Library Senate Executive Board

Meeting Minutes
2006-02-22

Present: Flynn (Chair), Minatodani, Carlson, Rutter (Recorder), Mattos, Frost, Riedy
Excused: Peacock, Sack
Guest: Diane Perushek (University Librarian)
Convened: The meeting was called to order by Flynn at 9:10 am in Addition Yap Conference Room A153.

1. Draft report to senate on 2005 evaluation of library administrators

Flynn began the meeting by asking Perushek to introduce her first topic of discussion, “channels to use for sharing of information...” Perushek explained that there were three areas she was interested in discussing with the LSEB, 1) desirability of more direct communication with departments by attending department meetings, 2) how department heads disseminated information from the meetings they attend, and 3) the usefulness of disseminating information gleaned from sources such as Educause and ARL to division heads who then transmit to library staff (some staff thought that the messages should go to all staff directly from the UL). Flynn noting that the LSEB needs time to answer as a board but would respond to Perushek’s questions as an individual. Observing that meeting with departments particularly during times of planning would be very helpful he encouraged the UL to meet with his department. As a department head he suggested going directly to lib_ids as a channel of communication rather than depending on department heads to be messengers for information that should go to all. Messages forwarded from ARL or Educause were sometimes redundant for him. Frost asked about the volume of messages from these listserv sources. Perushek said that it was perhaps two messages a week. Riedy said that when he was acting as division head he simply forwarded the messages to all staff. Riedy also encouraged the UL to meet with his department and that he regularly reports to his staff about meetings that he has attended so that they have an opportunity to discuss the issues. Riedy also recommended that the UL copy him as department head when the UL addresses one of the members of his department on an issue or project so that he can be apprised of activities being undertaken by the faculty in his department. Discussion ensued around examples of information that did not reach staff who should have been kept in the loop.

Perushek brought up a second topic regarding Human Resources processes that Jean Ehrhorn handled. Perushek explained that she has been dealing with faculty personnel issues since Jean’s retirement, as David Bruner as faculty cannot fill that function. She noted that she will continue to handle promotion and tenure recommendations but will be moving more of the personnel work, such as travel decisions, over to Paula Mochida. As Paula has been in her new position for two months, more responsibilities have been moved over to her, much of Randy Hensley’s
former responsibilities and Jean’s responsibilities are being moved to Paula. Perushek said that it will be another month before an accurate job description can be created for Paula. Perushek asked if faculty will be all right with the temporary ambiguity of who handles certain functions. Frost said that if faculty know to whom to send travel inquiries and sabbatical requests there shouldn’t be a problem.

Perushek said that she had just read a message from the VCFAO saying that the budget proposal deadline has been moved three weeks from February 24 to March 18 which will make the planning better.

Perushek discussed the library administration’s retreat in which one half day was used to focus on decision making. She said that though Karen Cross was engaged as a facilitator this did not imply that the facilitation process between faculty and the administration was underway, though Cross suggested that it was a step in the process the VCAA had recommended.

Rutter brought up a question regarding a resolution written by the Manoa Library Committee to hasten the flood recovery of Hamilton Library. Because Perushek is on that committee the discussion revolved around how she might request library staff input on a resolution that will be brought to the Manoa Faculty Senate. Members of LSEB encouraged Perushek to work with the chair of the library committee to disseminate the resolution to library staff. Rutter will tell the chair of the Manoa Library Committee to work with Perushek to inform the library staff about this resolution. The Manoa Library Committee is administered out of the VCAA’s office. Perushek suggested that the minutes of the Manoa Library Committee could be included on the library website.

A discussion about what kinds of information the staff need to see for growth and development that are too often considered confidential by the library administration. Minatodani noted that there is a perception that the administration does not share enough information and that to overcome that perception the library administration should over correct so that staff begin to believe that there is transparency.

Perushek left at 9:50 am.

The board approved the LSEB minutes of February 8, 2006 with minor corrections and the minutes for the meeting on February 13, 2006 were adopted.

Reports
Flynn described the meeting of the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs meeting held at Honolulu Community College on February 17, 2006. He said that President McClain met with the council, which serves as an advisory council. The ACCFSC has representatives from Manoa that includes 13 senate chairs from Manoa senates.

Minatodani reported that the notes from February’s Manoa Faculty Senate meeting have been sent out to the library faculty.

Riedy reported that the staff development committee is working with the Library Forum committee to develop a series together.

Flynn reported that work remaining on Article 23 should be directed to our elected UHPA representatives.

The board went through the report to the senate regarding the evaluation of
administrators. The senate still needs to go through sections 7.7-7.10 before the report can be adopted. Flynn noted that the board may modify its own resolutions that are not yet stated by the chair as being a motion before the senate for vote.

A discussion about 7.7 ensued as to whether the motion that was adopted on January 18, 2006 regarding the non-dissemination of evaluation comments referred to only the evaluation of 2005 or to all present and future evaluations. Flynn noted that the board recommendation of November 18, 2005, addresses the written comments from the inaugural 2005 evaluation.

Flynn observed that resolution 7.9 should be revised in accordance with our rules of order so that the senate can get straight to the question of amending something previously adopted. 7.9 was revised to state that the motion of January 18, 2006, regarding the disposition of the free-form written comments for the 2005 evaluations be amended to allow an LSEB-appointed committee to review the full results of the 2005 evaluations with the University Librarian and the Assistant University Librarian for Library Information Technology. Release of the free-form written comments to the committee will take place only after the administrator agrees in writing to participate in the joint review of the comments.

The next scheduled senate meeting is March 15, 2006 at 1:30 pm.

Flynn discussed with the board a list of issues that he has collected from individual members and from the Senate on future actions that the Senate might take. The board members requested that we begin to look at the list to prioritize.

Submitted by Sara Rutter