MINUTES
LAUC-I Executive Board Meeting
Wednesday May 26 2010 * 11am-12:30pm *LL 110

Present: Andrews, Brown, Ferry, Imamoto, Light, Lin, Peterman, Sibert
Absent: Novak, Williams

1. Agenda review
   ALL

2. Approve minutes: LAUC-I ExBd minutes from April 28, 2010
   ♦ Approved
   Sibert

3. News/Announcements
   ♦ None at this time.
   Peterman

4. LAUC-I Budget
   ♦ As of 04/30/10, balance was $2221.05.
   ♦ Funds not yet deducted for gift cards given to students.
   Ferry

5. LAUC Southern Region Assembly Recap – (May 6, 2010) Peterman/Andrews/Imamoto
   ♦ What worked. What didn’t. Advice for future.
     - Should have ordered coffee for morning.
     - Need an un-locked-down computer, projectors to check out; next time, use in-house equipment for those things.
     - Poster tear sheets worked well, easy to use.
       o Andrews notes that while poster sheets worked well in the meeting, we could improve what we do with them afterwards, i.e. recording of information and photography of sheets in one session rather than two.
       o Peterman and Andrews note that we should have taken pictures of tear sheets while they were up; could have then preserved their original order.
       o Poster tear sheets given to Carol McEwan; won’t fit on LAUC-I shelves; did not offer them to Sam Dunlop.
     - Peterman: helpful to have hash tags recorded ahead of time.
   ♦ Blog entries, Flickr review
     - Blog entries were good.
   ♦ Brian Schottlaender’s talk
     - Talk was nice; what did we think?
   ♦ Next steps: LAUC-I response to UL questions.
     - Matt Connor posted UL comments on blog & tagged them. No one has responded yet, even to UCI AUL responses.
     - Do we need to have official response to UL questions, especially those posed by our AULs?
       o Questions about their questions:
         - We could answer their questions.
         - Are we happy with them deciding by themselves?
         - Do we want to develop a LAUC-I response? Who would articulate that? Or should we encourage all members to respond?
Brown thinks we’re still in thought process, maybe a little early for an aggregate response.

Peterman thinks it’s worth encouraging people to respond to these questions (AUL questions), even anonymously. To leave them out there un-responded-to is not good.

- Seems like a lot of the questions are being addressed by the Strategic Planning for the Libraries Task Force. What is point of a LAUC-I response when the task force is answering some of these questions for the libraries? Also, who’s going to speak for the staff?
  - Maybe someone will speak for the staff, but not us, that’s not our role.
  - Peterman will consider, though, sending a liball message to encourage people to respond.
  - Though a LAUC-I response might duplicate work done by the task force, this might be the first opportunity for some people to respond.
  - LAUC-I response would be a professional response, which might be different than whatever the task force is doing.
  - Our individual responses are more data for them to use in making decisions going forward.

6. Discussion and decision on LAUC-I storage. Action steps.

- Lin and Williams have looked at options for dealing with LAUC-I paper and electronic records, in consultation with Special Collections and Web Services.
- No records management ever performed on any of the records.
  - Light: only 2-5% of any organization’s output is actually archival. If University Archives goes into an office on campus to assess what is archival, they might take 20% at most. LAUC-I should have an appraisal done to figure out what’s necessary to bring forward. Could probably toss about 50% of print and electronic records.
  - Rare that anyone has ever had to go in and look at the paper files.
    - Brown: last time we had interviews for a UL we looked at background information in LAUC-I paper files; it was interesting to go back and look at the organization structure over time.
    - Light: University Archives has about 50 boxes of library documents no one ever looks at, though not necessarily LAUC-I documents.
- Need to deal with paper documents that are currently in filing cabinets near the staff bathrooms in LL, develop a plan for storage and maintenance.
  - 2 options for paper documents:
    1. Leave things how they are: currently documents are in file cabinets in the bathroom hallway.
      - Advantage: no work involved if we leave things as they are.
      - Disadvantages:
        - Documents are degrading.
        - Documents are hard to find in the mess of papers.
        - The staff restroom location is not good for paper records due to possibility of water damage; pipe break or leak would wipe out the entire organization’s institutional memory.
    2. Move paper docs up to Special Collections.
      - Advantage: Climate controlled
      - Disadvantages:
Anyone wanting to view LAUC-I records would have to look at the documents during Special Collections hours; though this might not be an issue since no one looks at them anyway.

