

Present:

LAUC-I: Ariel, Landis, Manaka, Ruttenberg, Tunender, Urrizola, Wilson, Jacobs

Executive Council: Hughes, Kiehl, Kaufman, Munoff, Tanji

Absent: Bube, Palmer

LAUC-I and Executive Council

1. Agenda Review

The meeting agenda was developed by Ariel and Kaufman jointly. The group agreed to (try to) limit each item to a 10 minute discussion.

2. Planning for Spring Program

- For those who might not have checked e-mail this morning, Ariel sent a suggestion for a program about organizational culture.
- Landis led a brief discussion, asking for preliminary feedback from Executive Council on the ideas gathered thus far from Executive Board to spend the \$3,000 made available to LAUC-I this year for a special program. Those ideas are:
 - Collaboration and organizational culture
 - Work/life balance issues
 - Mentoring and recruitment
 - PATRIOT Act
 - Higher education funding – focus on California
 - Innovative roles for academic libraries: file-sharing, copyright, other digital issues
- Landis suggested that this was a chance for the AULs or GM to weigh in on any of these choices -- are there any that we *shouldn't* pursue?
- Tanji suggested consideration of the topic of “inter-generational synergy,” something that is current hot research topic – it might fall under organizational culture.
- We can begin to categorize our ideas as “informational” vs. “action-oriented.”
- The group agreed that we probably would want any of the topics to lead to action outcomes, or provide tools to suggest action.
- Kaufman can find the name of a terrific speaker for work/life issues.
- There was a suggestion to draw on UCI faculty expertise on organizational culture.
- Ariel will put this discussion item on the agenda for the next LAUC-I membership meeting. It was understood that this discussion fulfilled the proposal guideline that the program be developed in consultation with Executive Council.
- LAUC-I has a lot of leeway, from the perspective of Executive Council, to craft this program. There was general agreement that if we decide to do a program which is predominantly informational in nature, that we promote it as such.
- Some thought that higher education funding would be a very depressing program – others said that it may be too early to put the current situation in any kind of perspective. It was agreed that the higher education topic be set aside for consideration next year.

3. Career Recruitment and Outreach Program: Development of Library Internship Program

- Ariel and Kaufman had briefly discussed an internship program at their meeting on 1/15.
- Ariel asked Executive Council their level of interest in developing an internship program -- introducing interns to functions and services across the library divisions

DISCUSSION:

- A number of librarians at UCI have worked with interns in the past – either from UCLA and in less formal arrangements
- There is a growing interest among students in these types of opportunities.
- We need a programmatic approach to develop an internship.
- We have Humanities 75 on the books – would it be useful to have a course component to an internship?
- Hughes was in charge of the post-MLS library residency program at U. Michigan, and asked about the length of time for which the internship was conceived. She noted that it is very difficult to construct meaningful tasks within a limited time frame.
- It might be more meaningful if internship was focused – and did not attempt to expose a particular intern to the library broadly.
- Combined with a course component, we might be able to provide a broad presentation of ideas, but at the same time develop focused, targeted internships.
- The library should benefit from the internships.
- The work should not be clerical in nature
- Interns work would focus within a particular division, but could take advantage of broad-based opportunities. Example: a collections intern recently went on tour of technical services with new Research Librarian Harold Gee.
- There should be a discussion of the pros and cons of an ad hoc vs. a programmatic framework. Would this be different than the UCSD program – an internship with student employees to introduce them to the profession?
- Ariel: We wanted a general sense of interest today – which can lead to more thinking about next steps. Unless the internship is a program, we can't effectively advertise it. As a program, we could promote it with a brochure, e.g. as a component of our career recruitment and outreach activities.
- A program would also provide a common expectation of how an internship would occur – contact HR, etc.
- Education & Outreach might have something to contribute to this discussion [note: Palmer was absent] vis a vis their outreach to student clubs, and E&O's interest in Humanities 75.
- Kaufman described her experience with a library internship at SUNY Stonybrook and urged LAUC-I to consider our goals. If we want to attract people to librarianship, it may not need to be “mutually beneficial” in the sense that the library has to get something out of it.
- We briefly discussed length of time, credit, and whether the program should be for graduate students or undergraduates.
- Kaufman would be willing to serve on a Task Force to consider this further.

- Munoff indicated that he is in general supportive – but we should know that an internship program is difficult to do well. He also encouraged us to think about current library employees as possible participants.

4. Retirement and Emeritus Status and/or Benefits

Kaufman talked to Killackey. He is working with NACS on the UCINet ID issue (a benefits – not a status -- issue). Kaufman clarified that all retirees have access to the same parking permits for purchase.

Kaufman is working with Munoff on a process for nominating librarians for emeritus status – they will bring something to LAUC-I for review in the next two months. Within the UC system, only UCLA has written procedures for emeritus nominations – and their procedures are more elaborate than UCI would want to adopt.

