MINUTES
LAUC-I General Membership Meeting
Wednesday, November 4, 2009 * 1pm-3pm * LL 570

Recorder: Tony Lin

1. Agenda review – 2 min

2. Approve minutes: LAUC-I General Membership Minutes for July 14, 2009 – 5 min
   ♦ ACTION ITEM: Brown will find out if faculty have term limits for UCI academic senate committees.
     Update: faculty do have term limits; terms can be renewed one time, recommended that they cycle out. Length of service for some faculty has tended to vary; LAUC-I has the ability to set term limits if we want, it’s not a rule but we can.
     • Palmer notes that some faculty are ex officio on Acad Senate committees, so they don’t have term limits; some faculty could have responsibility based on what the committee responsibilities are, therefore ex officio members of the committee, and term limits might not apply.
     • Peterman encourages Acad senate appointments to change in the future rather than renewing the same members over and over, since this is a professional development opportunity.
     • Term limits may apply for academic appointees; however, some academic senate committee faculty members may serve without term limits.
     • Further investigation needed on term limits for UCI systemwide committees.
   ♦ ACTION ITEM: Lorelei will send URL for GRC to Mitchell
     Update: URL sent, website updated
   ♦ ACTION ITEM: Call for topics – let Bob or Becky know if there are any ideas, people, groups, topics, etc. that anyone would like to see next year.
     Update: Done
     • R Johnson notes that GIS was already in works. Andrews will talk about the PC activities later.
     • Andrews submitted an idea to the Program Committee for the “Future of Libraries”. Program Committee will look into finding an appropriate speaker.
     • December 2009 – The GIS will team up with LAUC- I to bring in Tracey Hughes from UCSD to discuss GIS resources.
     • Program Committee encouraged other LAUC-I members to send in other ideas.
   ♦ Minutes approved with changes.

3. Introduce the LAUC-I Executive Board – 10 min
   ♦ Dana Peterman referred to new LAUC-I executive board and introduced LAUC-I executive board members present in meeting, please see LAUC- I Wiki document on the LAUC-I wiki for more information: (https://dekiwiki.lib.uci.edu/@api/deki/files/664/=StandingCommitteesCharges%2526Roster20091027.docx)
♦ Ad Hoc Committee on LAUC Representation Committee formed during LAUC-I Executive Board meeting on Wednesday, November 20, 2009.
   o Committee members include Pauline Manaka and Judy Bube

4. Welcome new librarians -- 5 min
   (As of July 6, 2009– Jessica Wimer, Jackie Woodside, Melody Lembke)
   ♦ Dana Peterman introduced new Law Librarians to LAUC-I

5. LAUC-I Budget – 5 min
   ♦ Current Balance is $2444.73 as of LAUC-I General Meeting date
   ♦ Deb Sunday will cover the costs for two LAUC-I programs for 2009-2010

6. LAUC-I Standing committees update
   ♦ Academic Librarianship update – 5 min
     ○ Kristin Andrews mentioned three items ALC will implement for 2010:
       ▪ 1. Add names of librarians who volunteered to be resources librarians to a LibGuide.
       ▪ 3. Coordinate and schedule two panels: one with new UCI Law librarians concerning what law librarians do. A second panel should focus on articulating new roles as you may have discovered them using both the ACRL report mentioned above and the UC white paper, “The University of California Library Collection: Content for the 21st Century and Beyond”.
     ○ ALC is also involved in library school students currently employed at UCI Libraries and encouraging professional development in librarianship
     ○ Kathryn Kjaer will hold an informal gathering for library school students currently employed at UCI Libraries to network with professional librarians to promote professional development
     ○ ALC has a wiki presence on the LAUC-I wiki here:
       ▪ https://dekiwiki.lib.uci.edu/LAUC-I/Academic_Librarianship_Committee_%28ALC%29
   ♦ Librarian Review Committee update -- 5 min
     • The Library Review Committee reviews and advises the University Librarian on personnel actions, as applied to the Librarian series, including but not limited to matters concerning appointment, merit increase, and promotion.
     • LRC Implementation Plans for 2009-2010
i. LRC continue working with LHR to investigate the use of the My Data software as a means of making electronic versions of academic review files available for LRC use.

ii. Work with Review Initiators submit the completed dossiers to LHR as early as possible (prior to any deadline) so that LRC can review the files promptly.

iii. Work with LHR to revise procedures to include Law Dean in the process for appointments and academic reviews.

iv. Work with LHR to determine how librarians with distinguished status move from Librarian 5 to Librarian 6.

• LRC Encourages LAUC members to submit comments on potential new candidates
• Most LRC work is confidential

♦ Research and Professional Development update -- 5 min

• Committee members include: Michelle Light (2010), Virginia Allison (2011), Sheila Smyth (2011), Holly Tomren (2011)

• Charge: The Committee on Professional Development shall monitor and provide leadership on ongoing professional development and mentoring opportunities for LAUC-I members.