Projects that are higher priority would be done first by Special Collections, so LAUC-I would have to do the bulk of work.

- Ferry: would it be possibility to hire an intern in Special Collections for this project?
  - Light: can only hire UCI students currently, so would need a volunteer, and unpaid volunteers generally want something more exciting. Also, no University Archivist to supervise interns right now.

- Light thinks we should wait to move paper records until some assessment is done to determine what it will entail.

Need to deal with electronic documents that are in shared drives, develop a plan for storage and maintenance.

- Peterman only looks at docs for the year prior.
  - Brown: last three years electronic files were cleaned up.

- Currently have 106 mb of data; 1722 files, 393 folders in LAUC-I folder on the T drive.

- 4 options for electronic documents:
  1. Leave things how they are: currently all documents stored in T drive.
     - Advantages: no work involved if we leave things as they are.
     - Disadvantages:
       - Law librarians don’t have access to the T drive.
       - Retrieval of documents is increasingly difficult as we add folders and files.
       - Search capability for networked drives is spotty at best.
     - Advantages:
       - Accessible to everyone.
       - Documents would have metadata so they’d be more findable.
     - Disadvantages:
       - Since LAUC-I records fall outside of the scope of UCI Space, would have to apply through DSPWG for approval.
         - Light: DSPWG and AULs have stated that UCI Space is only for research purposes, no administrative documents; to request to put LAUC-I stuff in UCI Space will be an uphill battle to convince the AULS that these docs are important to the research mission of the library.
       - Adding metadata requires expertise, time, effort.
  3. Move LAUC-I documents into the Content Management System.
     - Advantages: documents accessible by IP address.
     - Disadvantages:
       - CMS on consortial: the more storage used, the more cost involved.
       - Ferry says this is really not an option.
  4. Keep only the last 2 years on the website.
Keep saving documents to the T drive; in order to post something through the CMS it has to be saved somewhere anyway, so the T drive remains the archival space.

◊ Andrews: we could restructure the T drive folders to include an archive folder and move documents into that folder at a certain time
   ∆ Lin: this could be part of option 1 action.
   ∆ Peterman likes this idea; keep things on the T drive, but archive everything older than 2 years in an archive folder.
   ∆ Light: this makes the most sense from a records management perspective; build in an appraisal function to make sure things that are inappropriate are not moved.

♦ Ferry: Web Services is ready to move the LAUC-I website into the CMS; LAUC-I needs to appoint someone as a representative for 2 years minimum to be the project manager.
   • Peterman: we will not appoint the LAUC-I Secretary to be project manager.
   • Ferry will find out if we can hire a student to do the work on print and electronic records. Summer is an excellent time to get things done.

♦ Ferry thinks moving the website into the CMS needs to happen first; this archival stuff could be part of the student’s overall project. Website is more important right now.
   • Ferry: even though there’s overlap, these are two very distinct projects: website project manager and archival project manager.
   • Ferry and Peterman will work together to make sure that is clear on the calls Peterman sends out

♦ Peterman would like to appoint someone to handle this particular project as soon as possible.
   • Peterman hopes that the commitment will not be too tough, though at the beginning it might be a bit of work.
   • Andrews: what qualifications should the web project manager have, and should they be included in the call?
     o Ferry: they would just be the content owner, so nothing technical needed.
     o Ferry will look at the LAUC description of Web Manager position and get back to Peterman.

♦ Ad-hoc committee should still look at guidelines for the T drive and the wiki; refer to guidelines posted on IT website.

♦ There’s also a retention schedule on the LAUC-I website differentiating what goes on the website vs. what goes on T drive (http://lauci.lib.uci.edu/0203/AdHoc/RetentionSchedule.pdf).
   • Retention schedule documents archival workflow, could be updated and adapted.