5. Principal Investigator Status

Kaufman: Nothing to report – there has been no update on this issue.

DISCUSSION:

- All non-Senate academics can be PIs by *exception* – needs UL’s recommendation to Vice Chancellor for Research. This process does happen on this campus (nurses, for example). This is a system-wide policy.
- UCI Libraries do have a grants process on the Library Administration website – grant-seekers need to fill out a pre-proposal concept. These come to UL/Munoff and if the PI status is an issue, Munoff will review and talk about his recommendation with the applicant.
- Munoff: Not his preference to be listed as the PI on every grant. He appealed this initially and was rejected initially by the Vice Chancellor for Research. However, the current EVC is sympathetic to wanting the actual researcher to be the PI.
- At UCI there is now a standard procedure for requesting an exception (this is a process for UL, not the applicant).
- **Recommendation that we add to grants website that this is the place to request the PI issue – as part of our local process.**
- **ACTION ITEM: To review grants website to make sure it’s clear and enhance as necessary/desired.**
- **Recommendation that we have a brown bag or early bird on this issue next year (with appropriate administrator) – this would also promote awareness of grants in general.**

6. Privacy Issues: Update

Hughes: Clarified that confidentiality is about the retention of records, and privacy is about rights of the user. Susan Lessick conducted a library privacy audit – UCI Libraries are in great shape protecting confidentiality. Executive Council plans to share these results and report to the library – perhaps directly to LAUC-I membership as a professional librarian issue? The Privacy Task Force did have some recommendations – and a recent ARL SPEC Kit forced us to look hard at retention of records. Our goal is reduce the vulnerability of information – so we need to be mindful of this in posting or reporting on our own results or privacy situation.

ACTION ITEM: To check with Lessick about reporting at the LAUC-I membership meeting on Feb. 9.

7. Open Librarian Positions: Update on status, process and criteria for determining recruitment priorities and position descriptions; possible roles for LAUC-I.

Munoff: This is heavily tied to our budget – we still don't know the full extent of this year's, much less next year's budget situation. We do anticipate that next year will be bad. Other UC campuses are in hard-freezes, even considering layoffs. What we do (or don't do) this year will help us manage next year.

As for process: There is a well-established process of holding discussions in the divisions, and collating recommendations into a master list. It is Munoff's intention to involve everyone in the library in this process.

It will be summer before we really know anything – some depends on the bond issues (including Prop 55).

We don't want to make decisions in the short term that would just need to be undone. Intention is to avoid layoffs and maintain some discretion about which positions to fill. Discussions in the divisions will take place when we have some more knowledge of our circumstances.

Kaufman suggested that we can have discussions now about coping in the next few years, and continuing to cover vacant positions. She noted that such discussions are taking place across campus. Perhaps these can take place in the divisions. Or maybe this can be a program idea for a library-wide discussion.

8. UCI Faculty Profile: Postponed

9. Old Business/New: None

LAUC-I Executive Board

1. Agenda Review and Meeting Minutes

Minutes of 1/14 approved. We have achieved a happy medium between too much and too little information in the minutes.

We discussed whether we need EB meetings on both 2/25 and 3/1? Perhaps we should develop task forces for both the internship program and the spring program and have those meet separately?

We decided to keep both meetings on the books and use one for a task force meeting. We may use the 3/1 meeting for this.

Ariel will get more information about the UCI Career Fair. She will check with Palmer about E&O activities in past career fairs.

2. Meeting with Executive Council: Follow-up, next steps.

Executive Board agreed that Munoff should be invited to recast his comments at the LAUC-I Membership meeting.

In the meantime, librarians can initiate this discussion locally in their departments. We discussed the limitations of divisional discussions: what about the cross-divisional positions, such as grants or planning?

We discussed the possibility of a list of positions coming to LAUC-I at some point for review. Whether or not LAUC-I gets to review position priorities and descriptions, the bottom line is that there may not be recruitments for a while. It may be best to review the overall budget situation and let the membership hear Munoff talk about his strategies for avoiding layoffs. Can he also talk about what he thinks our overall professional strategy should be, given that we want to move forward with new initiatives, but with less professional staff? As we work in departments and individually, what should we be doing, emphasizing? What can we sacrifice, what's not essential?

Executive Board agreed that this would be worth a special meeting to discuss if scheduling warrants and UL agrees.

3. Spring Program

ACTION: Landis will put out a call for participation on the spring program committee. We will charge this new task force with planning including determination of the topic. Tunender and Landis will be on the task force, and Jacobs will appoint someone from the Program Committee. There was interest in a program on organizational culture and higher education, as well as work/life balance issues.

4. Nominations Committee

Manaka reported that we have both self-nominations and nominations of others, but they are not equally distributed across the vacancies.

Crooks is approaching individuals currently to find out their interest in serving. Once that list is determined, the committee will bring a final slate to Executive Board. There will still be time for people to be individually approached and encouraged to run.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.