Library Senate Executive Board

Meeting Minutes
2006-01-11

Present:
Cartwright, Flynn (chair), Minatodani, Riedy, Rutter, Sack, Schultz

Excused:
Frost, Peacock

Guest:
Perushek

Convened:
The meeting was called to order by Flynn at 9:07 am in Addition Yap Conference Room A153. The first order of business was agenda item 3, after which Perushek left the meeting.

1. Approval of LSEB minutes for December 28, 2005.

The minutes were approved as corrected.

2. Reports of officers, standing committees, and MFS representatives

Flynn posted a message to libfac-l inviting discussion about the VCAA's recommendation for mediation. So far there has been no response.

Schultz: LPC has not yet met to select a new chair..

Cartwright: UHPA's faculty forum will be held in early February.

Minatodani and Rutter: The next MFS meeting is February 18. Hearings regarding the UARC will take place on January 20 at the Campus Center. The ad hoc UARC committee and the outside counsel reports will be presented.

3. University librarian

The UL announced that the ground floor committee has sent its recommendation to the architects.

a. Request for board advice on library budget.

UL: This request for advice concerns non-materials budgetary expenditures in particular. For example, the chancellor provided money to hire a temporary archivist to process the 442nd materials. Jan and John's separate accounts of the expenditures were very different, leading to Laura's near dismissal, and highlighting the need for a monthly report of departmental expenditures from the library's fiscal office.

LSEB: agreed that this would be a good idea and asked about conference travel monies: how the amount is calculated, what steps are being taken to address the shortfall so that the UHPA-UH contract rules can be followed? This gets at the concern for transparency.

UL: Years ago there was a Budget Advisory Group (BAG) but it hasn't operated in the
time I've been here. We've decided to have two budget meetings each year after the recent success of the first one. They will probably be held in April and early November, when we have the most information. BAG could be part of that. We're now in the second year of the biennium. In April, the library will submit a budget for the next biennium, 2007-2009. The campus administration informs the library administration only 4-6 weeks in advance of the April deadline that it needs a budget. The budget that campus administration approves is never enough; supplemental budget requests come afterwards. Projected expenditures aren't believed by campus administration so we have to wait until serials bills, for example, start to come in. It's impossible to know, ahead of time, what the final library budget is.

LSEB: Does library administration go directly to the legislature?
UL: Last year I went together with the chancellor but there is no regularly scheduled meeting with the legislators.
LSEB: Is there a way to talk directly with legislators?
UL: Under Dobelle, no. Interim chancellor Konan says it's OK but she must be apprised of every discussion with a legislator, no matter how casual, so that the university is not committed to honoring a budget allocation it knows nothing about.
LSEB: Faculty need to be part of the process and we need a timetable in place in order for that to happen.
UL: We can have a budget-themed meeting for all faculty to set up a timetable for future years. Paula can help guide that process. BAG can be revived if that's something the faculty recommend. John Hawk appointed an external faculty committee to advise him solely on budgetary issues. It has been at least eight years since that met.
LSEB: The impression is that there is a lack of appreciation on campus for the role of the library. The library is conceived of as a black hole. Legislators too must be better informed about the vital role the library plays on campus.
UL: That's a good point. I learn from deans who have a lot of access to legislators. With the flood I haven't been able to spend time in legislators' offices but I intend to in the future.

b. Request for preferred communication methods and dissemination of information
UL: Different people prefer different means of communication—memos, meetings, e-mail, etc. I'd like a list of meetings that we ought to have. Right now we have two budget meetings each year and the annual state of the library address. I want to schedule public information meetings.
LSEB: The weekly recap used to be informative, with news from admin. Today it's mostly a repost of messages that were previously sent.
UL: Does that mean more information is getting out during the week?
LSEB: No, more information from admin is needed. Some meeting minutes get posted without notification, e.g., CDMC and ULC. There's frustration among faculty because information is transmitted downward but we have no opportunity to affect it. How much influence would BAG have, for example, if it's revived? There's also frustration because many of us feel that much of what we say doesn't make any difference outside the library, with the VCAA, the chancellor, and the president. For some of us, it's even a question of access. Because the library admin is so hierarchical, faculty below department-head level have limited means for giving input.
UL: What about using the strategic planning process as a way to involve more people?
LSEB: That's possible. Meetings could be productive if people come prepared to discuss important issues. Getting back to campus support for the library, after the flood everyone saw what happens if the library can't function. We could have capitalized on that.
UL: I keep repeating to campus administration that things are still not normal in the
library.

**LSEB**: But there has been so much effort to demonstrate that it is business as usual in the library.

### 4. January 18, 2006 senate agenda and preparation

The agenda will include:
- Approval of Dec. 15 minutes
- Reports of officers and standing committee chairs
- Sharing of written comments of administrator under review (10 minute limit)
- VCAAs' recommendation

The implications of the poll of the senate were discussed.

### 5. New business

Discussion postponed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:05.

Submitted by Nancy Sack, secretary