarians in all appointment categories. Librarians in their first five years of employment with UHM are “new” librarians.
   B. Training for specific positions
      Example: Hardware and software training for Systems Staff. Required training (see BU03/04/08 contracts) would support registration, airfare, and per diem. Recommended or requested training will be supported at varying levels depending on need/justification.
   C. Acquisitions trips required for specific collection development activities
   D. Conference/Workshop Participation
      1. Attendance=official leave for period of conference, registration support for specialized preconference, if attended.
      2. Committee member=official leave for period of conference, and per diem for conference days.
      3. Panel Discussant=official leave for period of conference, and per diem for conference days.
      4. Poster session presenter=official leave for period of conference, and per diem for conference days.
      5. Committee Chair, Paper Presenter, and Panel Organizer=official leave for period of conference, per diem for days of conference and airfare, if funding available.
      6. Significant professional activity such as elected position on State, Regional, National level=support determined by University Librarian.

III. Grant Related Travel
   A. Travel support directly specified and funded in the grant itself is approved.
   B. For non-grant funded, but grant related travel, support is provided as follows pending availability of funds:
      1. Conference attendance=official leave and per diem for days of conference.
      2. Committee work=official leave, per diem and airfare.
      3. Further support at discretion of University Librarian as justified.

IV. Other travel. Airfare or other support for other purposes is granted at discretion of University Librarian.