Library Senate Executive Board

DRAFT Meeting Minutes
2005-02-10

Present:
LSEB: Barnard, Cartwright, Christensen (chair), Flynn, Horie, Kwok (recorder),
Rutter, Sack, Mattos (for Schultz)

Excused:
Chopey

Convened:
The meeting was called to order by Christensen (chair) at 3:30 pm in Sinclair
Library Room 110.

1. Diane Perushek's (University Librarian) response to
Senate concerns about how the University Librarian
administers the library.

Christensen thanked the University Librarian for agreeing to meet. He read a prepared
statement to introduce the purpose of the meeting and the members of the Executive
Board.

Welcome, Diane, and thank you for agreeing to attend this meeting of the LSEB. As Chair
and to facilitate the meeting, I will start by providing some context.

This is a formal meeting of the LSEB, acting on behalf of the Senate, and minutes will be
taken. The LSEB consists of its elected officers, the chair, vice chair, and secretary (myself,
David Flynn, and Ted Kwok, respectively); the chairpersons of the standing committees to
which they were elected or appointed (Nancy Sack of the Elections Committee, Elaine Shultz
of the Library Personnel Committee, and Yati Barnard of the Staff Development Committee);
the two elected representatives to the UHM Faculty Senate (Michael Chopey and Sara
Rutter), and the UHPA representative, an ex-officio Board member (Jim Cartwright). Although
not a member of the Board, Ruth Horie is present in her capacity as the Senate
parliamentarian.

This meeting is the outcome of a Senate action, whereby the majority of a quorum of the
Senate, in its meeting of January 12, 2005, voted to present you with a statement of its
concerns and to request that the LSEB meet with you. This Senate action was the result of
several months of deliberation beginning at its August 10, 2004, meeting.

The purpose of this meeting is to obtain your response to the LSEB's memo of January 19,
2005 and to convey it back to the Senate.

If there are no questions, I will begin now by requesting your response to the cover memo
and the Senate's Statement of Concerns.

Perushek thanked the committee for the list of concerns and expressed, however, that
it is not something one would want to receive in one’s career. She emphasized the
concerns deserve serious consideration. Some of the concerns are difficult to respond
to without having examples; however, she acknowledged the challenge of maintaining
confidentiality with sensitive issues. She indicated that she would like to talk about the
next steps in the process. Perushek also shared that she had originally ask Kelly
Aune, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, to come to the meeting.
However, in the end, she asked him not to come after discussing it with Christensen.
Perushek indicated four areas from the Senate’s Summary Statement that could use consultation and improvement, and indicated that some of these fall into multiple categories in the Senate’s list.

1. **Communication**: She said this is an eternal problem of all organizations; however, she is remiss if she has not communicated important issues. She added that it is very difficult to please all, and perhaps a standing committee is needed or the University Librarian's Council needs to be brought in to improve communication.

2. **Style**: She said "style" falls into many categories (management, presentation, human resources, etc.) and that this is an area that is hard to change, but is willing to and may need nudging.

3. **Attention to faculty concerns**: She expressed that lack of attention to what faculty are concerned with and that faculty feel ignored is not good. She indicated that when she is lax in these areas, she needs to know.

4. **Interaction with faculty**: She acknowledged Senate concerns that her interaction with faculty are too infrequent and with not enough substance. She expressed that faculty need to feel valued and listened to.

Christensen acknowledged that Perushek would need more information and additional discussion. He asked, "What would you envision as the next steps?"

Perushek indicated that she prepared a response to the list of concerns, but that it might not be what we want. Regarding next steps, she suggested general meetings of the full Senate as well as special interest groups to counsel her on what they would like to see.

Perushek indicated what she would like to get out of this.

- More harmony
- Have people accomplish what they want to accomplish.
- Some give and take.
- Recommendations, because it would be unproductive to go in the wrong direction.
- Happy to address issues and work with everyone, although totally anonymous recommendations are hard to act on.

Christensen indicated that there are specific issues underlying the list of concerns. He summarized the process of gathering comments:

1. Requested comments from the full Senate
2. Comments were received by Chair of LSEB only
3. LSEB Chair redacted names
4. Shared comments with LSEB
5. LSEB composed list of issues
6. Senate reviewed and approved cover letter and list of issues

Perushek indicated that she appreciates how everything was handled and how much work it took to distill all the input down to the list of concerns.

Perushek continued by commenting on selected aspects of the list of concerns:

- **Fiscal management**: Perhaps we would like to revive an ad hoc budget committee that existed before she became University Librarian. It may be good
way to disseminate information.

- **Leadership:** Regarding the concern that she has not articulated strategies for addressing long-standing problems (such as inadequate library budget, insufficient human resources, and a fragmented library organization), she is not sure if this is a criticism of the "process," such as the town meetings held or the reliance on the department head structure for communicating information. She noted that she has dealt with the strategic and tactical plans for two years.

- **Morale:**
  - **Lack of trust in the University Librarian:** She said it is important to build mutual trust.
  - **Faculty demoralization:** She emphasized that this is an issue that needs redress, if things are not too far gone already.
  - **Faculty discouragement:** She said that faculty need to feel the University Librarian takes seriously the challenges faculty face.
  - **Perceptions that the UL does not understand, value, or enable faculty:** She expressed that everyone should feel valued and to know that the University Librarian understands.
  - **UL is difficult to work with:** Perushek indicated that she is very detail oriented. She expressed that she would be happy to give thought to this issue.

In general, Perushek commented that examples were needed. She mentioned, for example, the Senate's concern [under Organizational Management] that the University Librarian "attempts to control librarian liaison activities." She also offered that we might want something different and to give her an opportunity to change. Perushek asked what qualities did John Haak have that were desirable that she does not have. LSEB members commented that we might not want to go there because not everyone has had a uniform experience with Haak over his 18 year service. Many faculty now came on after Haak left. And this is potentially unfair to Perushek and we do not want to get into a situation where people resort to saying "but John did it this way and John did it that way." LSEB members commented that we might want to look at what an ideal situation would be and what do we want. We can make an assumption that there are problems without revealing examples. We could use hypothetical examples. Perushek commented that there needs to be trust on both sides and perhaps we could focus on the future.

Perushek asked the LSEB whether or not we wanted to continue with the remaining points. She emphasized that she was not trying to avoid going through them, but rather asking if at this time it is necessary. She prepared responses to them, but they are similar to her responses previously discussed. Christensen responded that if she is proposing a process, then avoiding the concerns is not an issue, as the concerns will be dealt with at future meetings. He indicated that Perushek did not need to make decisions on the Senate concerns at this meeting and could share as much information as she wants. Perushek agreed. Christensen also indicated that she, as an associate member of the Library Senate, can initiate actions and bring forward issues. Christensen went on to say that the Senate wants face-to-face meetings in the future, that it wants to begin a process of discussion, and to be sure to transmit issues to the Chair of the Library Senate. Perushek thanked the Board.

**2. Adjourned**

4:20 pm

Submitted by Theodore Kwok, Secretary