Library Senate Executive Board

Meeting Minutes
2005-07-13

Present:
LSEB: Christensen (chair), Flynn, Horie, Minatodani, Rutter (recorder), Schultz, Stone. Guest: Diane Perushek (University Librarian).

Excused:
Barnard, Cartwright, Kwok

Convened:
The meeting was called to order by Christensen (chair) at 9:05 am in Hamilton Library Addition, Yap Conference Room A153.

1. Meeting with Diane Perushek (University Librarian) regarding her request to have the Senate Chair join the University Librarian's Council (ULC) meetings.

Christensen welcomed Perushek to the meeting explaining that she was present to discuss her idea of inviting the LSEB Chair to join the University Librarian's Council (ULC) meetings.

Perushek said that in analyzing the points brought to her by the faculty about problems in her administration that the crux of the problem seemed to be communication. Currently the ULC has a representative from the Department Heads attend the meetings. It seemed that from the things that the library senate is interested in, it would make sense to have the LSEB chair in on the ULC meetings as well. Attendance would mean that the LSEB chair could bring forth agenda items and could help the ULC understand what faculty wants and would give more knowledge of what is going on in ULC.

In the weekly meetings of the ULC, a different person gives an update, e.g. John Awakuni on the budget, Dana Meyers on the foundation, Wil Frost on space issues, etc.

Perushek also suggested that LSEB might want to have a representative on the Library Department Council, though this is a joint meeting, Perushek said that she couldn't unilaterally authorize it. It was noted that the LDC has several senate members present and did not think another faculty member in an already large group was needed.

Christensen summarized the earlier LSEB discussion about the LSEB chair attending the ULC. The LSEB had identified different ways of establishing an organizational connection between the senate and library administration. Options included the University Librarian attending LSEB meetings from time to time. It was noted that there was a concern about putting into place an artificial bridge rather than using the current structure, which does allow for communication if effectively used.

A question about whether the LSEB chair would be free to tell the faculty senate all that they learned in the ULC meetings. Perushek said that when personnel issues are
discussed, those discussions could not be shared. The UHM Senate Executive Committee chair attends the Manoa Chancellor’s council and then takes those notes to the SEC for discussion about issues that should be taken to the senate.

Christensen noted that it may be a very good idea to have the LSEB chair attend ULC meetings, however it would be untenable if the chair could not go back to the senate with everything they had heard. He also noted that after the flood the senate became a clearinghouse of problems, which is not the true role of the senate. This occurred because other avenues for action were not working. For the senate to have a new role with administration, the roles have to be defined. For example, LDC needs to be able to take action focusing on operations. The senate needs to operate on a broader context.

Although communication is extremely important, it is not the only role of the senate. The senate is an advisory and deliberative body. If the role of the LSEB chair is to act as a liaison to communicate, the senate would want to fulfill its advisory purpose.

Perushek said that the ULC would want two way communication.

Logistics of how the information gathered by the LSEB chair would be dealt with by the LSEB were discussed.

It was noted that channels of communication already exist, is this needed. Another noted that if the LSEB chair attended the meeting, there would be more unfiltered information--the senate cannot react to things they don’t anticipate.

Another LSEB member commented that if there is routine communication and routine consultation with all involved and those with knowledge, it would alleviate a lot of frustration about not being listened to or heard.

Perushek asked how LSEB members felt about how the Groundfloor rebuilding team went about their work, with library wide meetings, surveys.

Christensen said that as chair of the LSEB he had received a lot of concerns from library faculty about how the VCAA’s library rebuilding team (LRT) would work with the library’s groundfloor committee and that decisions were being made in a non-consultative manner.

Perushek said that she presumed that the result of the LRT was what people wanted. After much discussion, Christensen said that this was an example of the lack of organizational clarity--we need to have faculty and administration work together better. Whatever is decided regarding the ULC should enable faculty and administration to work together more beneficially.

Perushek said that she was open to other options, but wanted change and not to continue the status quo.

Perushek left at 10:05 a.m.

The meeting resumed at 10:10 a.m.

2. LSEB meeting with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs regarding the Vote of No Confidence in the University Librarian.
Christensen said that he had heard from almost all LSEB members regarding the meeting with the VCAA to discuss the Vote of No Confidence of the University Librarian. The consensus was that the LSEB preferred to meet with the VCAA as a board rather than having only the chair meet with him. Christensen will respond to the VCAA’s request and set up a meeting time, suggesting either July 20, or 27th. The next senate meeting is scheduled to be July 27th.


A discussion of the two versions of the review and evaluation forms ensued. The instructions for the detailed and simple form were discussed. Points of the discussion included what weight a minority held position would have in this review, the consequences of the review. The review form is a way to capture faculty perspectives and identify performance areas that are seen as problem areas. The presentation of the evaluation form was discussed. The members present unanimously approved the presentation of the simpler evaluation format. Christensen will present this preferred format and review the decision making process. The more detailed form has the disadvantage of being difficult to interpret the results and may actually result in fewer explanatory comments. The instructions should provide enough explanation to encourage reviews to provide substantive feedback to the administrator under review.

Christensen will send out outline of presentation to LSEB. The review instrument will be presented at the next senate meeting.

4. Committee Reports (via email).

Library Personnel Committee (Schultz): None.

Manoa Faculty Senate (Rutter): None.

Elections Committee (Stone): The Elections Committee has concluded voting for the LSEB Secretary position, Nacy Sack will be taking over in this role. Susan Johnson and Allen Riedy will be filling vacant positions on the committee.

Staff Development Committee (Barnard): None.

UHPA (Horie/Cartwright): None.

5. Approval of 2005-06-29 minutes.

Approved.

6. LSEB discussion on University Librarian's request (agenda item 1 above) to have the Senate Chair join the University Librarian's Council (ULC) meetings.

Flynn asked about next steps regarding Perushek’s suggestion that the LSEB chair attend ULC meetings. Various models were discussed. Flynn suggested that his preference would be to use a similar meeting schedule as the Manoa Faculty Senate, with the Board meeting weekly. It could be made clear that the University Librarian may request an agenda item and meet with the Board rather quickly when the need
arises. This would give the LSEB an opportunity to ask for elaboration about ULC issues.

Christensen will e-mail LSEB to ask for board members recommendation and justification regarding how to proceed.

7. Adjourned

11:38 am

Submitted by Sara Rutter in Secretary's absence.