Library Senate Executive Board

Meeting Minutes
8 May 2012, Hamilton Rm 027

Present: Jim Cartwright (MFS), David Flynn (UHPA), Eileen Herring (Secretary), Dore Minatodani (MFS), Allen Riedy (Vice-Chair), Sara Rutter (LPC), Nancy Sack (Elections), Gwen Sinclair (Chair)

Convened: 10:30 a.m.

1. Minutes Approval

The minutes for the 10 April 2012 meeting were not available for review or approval.

2. Reports

a. Chair (Sinclair): Sinclair attended the last ACCFSC meeting for Spring semester. John Morton, Vice President for Community Colleges, spoke about student retention in the community colleges. In some programs, students can obtain necessary skills without finishing a degree and this skews the graduation statistics. He also spoke about the need for more articulation. Robert Cooney, the outgoing ACCFSC Chair, sent a letter to President Greenwood asking for support of system-wide library resources. The letter is available at http://www.hawaii.edu/accfsc/docs/20120419_memo_libraryresources.pdf

b. Vice-Chair (Reidy): No report.

c. Secretary (Herring): No report.

d. Elections (Sack): Sack reported that Chow and Saeki tied in the voting for the Elections Committee member so straws will be drawn. The next election will be for a member of the Manoa Faculty Senate committee on faculty status. Before the end of June, there will have to be an election for a new Chair. LSEB members commented on the increase in the percentage of members participating in the elections most likely as a result of additional reminders sent out by Sack.

e. Manoa Faculty Senate (Minatodani): It was noted that Cartwright no longer has to come to the LSEB meetings since Sinclair is now an official Senator. She also reported that the institutional learning objectives resolution passed at the last MFS meeting. Also discussed was a plan for guaranteeing five years of financial support for PhD candidates. This item is part of the strategic plan implementation. They are currently evaluating the needs and identifying which departments are unable to provide this support. Parking rate increases were also discussed at the meetin
f. **UHPA (Flynn):** Flynn had no report. Rutter asked about the announcement that the scholarships for faculty dependent children had been discontinued. It was determined that this was not a contractual issue. Sinclair mentioned that the ACCFSC is asking that this funding be reinstated.

3. **Old Business**

   a. **Faculty recruitment practices:** Sinclair compiled the comments and forwarded them to Geary and Grosenheider. (See below.)

4. **New Business**

   a. **Public Services issues how to frame discussion:** The discussion began with a review of the questions that Minatodani had sent in her 26 April 2012 email. They were:

   - Who are we serving?
   - What services do we offer to them?
   - What are we doing that we want to continue doing?
   - What are we doing that we want to stop doing?
   - What are we not doing that we would like to start doing?
   - Do we need a head of public services? What should that person's responsibilities be?

   The members discussed which questions were most important, how the discussion should be handled, and why the questions were being raised at this point in time.

   On the question of how the discussion should be handled, there were strong feelings that it should take place as an open discussion in a forum. The forum should be senate sponsored and generate documented results. The possibility of soliciting electronic input was discussed, but there was general agreement that it would only be an adjunct to the in person conversations at one or more meetings. Members felt that having an outside facilitator would be helpful. Several members recommended Donna Ching. Herring will contact her to see if she is available.

   Multiple points of view were expressed in the discussion of why these questions were being raised now. Riedy thought that the forum results could prepare recommendations for organizational changes to present to the Library administration for discussion. Minatodani felt the forum should result in a common understanding that could be the basis for discussion with Library administration of the results of the withdrawal of the reorganization proposal. Sack suggested that it should establish a shared sense of priorities.

   Minatodani expressed the opinion that public services is the core of everything the library does. She also felt that no one currently knows that is being done in all public services areas. There was extensive discussion of the definition of public services, the importance of technical services, and the interaction of the two activities. Members began discussing the question about the head of public services, but there was insufficient time to articulate any specific ideas.
Submitted by Eileen Herring

**Date submitted to Library Senate / Library Staff Advisory Group:** March 20, 2012

**Proposal:**

Adoption of recommended best practices for the recruitment of librarians

**Tentative implementation date:**

Immediately following reply-date

**Rationale:**

In conformity with Administrative Procedures Manual A9.540 [http://www.hawaii.edu/apis/apm/pers/a9540.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/apis/apm/pers/a9540.pdf) that promote diversity vis a vis affirmative action requirement, national best-practices such as those documented in ARL SPEC Kits* for academic librarian recruitment recommend that screening committees include members with a diversity of demographic backgrounds as well as members with a diversity of job classes [i.e. librarian, civil service and APT], at least one member from outside the Dept. [or from another Division], and a member from outside the Library who holds a stake in the outcome of the search.