**ACTION ITEM:** Ferry will look into whether we can hire a student with LAUC-I funds.
**Update:** Yes it is possible.

**ACTION ITEM:** Peterman will put out a call to LAUC-I to see if anyone is willing to work on the electronic archives part of it.
**Update:** Pending.
**ACTION ITEM:** Peterman will put out a separate call for someone to be project manager for the website, which will include moving the current website into the CMS and then ongoing maintenance.

**Update:** Pending.

7. Standing committees update
   ♦ ALC (Academic Librarianship Cttee.) update -- Andrews
     - Helped Peterman wrap up LAUC-I program, recorded the notes.
     - Peterman and Andrews worked to photograph all the poster tear sheets from the LAUC Regional Meeting and tagged them.
       - Wanted to go back to posters because it was unclear what some of them meant after taking pictures.
       - Peterman working on summaries from each section, will continue to tag them also.
       - Rachel Shulman helped before the program.
     - Had a table at the student appreciation picnic.
       - Talked to 5 students; half were current students/staff who are just about to start library school.
       - Got contact information for one person to further discuss what librarians do.
     - Meeting today to plan the rest of the year.
       - Possible program on library professional associations.
       - Possible panel program to hear from law librarians.
     - Updating the list of librarians who are willing to be mentors to potential and new library students.

**ACTION ITEM:** Peterman will release summaries of each section from the Regional Meeting as soon as they are ready.

**UPDATE:** Pending. Raw data (votes) sent to UCSD LAUC upon request. Peterman might post this instead.

♦ LRC (Library Review Cttee.) update -- Novak
  - Novak not here to give update.

♦ RPDC (Research & Professional Development Cttee.) update -- Light
  - A month ago the LAUC RPDC sent out the letters for the grant recipients, but haven’t yet released the names of those who were given grants. Pretty much everyone who applied got a grant; a number of people who submitted the research grants withdrew, so there was money left over to fund almost all of the presentation grants. Shulman got funded for her research grant proposal. Tomren, Allison, Murphy, maybe others. LAUC should formally publish the list soon. Light will distribute or forward to Peterman to distribute as soon as it goes out.

  - (Aside) Peterman created a section called Recorded Presentations from UC Librarians on the LAUC wiki under Professional and Continuing Education (http://laucwiki.lib.ucdavis.edu/index.php/Recorded_Presentations_from_UC_Librarians).
    - Light notes this is great as long as it does not compete against eScholarship; important to keep those separate
Maybe next year RPDC could draw up a document defining where things go.

**ACTION ITEM:** Peterman/RPDC consider recommending that next year’s committee create a document defining where librarians should put their professional development documents, presentations, etc.

**Update:** This should go into year-end report.

♦ **PC (Program Ctte.) update -- Imamoto**
  - Gallup Strengths Finder Assessment program scheduled for 07/15 12-1:30 pm. Leadership One is the assessment program they chose.
  - People sign up, take the assessment, then attend the program to have it all explained, get a packet of info, etc.
  - Costs about $15 per person. Do we want to cap it at a certain number of people? How much money can we use? Not invite staff this time around?
    - No response from the expert who will work with us about whether there should be a limit on this type of program.
    - Peterman: PC should submit this program to Deb Sunday as a budget request.
    - Ferry will ask for funding for students first, then let Becky know so she can then request funding for the program.

**ACTION ITEM:** Imamoto will wait to hear from Ferry, then will send funding request to Deb Sunday for Strength Finders Assessment program.