• Research and Professional Development Committee now has wiki presence here:
  i. https://dekiwiki.lib.uci.edu/LAUC-I/RPDC

• Research and Professional Development Committee 2009-2010 implementation:

  • 2009-2010 Implementation Tasks:
    i. Remind Librarians by email about the various deadlines for poster and presentation submissions of key conferences and workshops as well as grant deadlines. For example, ALA, MLA, SLA, ACRL.
    ii. Explore and promote the various non-travel options for professional development, including virtual conferencing, local opportunities, writing clubs and the like.
    iii. Promote free resources for academic librarians who want to do research and writing, including those already created by LAUC-I, such as http://lauci.lib.uci.edu/0809/lunch/index.html.
    iv. Offer peer-reviewing sessions, either one-on-one or with committee members as an audience for presentations and publications. Provide constructive feedback.
    v. Actively seek out past UCI librarian publications eligible for UC eScholarship Repository instance and assist librarians interested in using the Repository.

• Send eScholarship submissions to Kristin Laughtin, so far only two eScholarship submissions by UCI Libraries, Dana Peterman and Cynthia Johnson

• LAUC call for research grants posted October 26, 2009, for more information, please go to LAUC Grants Page:
  ii. If you have further questions, please ask any members of the LAUC-I Research and Professional Development Committee

♦ Program Committee update -- 5 min

R. Johnson/Imamoto
• Deb Sunday will support two LAUC-I programs for 2009-2010
• Timely Topics are included in the LAUC-I programming
• Kristin Andrews submitted a Future of Libraries suggestion
• GIS Team will coordinate LAUC-I December program with Tracey Hughes from UCSD

♦ Nomination committee update and orientation to new librarians -- 5 min  Murphy
  • Nomination Committee will begin work in December 2010
  • Committee will seek out LAUC-I members interested in serving on other committees
  • Outreach to Law Libraries will begin with an orientation to LAUC-I and also encouragement to participate in LAUC-I
  • 2009-2010 Implementation Tasks:
    i. Review and revise the current standing of committees representation to be sure that we have adequate representation among Academic Senate committees.
    ii. Actively foster and support nominations and volunteers for LAUC-I elections and committee appointments including representatives to UCI Academic Senate and LAUC systemwide committees.
    iii. Conduct all regular and supplemental elections including Bylaws revisions as directed by Executive Board.

7. APP L Questions – 30 min  Sunday and Kjaer
  ♦ Discussion centered on questions received regarding revisions to the APP-L. Please see Kathryn Kjaer's Word document at the end of the minutes.

8. LAUC Update – 25 min  Peterman
  ♦ Future of the UC dialog viewable in a Podcast
    o Only UC library figure mentioned is Dan Greenstein
  ♦ LAUC Assemblies will be reduced from two assemblies a year to only one assembly, it is unclear at this point with the annual assembly will occur, to be determined at a future date.
  ♦ Dana Peterman encourages new UCI Librarians to attend LAUC Assembly
  ♦ Selection of new UCI University Librarian after April 1?
    o Unknown at this point. It is likely at UCI Librarians will serve on the future search committee for the UCI University Librarian

ACTION ITEM: Pauline Manaka, Dana Peterman, Yvonne Wilson, and Mitchell Brown will draft a letter to the EVC encouraging UCI Librarian involvement in the selection process of the new UCI University Librarian

♦ LAUC-I Webpage vs. LAUC-I Wiki?
  o An ad hoc committee will be appointed to study the LAUC-I information structure for the LAUC-I webpage vs. LAUC-I wiki
  o Currently LAUC-I does not have enough resources to keep the LAUC-I webpage as current as possible, it is likely that most information will be moved to the LAUC-I wiki
LAUC-I send off for Gerry Munoff?

**ACTION ITEM:** LAUC-I Program Committee will coordinate an appropriate event for the retirement of UCI University Librarian, Gerry Munoff.

- Assembly (UCB Dec.3) – Travel awards grant to attend for new members, what the assembly is about, how you can participate without going. [(http://laucassembly.blogspot.com/), Assembly site not live yet, see wiki for draft info]
- LAUC Representative Appointments update –
  - Pauline Manaka – Committee on Professional Governance
  - Holly Tomren – Committee on Research and Professional Development
- Meeting Adjourned.

9. Wrap up and Adjournment

Next LAUC-I General Membership meetings (2010):
February 2, 12-2 in SL 104
May 5, 1-3 in LL 570
August 3, 1-3 SL 104
LRC Questions re: the APP-L

These questions were sent to Deb Sunday and Kathryn Kjaer by John Novak, who agreed in a LAUC Executive Board meeting to examine the APP-L on behalf of members of LAUC-I. The concerns below are a combination of questions from LAUC-I members and LRC board members.

