Library Faculty Senate  
July 16, 2013  
Hamilton Library Yap Room

Voting Members: Jan Sung, Hisami Springer, Kim Nakano, Naomi Chow (recording), Sharon Ouchi, Asako Shiba, Gwen Sinclair, David Flynn, Susan Johnson, Nackil Sung, Stu Dawrs, Jude Yang, Carolyn Dennison, Dore Minatodani, Michael Chopey, Amy Carlson, Rohayati Paseng, Ross Christensen, Dainan Skeem, Nancy Sack

Non-Voting Members: n/a

Meeting Convened at 10:32 a.m.

I. Approval of minutes for June 18, 2013 Library Faculty Senate Meeting. Minutes approved.

II. Reports:

   a. Chair [Dawrs]  
      Library Leadership Team (LLT)  
      i. Geary reported adopting library travel policy as proposed by the travel taskforce; exception – names will not be posted on the intranet with approved travel allocations; Geary was going to send memo to Library staff via library listserv; Dawrs to follow-up regarding memo; Geary will leave final decision regarding travel policy with new UL Herold.
      ii. Krystyna Aune, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, acting UL while VCAA Reed Dasenbrock is away, held an LLT meeting the week of July 8, 2013 and will hold a meeting the week of July 22, 2013. She will meet with Library Department Chairs (LDC) as well.

   b. Vice-Chair [J. Sung] – No report.

   c. Secretary [Chow] – No report.

   d. LPC [Flynn] – No report.

   e. Elections [Dennison]  
      i. Eleanor Kleiber has been elected Library Faculty Senate Secretary for 2013-2014 year. 36 faculty members voted (80% of eligible voters).


   g. UHPA [Rutter/absent] – No report.
III. Old Business:

a. Update on Working Group on Strategic Planning [Sinclair]
   - Working group did a poll on the proposed vision, mission, and value statements for the Library. The group is currently evaluating the results, figuring out how to integrate into the proposed statements, and will next address goals and objectives. The group will request to meet with UL Herold to open discussions on its work.

b. Transition to incoming UL (Attachments for proposed documents to share with UL) [Dawrs]
   - UL Herold will meet at the regularly scheduled August meetings for Library Senate; LSEB on August 13, 2013, and Senate on August 20, 2013.
   - LSEB via Dawrs created in executive summary of the concerns of the Senate to present to UL Herold. The summary, sent via email, July 12, 2013 (see attached), pulls out broader themes and concerns. LSEB will provide the summary and document to UL Herold at its August meeting including background of Senate as a consultative body, aiming to open discussion that will continue to the Senate August meeting with Herold.

IV. New Business:  
None introduced.

V. Meeting Adjourned at 10:42 a.m.

Next Meeting: August 20, 2013, Hamilton Library, Yap Room

Attachments:
UHM Library Senate Survey, June 8-14, 2013, Executive Summary (below)
UHM Library Senate Survey, June 8-14, 2013, Results (pdf attachment)
UHM Library Senate Survey, June 8-14

Executive Summary

In preparation for the arrival of UL Irene Herold, the Library Senate at its April 16 meeting voted to conduct a poll to identify which issues are of priority for the Senate. Through discussion at that meeting it was determined that the Senate would like to communicate the following with Irene:

- The general concerns of the library faculty senate, i.e. to give background on how the Library Senate functions, and to explain the Library Senate's role in the consultative process.
- The general scenarios in which consultation with the Library Senate would be appropriate.
- The current concerns of highest priority to the Library Senate.

The survey was open June 8-14. Eleven people provided responses to the questions. General themes that emerged included:

- the need for a clearer understanding between the Senate and Library administration as to what shared governance is and how it applies in the library setting;
- the need for more timely and complete consultation with the Senate, so that it can more effectively fulfill its mission as an advisory body;
- the need for a clearer understanding as to the delineation between administrative duties and Senate duties.

Specific issues of concern include:

- The recent abolishing of all vacant faculty positions and how the library plans to prioritize and apply for their re-establishment.
- The need for clearer communication on budgetary planning.
- An overall need to establish clearer priorities.
Introduction

In preparation for the arrival of UL Irene Herold, the Library Senate at its April 16 meeting voted to conduct a poll to identify which issues are of priority for the Senate. Through discussion at that meeting it was determined that the Senate would like to communicate the following with Irene:

- The general concerns of the library faculty senate, i.e. to give background on how the Library Senate functions, and to explain the Library Senate's role in the consultative process.

- The general scenarios in which consultation with the Library Senate would be appropriate.

- The current concerns of highest priority to the Library Senate.

The survey was open June 8-14. Eleven people provided responses to the questions.
Questions

Question 1

The Preamble of the Library Senate's Constitution frames the role of library faculty and the Library Faculty Senate as follows (emphasis ours):

Board of Regents Policies, Section 1-10, states, "With unanimous agreement and understanding that the faculty of an educational institution contributes to its quality, spirit, aspiration, and effectiveness, the Board of Regents issues this policy to provide for organized faculty involvement in the development and maintenance of institutional academic policies and to emphasize the maintenance of collegial approach to academic decision making and policy development."