**Update:** Done.

♦ **LAUC-I Nomination committee update and orientation to new librarians -- Brown**
  - More on elections
    - Slate set; election set to go forth; electronic ballot ready and pending.
    - Took a little longer to develop slate this year.
    - One open position for ALC but no additional candidates yet. When ballot is released that will still be an open position.
    - Ballot will open today, 05/26/10, and stay open through the end of the work day on 06/03/10.
      - Limited to LAUC-I members by UCINetID.
      - Brown will remind people to contact him if there are any log-in problems.
      - Can only vote once, but can view the ballot as many times as you’d like.
      - Tallying will be ongoing throughout the election.
    - Judy Bube will report on results since Brown’s name is on the ballot.
      - Brown already notified LAUC Secretary Singh about this and the status of the LAUC-I election.
    - Ferry: why did people not want to be candidates?
      - Brown: there is a requirement for committees to balance members across the departments. People were interested in serving but not necessarily in those positions; there were a few people who said they were interested but couldn’t get supervisor approval; there was a general feeling of not being able to commit to the time involved. Not a disinterest per se; people expressed interested in serving on certain committees. Some years there is difficulty in getting candidates for Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect and Secretary.
Some years there’s the difficulty that there are not enough people who have been in their positions long enough to serve on a particular committee, like on LRC. Talked to a lot of people, and it was friendly, but they turned down the nominations nonetheless.

- Andrews: question about the open ALC position; what happens if no one ends up in that position?
  - By-laws allow for a variety of different interpretations:
    - Chair could appoint someone.
    - Had to appoint people this year for ALC and PC.
    - Run committee with a reduced number of positions
    - Has happened in the past due to attrition.
    - Brown: this year ALC members were recruited to serve on other committees; there are provisions in the by-laws for small campuses to allow people to serve on two committees, but LAUC-I chooses not to allow that at this time.
    - Peterman: depending on staffing situation, we may have to look at this decision soon anyway.
    - Imamoto: suggests we could get rid of or combine some committees.

- Brown: law librarians were interested this year in serving on committees, but most are still trying to get situated with their own positions.
  - Imamoto: we should streamline the process of working with the law librarians so it’s easier, i.e. on listservs, calendars, etc.

- Brown: Balloting is electronic again this year, though with the option to print and mail if people want to. One person last year did this last minute.

- Peterman and Sibert are administrators for the ballot.

- LAUC-I Secretary required to forward results to LAUC Secretary.
  - Secretary has formal certification of election and must adhere to the timeline for sending in results for LAUC-I and LAUC ballot anytime before 06/14/10.

- Results will be released to LAUC-I membership, probably by Judy Bube.

- Vote counts will not be released this year to LAUC-I membership. Report of nomination committee for LAUC-I Exec Board does include this data, however.

8. LAUC Executive Conference Call highlights

- Brown will attend June 1 conference call rather than Peterman.
  - Actual resolution concerning support for school librarians.
  - Connor interested in putting other professional development things up on the wiki.
  - LAUC Professional Governance Committee is going to submit a final report detailing all the things that went on in the regional meetings/assemblies as well as the main LAUC Assembly; report will outline the things people identified as needing to be done.
    - Manaka is a member of this committee.

- Last LAUC Executive Conference Call was on May 4. Info was reported to the May 5 General Membership meeting by Lucia Diamond.

9. Wrap up and Adjournment

- Brown notes that when looking through the details about the election this year, Murphy suggested we need to do a by-laws revision concerning the details of
election reporting. Brown relating this to Exec Board, but he doesn’t really want to do another by-laws revision, though he recognizes that some wording is a little vague.

- Sharing with Exec Board in case there’s a question about whether we adhered to official calendar and mechanism for conducting the election, both of which we’re in compliance with.
- Approval for slate based on by-laws provision that a quorum is 33% of the general membership, which was reached electronically.
- Small sentence that ballot has to be approved 7 days before election; interpreted to mean by general membership, which was met.
- Members approved to vote in the electronic ballot includes all law librarians; had to build the list because current LAUC-I membership list is not updated with all law librarians at this time.
  - Some people have a last working day that falls after the opening of the ballot, but that’s ok; as long as they’re current as of today, which is the ballot opening, they are eligible to vote.
  - Any concern by Exec Board about the time that the ballot opens?
    ☧ No.

**ACTION ITEM:** Peterman will update the general membership list to include law librarians and send to Brown.

**Update:** Pending. Peterman will send Excel file from T drive to Libraries HR to check on validity of members, add, delete, etc. Need to move past lists into archive at the end of the year.

- Meeting adjourned at 12:16 pm.

**Next 2010 meetings:**
30 June 28 July 17 August