It is also recommended to NOT include the Dept Head on screening committees. Dept. Heads especially if they serve as chair of a screening committee can have a negative albeit subtle impact upon diversity. They may - unwittingly - exclude "outliers" or those different from themselves during the screening process. This can be compounded if the Dept. Head repeatedly serves on screening committees for a department.

This is not to say that Dept. Head's should have a diminished role in the selection. On the contrary, just as in the peer review process of Tenure & Promotion a Dept. Head should make an independent recommendation. To this point, added to the Library's check-list will be a one-on-one meeting with the Dept. Head to the list of necessary interviewers for on-site interviews. This will conform to national best-practices and the practices of most academic units on Manoa Campus.

These are recommended best-practices but each recruitment and each screening committee will be unique and there may be special circumstances and exceptions. But, the voluntary adoption of these best-practices is strongly encouraged.

* M.L.S. hiring requirement / a SPEC kit compiled by Julia C. Blixrud. ARL SPEC kit no.257
  Minority recruitment and retention in ARL libraries / Systems and Procedures Exchange Center. ARL SPEC kit no.168
  Recruitment and retention / [compiled by] Jen Stevens and Rosemary Streatfeild. ARL SPEC kit no.276
  Recruitment practices in ARL libraries / Systems and Procedures Exchange Center. ARL SPEC kit no.78
Reply date: April 20, 2012

Comments made during the April 17, 2012 Library Senate meeting:

The comments revolved around two major themes: inclusion of non-faculty in screening committees and the inclusion/role of department heads in screening committees.

Inclusion of non-faculty in screening committees

For some positions in some departments, it is important to include non-faculty members in the screening committees because they have the most expertise about the requirements of the position. Sinclair gave the example of including the maps civil service position and the GIS APT position in the screening committee for the GIS librarian.

While in some cases it might be beneficial to include specific non-faculty members, several members felt that it should not be a requirement since civil service and APT library staff do not have an in-depth understanding of the tenure and promotion process. They may not be very knowledgeable about the librarian aspects of the position responsibilities.

Ghosh asserted that no other UH Manoa department includes civil service or APT positions in their faculty screening committees.

In departments where there is only one librarian, inclusion of civil service and/or APT staff provides the only representation for the department being impacted. J. Sung gave her screening committee as a case in point.

Rutter felt that staff members should always be included in screening committees because they provide a different perspective than library faculty. In addition, it provides an opportunity for staff or outside faculty to become more aware of what is involved in librarianship. She suggested it could serve as a tool for improving communication between library faculty and library staff.

The most important criterion for being included in the screening committee should be knowledge of the position and its requirements rather than diversity for diversity’s sake.

Inclusion/role of department heads in screening committees

Several people made the comments to the effect that the home department of the position needs to be adequately represented on screening committees.

The department head often has or should have the best overall view of the department and of the requirements of the position.

In addition, some members felt that the department head should be included as part of their role as leader of the department.

The point was made that the department head benefits from participation in the discussions with the candidates.

Several members made the point that, when included in the selection
committee, the department head is only one voice and generally does not have excessive influence on the outcome of the process. In addition, some departments do not have permanent department heads and thus do not have long enough time in position to have the opportunity to influence many librarian position recommendations. Minatodani supported the ideal that there is often an almost invisible influence of some long-term department heads and gave Karen Peacock as an example of that circumstance.

It was suggested that department interviews should be included in a routine, codified selection process. Comments from members of the department would be forwarded to the selection committee for inclusion in their deliberations.

A comment was made that these best practices had been developed in libraries with significantly more librarians. In our library, it is often impractical to leave the department head out of the screening committee because they may be the only other faculty member in the department.

**Comments received via email:**

1. A commenter objected to the imposition of an inflexible set of regulations and agreed that knowledge of the position and the department should be the most important factor in selecting screening committee members.

2. A commenter contested Ghosh's assertion that no other departments on campus permit civil service or APT staff on screening committees, and agreed with Minatodani’s remarks about influential department heads.

3. A commenter observed that screening committees play a minor role in ensuring a diverse pool of candidates and that if the Library wants to ensure diversity, this must be done through outreach.

4. A commenter contested the assertion that the SPEC kit is representative of national best practices. Excluding a department head assumes the worst and ignores the positive aspects of including the department head on the committee. It is not necessary to include non-library faculty on all committees. They and civil service/APT staff can be included in the screening process without serving on the screening committee. The proposal should be rewritten to make the rationale for the recommended practices more clear and well-supported.

5. A commenter agreed with others who pointed out that many departments only have one or two faculty members, so the department head would need to serve on the committee or be its chair. Guidelines need to be sufficiently flexible to work in a variety of circumstances.