The Library Senate and its Library Senate Executive Board, standing committees, and various ad hoc committees function as forums for professional discourse and consideration of such policies which have Library-wide concern and relate directly to the intellectual life and educational process of the University.

For the purpose of providing background on how the Library Senate functions, and explaining the Library Senate's role in the consultative process, is there anything further you think needs to be conveyed to Irene Herold?

Question 2

Under what scenarios would the Library Senate want to be consulted and to have input on decisions?

Question 3

In your opinion, what are the current concerns of highest priority to the Library, within the purview of the Library Senate?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION 1</th>
<th>QUESTION 2</th>
<th>QUESTION 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>any issues that affect the functioning of the library</td>
<td>Setting funding priorities Creating policies and procedures for library-wide activities such as filling vacant positions and providing opportunities for professional development</td>
<td>At least a decade (and one could argue longer) of steady abandonment by UH Admin which has resulted in decreased budgets and loss of staff and faculty positions that have not been replaced. Also, during this time there were two interim University Librarians. The library is adrift. Irene's primary task will be to work with UH Admin to sell our needs and get the library back to a central crucial entity for the campus...and system...that will add to UHs success. And, what she will do within the library might take years to make progress on instilling some kind of morale, and address the daily myriad of problems that will occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perhaps the meeting schedule to show that this is an active body.</td>
<td>any decisions that will impact the use of library resources (people, materials, rooms) by students and faculty</td>
<td>I think the library senate has had to concern itself with operational issues--issues that would be better handled within the library organizational structure--because the &quot;chain of command&quot; has been dysfunctional for so long. If all the department heads, division heads, and administrators made well-informed decisions based on discussions with their knowledgeable constituents, then the senate could perform its advisory role more successfully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Senate needs to be consulted regarding prioritization of budget matters and allocations of positions.</td>
<td>The Library must learn to live within its means. Either its budget must be increased, or we must make difficult decisions about which programs and services can no longer be sustained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget Staffing Space utilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION 1</td>
<td>QUESTION 2</td>
<td>QUESTION 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just would like to emphasize that Library Senate would like to serve in the role of providing feedback and consultation in the pre-planning process (information gathering phase) more so than reactionary. Our role would ideally contribute to a positive decision making process.</td>
<td>Creation of the Library's Strategic Plan and the setting of annual goals/objectives; Major changes in personnel duties and structure (e.g., re-organization, large changes in position assignment/duties/ responsibilities such as from one department to another, or creation of new positions); Major budget re-allocations (e.g., redistribution of collection monies among types of funds or subject areas; redistribution of monies among departments)</td>
<td>Establishing a stable, functional administrative team; Figuring out what direction the Library needs to take to most optimally address the needs of its University patrons within its limited resources of both personnel and budget; Reviewing funding and budget allocation as well as invest in information technology/systems to best address the patrons' information needs in a timely, efficient, effective manner; Reviewing and assessing the Library's staffing levels and structure with regard to patron needs and strategic planning/goals and objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We might consider adding more of the BOR policy to quote where they will award charters for the organization of faculty senates and then show the approval of the Library Faculty as an approved BOR faculty body.</td>
<td>Reorganization of the library structure; Re-envisioning the purpose of the library as reflected in current and future mission statement, procedural plans, etc.; Redirecting library collecting efforts and focuses; these are three crucial areas for faculty to be involved.</td>
<td>I think the nature of our collecting policies, the nature of what we are to become for the campus, our vision(s) of the library of ten years from now, twenty years from now, is the primary area in which Library Senate should become a voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This preamble states the role of the Library Senate well.</td>
<td>Any major changes in services or structures of the organization e.g. reorganization, selecting major vendor such as Ex Libris etc</td>
<td>Staffing issue: Re-establishment of abolished positions (both faculty and staff positions) Examination of structure of the library in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Library Senate is the body that provides consultation. The LSEB administers Senate affairs, but should not be regarded as the primary consultative body. Put another way, the LSEB doesn't speak for the Senate, rather the Senate speaks through the LSEB.</td>
<td>Establishing policies that affect faculty tenure and promotion. Establishing the core library priorities. Engaging in reorganizations that alter reporting lines and roles of units in the library.</td>
<td>Establishing the core library priorities. Establishing a consultative process for the hiring of permanent AULs. Establishing a process to align new faculty and staff hires with library priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation is often done after a considerable amount of work has been done by library administration. It often seems that by the time consultation is done, administration is deeply invested in the plan on the table and is not willing to incorporate whatever changes might be suggested during consultation, and general disappointment and even anger often results. This has led to a fairly cynical view of the process, on the part of both administration and the library faculty. Early consultation, then, seems the best way to go.</td>
<td>The emphasized text in the first question is a good guideline, and I would interpret that liberally. At the same time, I would like library administration to be administrators.</td>
<td>1. Establishing priorities for “both” growth and maintenance. I would emphasize maintenance. It seems like library administration in the past few years has focused on new programs and has completely abandoned or at least stopped paying attention to existing services and programs, including the library’s core services and programs. 2. In setting priorities, be deliberate about a) what is <em>not</em> being prioritized and b) what is being decommissioned. 3. Addressing morale. I think my points 1 and 2 would go a long way toward this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>