

**Minutes  
LAUC-I General Membership Meeting  
Monday, May 12, 2003  
1:00-3:00pm, ML 570**

---

**Present: Ariel, Bisom, Bube, Davis-Kahl, Dooley, Ford, Gelfand, Goldberg, Horn, Hughes, Jazayeri, Kaufman, Kjaer, Landis, MacLeod, Manaka, McAdam, Renton, Riggs, Ruttenberg, Sisson, Sorrell, Tanji, Urrizola, and Woo.**

---

**Meeting Called to Order at 1:05pm**

Manaka reviewed the agenda, including the *Proposed Personnel Practices for Librarians*, Spring Assembly preparation, the Bylaws revisions and an election update.

**I. Approval of Minutes**

Minutes of the February 10, 2003 General Membership Meeting were adopted with two clarifications.

**II. Proposals Regarding Librarian Personnel Practices in the UCI Libraries**

Judy Kaufman led the discussion of the *Proposals Regarding Librarian Personnel Practices in the UCI Libraries*.

Proposal 1: *Allow Review Initiators and others in the supervisory chain (Secondary Supervisors, AULs) to view, by request, past reviews of librarians who currently report to them. The librarians whose reviews are being viewed would not be notified.*

Kaufman clarified that this would give the Review Initiator (RI) and others in the supervisory chain access to the past review documentation, including factual resumes, peer letters, RI letters, Secondary Supervisor letters (if any), AUL letters, Library Review Committee letters, the Ad Hoc Committee letters (if any), and the University Librarian's letters as well as the reviewee's responses to supplemental materials added to the file. She said that the members of the Ad Hoc Committees, if any, would be kept confidential. Some of the membership asked that she reconsider notifying the reviewee that the file was being reviewed and at what stage it was being read. Several members were opposed to this proposal saying that librarians should be able to start fresh with a new supervisor.

Proposal 2: *By request of review committees, allow review committees to see previous review files (whole or partial, as needed) of a librarian under review in the following situations.*

- A. *By request of the review committee when the RI recommends an action that requires review of the entire career at UCI and the review committee feels that viewing previous reviews would help to clarify questions raised in the review about the entire career.*

- B. *By request of the review committee when the content of a current review references a previous review and the review committee feels it needs to view part or all of the previous review in order to seek clarification.*

Members asked about the faculty model, which does not give access to past reviews. Members discussed the actions that were covered in Proposal 2A and suggested adding “termination” to the list of actions. Some members were troubled that decisions about careers would be based on past review documentation. Kaufman said that requests for access to past review documentation would be made to clarify questions raised in the current review file.

*Proposal #3: Make it a routine practice for the AUL for Administrative Services to send to each Review Initiator and AUL, after the completion of each review cycle, redacted copies of the review committee(s)’ recommendation for each librarian that reports to the RI and AUL.*

Members expressed concern about the distribution of the letters; some suggested having the letters read in Human Resources rather than sending them to the RI and AUL. Some members also suggested always sending a copy of the letter to the librarian under review. Others pointed out the librarian might not want a copy of the letter. Kaufman said she thought that the review committee(s)’ letters could not be sent to all librarians because of the terms of the MOU and APM; the librarian needs to formally request the letters.

*Proposal #4: When a Review Initiator is preparing a review file for a librarian when the previous review resulted in a “no action” decision after the normal period at step [as described in APP I.B.1 1], allow the Review Initiator to include in the current review file non-confidential supervisory letters from the earlier review. If the Review Initiator includes such material, the Review Initiator shall inform the librarian under review and shall give him or her copies of these past supervisory letters. The Review Initiator shall also make clear for other readers of the file that these are copies of non-confidential materials from the earlier file.*

Kaufman explained that this refers to materials from the review(s) since the last positive action. In order to fairly assess the performance, reviewers need access to this documentation. Members asked what would happen if the Review Initiator were new; would material written by a past RI be included. Members were inclined to be in favor of this proposal.

### **III. Getting Ready for Spring Assembly**

Position Paper #1 and Distinguished Status:

Manaka gave an update on the Position Papers and other issues to be discussed at Spring Assembly. She said there was an impasse at Fall Assembly related to the Committee on Professional Governance's report and Position Paper #1, especially the following: the focus on the distinguished step in Position Paper #1; the definition of "distinguished;" whether the designation of "distinguished" should be associated with a step within the salary scale; and how to define "significant achievement" as it relates to awarding the distinguished designation. Manaka pointed out that the revised Position Paper #1 does not mention the "distinguished step" but, according to Kaufman, it allows it. Ariel thought they were trying to eliminate it. Some

members questioned whether the designation of "distinguished" would be tied to a specific rank and step or not. There was confusion about the specific questions to be addressed during Spring Assembly; our delegates were concerned about their ability to represent the views of LAUC-I members. A quick vote was taken to get a sense of the membership related to Position Paper #1. Of the 23 people present, approximately 5 people supported changes as written in full; approximately 10 people supported the changes, except for part 4; and 17 people thought we needed significantly more discussion. Based on this, Manaka will find out from Grassian if the Spring Assembly delegates will be asked to vote on Position Paper #1. If needed, Manaka will schedule a special meeting of the membership during the week of May 26<sup>th</sup> to discuss it so our delegates can represent the views of the membership.

Patriotic Act Resolution from UCR:

The membership briefly reviewed the Patriot Act resolution, which will be introduced by UCR at the Spring Assembly. LAUC-I supports the resolution.

#### **IV. Brief Review of Bylaws Revisions**

Horn reviewed the Bylaws revision process. Horn and Wilson have been working on the Bylaws for some time. The Bylaws were discussed briefly at the several General Membership meeting. The revisions were presented to the Executive Board, which will discuss them at the May 19<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. Based on that discussion, additional changes will be made. The Bylaws revisions will be shared with the membership and discussed at the June 9<sup>th</sup> General Membership Meeting. Further changes can be suggested by the membership. All changes have to be brought to the membership at least ten days before the election. The Bylaws revisions have to be approved by the statewide committee.

Ariel distributed the changes she is suggesting to *Article II: Duties and Objectives*. For comparative purposes, she provided a table with language of the Bylaws related to "duties and objectives" for Berkeley, Davis and UCLA LAUC divisions. Her goal was to strengthen the duties of LAUC-I. The membership briefly discussed these Bylaws changes. She asked that members forward to her suggestions for further revisions related to this section of the Bylaws.

#### **V. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.