Responses in red are from Kathryn Kjaer and are unedited.

-- John Novak, LRC Chair 2009-10

Responses in red below.

**General Questions**

1. when does this document go into effect - with the next review cycle, effective July 2010? Yes.

2. where is this scenario addressed: Librarian X currently holds an appointment in the Librarian series; he/she elects to be considered for another position in the library; goes through recruitment process and is successful hire. In the process, Librarian X negotiates another step or rank and is appointed at new higher step. When does Librarian X come up for review now? Does the clock start all over or do they gain credit for time at UCI in previous position? Are they eligible for review on their original timetable or a new one depending on start date of new position? The review clock starts over based on the date of appointment to the new position. Their next review will cover the period since their last positive review.

**Role of the LRC**

The main change regarding LRC is on page 48, Change #52

I. Review of Members of the Librarian Series

J. Library Review Committee’s Role
14. ASSESSMENT, RECOMMENDATION AND REPORT

d. The Library Review Committee shall submit a comprehensive report and recommendation for action to the University Librarian. For law librarian candidates, the LRC will also provide a copy of their report to the Dean of the Law School via Library Human Resources.

Don't we as LRC submit our report to the Law School Dean too? I mean should we not address it to both UL and Law School Dean? Not just "provide a copy"? Yes, the language will be modified to the following:
The Library Review Committee shall submit a comprehensive report and recommendation for action addressed to the University Librarian. For law librarian candidates, the LRC will address their report jointly to the University Librarian and the Dean of the Law School. A copy of their report will be sent to the Dean of the Law School by Library Human Resources.

Issues that may need clarification:

1. In Preface, under MOU New Article - should a reference be made to when the MLS or its equivalent is required or preferred for the position even if we may be more flexible than in the past?

   Not appropriate. There is no change from earlier procedures.

2. p. 4 - An accelerated advancement is a two or more step advancement within rank awarded only when achievement has been exceptional, recommended at either a regular or an accelerated review - I am not sure that it is two or more steps, but it can be one step out of calendar with resetting to the new timetable if successful.

   Note there is a difference between Accelerated Advancement and Accelerated Review. Accelerated Advancement results when the candidate is advanced more than one step during a regularly scheduled or accelerated review. An Accelerated Review is not a result, but occurs when a librarian requests and is given an academic review earlier than their normal or regularly mandated review.

3. p. 15 - more on acceleration - if an acceleration is unsuccessful when out of calendar as example suggests, why can't a librarian come up the next year? Faculty do this rather routinely. I am not sure that it is an either/or situation - but should be a decision that is judicious and lends to great likelihood for support; if not, librarian should be entitled to a routine review at regular time by updating file to reflect the final year of third year at rank.

   I.B.10., paragraph #4, sentence #2—We will change “granted” to “given.” Add phrase to last sentence: “However, under I.B.11., the Review Initiator will perform an assessment each year after the “No Action” and a review will be initiated when the Review Initiator believes that the record merits action, or if the candidate requests an accelerated review.” However, as stated above, the review will cover the period since the last positive review.

4. p. 7 - under Normal Periods of service at ranks/steps - I think it may be helpful to add that depending on when librarian is appointed, determines when they come up for review and we have had many librarians who are reviewed the first time after 9 months at rank/step - normally does not speak to that.

   The shorter period only applies to one’s first review, so it seems appropriate to state that
these are the normal periods of service at ranks and steps. See p. 9, I.B.5. definition of review year vs. service year (p. 8, I.B.4.) explains the difference with the first review after appointment. There is no contradiction.

5. p. 7 - 3 c. 2 "will normally not be considered with less than three years of service at Step V." The situation changes this year, when some librarians have achieved "distinguished status" many years ago and got realigned with new scale and have not had possibilities for merit until now should be parked at V. For them, movement from V to VI is normal merit and nothing more. See also p. 24.

In the Librarian rank, the normal period between reviews is 3 years. This is true for all librarians at step V as well. Some librarians achieved “distinguished status” under the old scale. When they transitioned to the new scale, they retained their distinguished status and were told they would not have to go through the career review again. In the transition to the new scale all librarians ended up in a step that was lower than under the old scale. The distinguished librarians have all undergone regularly scheduled reviews and merits have been awarded since then. The librarians with distinguished status who have reached the new step V do not have to go through another full career review. Their review period covers just the last 3 years.

6. p. 8 - 4 d - it may be better to state that a librarian appointed between July 1 and November 30 is eligible for academic review in the next review cycle with a potential period of review amounting to less than a full year. (question #8 relates to this as well).

Note the footnote p.8, 4. MOU (and the APM) defines the effective dates of appointment and service credit. Service credit for the year is given if the effective date of appointment is July 1 – January 1. No service credit is given for the year if the effective date of appointment is January 2 – June 30. So, the person who started in mid December actually receives credit for the full year since their effective date of appointment falls between the July 1 - January 1 period.

7. p. 10 - for consistency's sake, either bold "mandated" in 7a2 or unbold "mandated" in 7, b. 2 Both will be unbolded.

8. (See #6 as well) please reconcile the language between page 8, 4. c with page 10, 7. b. 3 - if one does not get service credit starting in Dec until January why is candidate eligible for review?

They are consistent because the “effective date of hire” is within the July 1-January 1 period.

9. p. 24 - There needs to be a separate statement for librarians who have achieved "Distinguished Status" or passed the "barrier step" earlier in their career. This applies to only a very small number of librarians who achieved distinguished status prior to or at the point of implementation of the new salary scales in 2000/01. No change will be made. For them, movement from Step V to Step VI is ordinary review for merit advancement - it does
not mean anything else and is a rather different review than what is suggested. The
difference is that they do not have to go through a full career review. However, the bar is set
higher at every step in the review process especially after the distinguished step V. The
AFT Under 2, the following do not apply:

1.- actually #2 - Significant achievement in the period since attaining Step V
Everything in quotes on p. 24 is a document which was approved by LAUC-I, the
UL, and the Associate EVC on January 1, 1990 with edits reflecting the salary scale
changes effective July 1, 1999.
Significant achievement since attaining one’s last advancement is always required,
whether one has distinguished status or not. As described in Appendix B, the LAUC-
I document: “Guidelines for Interpretation of the Criteria for Librarian Personnel
Actions within the UCI Libraries,” performance expectations become progressively
higher for each step as one moves through the ranks.
Also, the “normal outcome” for the review at Librarian V, VI, and VII is “no action.”
This is not necessarily a negative outcome, but continued superior performance would
be required in order to advance.

10. p. 24 - please consider renumbering subsequent sections as they are different, begin #2,
While there is no one pattern....
Not needed. Numbering within the quoted document is separate from APP-L numbering.

1. this does apply if someone has already achieved Distinguished Status - in
particular "significant achievement in the period since attaining Step V." How
"significant achievement" is defined remains unclear and how that is
differentiated from a barrier step review and normal merit, seems to be very fuzzy
and subject to administrative interpretation. How can normal merit be construed
with "significant achievement" when nothing in the APM indicates that
Distinguished Status must be the benchmark in all subsequent reviews.
Significant achievement is not a special requirement only for those going for
distinguished status. It is stated here to remind us that in a full career review
achievements must not only be in the distant past, but must be sustained up to the
most recent period. Significant achievement is always required for advancement.

2. Clarification is needed about whether a candidate being considered for Step VI
with distinction has to provide a full career review; those with Distinguished
Status only need to document three years of achievement. Those librarians who
have already attained distinguished status under the old salary scale have been
notified that they do not have to go through a full career review again.

11. p. 24 - renumber "Distinguished achievement..." paragraph as #3—Not needed.
Numbering is consistent within the quoted document.
1. 2, 3 - does this apply to those who have achieved rank with Distinguished Status? Yes.

12. p. 28 - 3 a - "for all reviews, if the former RI supervised the candidate for more than one-third of the period since the end of the last review period, a letter of evaluation from the former Review Initiator is Required...." then 3 d, begs the question of why the letter is confidential. The point is that there should be no difference of where the former Review Initiator is, still at UCI Libraries or not. It is clear that the letter may not be received, but that is handled in 3a by "...but its absence shall not delay the review process." When something is "required" it should be applied the same terms of understanding and practice that its analogous reports include - all letters from RIs should be afforded the exact same status and be open, non-confidential letters. There may be no other justifiable reason to request a letter from a former RI except to cover that time period. If no professional relationship, intellectual relationship exists, and it is required or mandated, then please make the letter open and it should be clear if the letter has been received or not. Why are we protecting previous employees instead of current employees? As the documentation is currently stated, it is inconsistent and illogical. This needs serious attention.

There is no change here. Someone who is not employed here is an external reviewer and their letter is confidential per campus practice.

13. p. 32 - J - this statement should state at what juncture in the review process copies of redacted letters may be requested.

This is outlined in the table on p. 61.

14. p. 35 - 10 d - is not accurate for "advancement from Librarian V to Librarian VI, advancement to Librarian VII - these are considered normal merit reviews assuming the Distinguished Status has been achieved. The “normal outcome” for these reviews is No Action. Therefore, a more thorough assessment is needed in order to award advancement.

15. p. 35 10 b - should this passage not be synchronized with p. 37 - 12 b? This is the same code that is referred to, is it not?

We will revise to make both sections identical.