

---

**LAUC-I Executive Board  
Minutes  
June 7, 2004 \* LL 110**

---

**Present:** Ariel, Landis, Ruttenberg, Tunender, Jacobs, Urrizola, Palmer, Manaka, Palmer

**Absent:** Bube (Riggs joined part of meeting, representing LRC)

**1. Agenda Review and May 3<sup>rd</sup> Minutes**

- Minutes from May 3 were accepted.

**2. Chair Report/Announcements**

- LAUC President Linda Kennedy sent out comprehensive report to membership on Spring Assembly
- LAUC System-wide is gathering data on the Distinguished Step: How many librarians are advancing in the librarian series and how many are in the distinguished step of the new salary schedule?
- There is an ongoing concern about the University budget – there will be a draft statement on the importance of retaining librarian positions forthcoming from LAUC.
- Faculty Profile: Some librarians have created profiles using this system and “library” is a department on the system.
- Is there an interest in parallel play? The two times discussed were after ALA, piggybacking on the call for reviews, or right after ALA.  
**ACTION:** Cathy will organize a parallel play through the Professional Development Committee – Late June/early July and again in August. People will be encouraged to bring their most recent CVs.

**3. LAPTOP:** Nothing to report

**4. Librarian Emeritus Nominations Procedures**

- Munoff and Kaufman drafted this document. Killackey has reviewed and approved. Ariel’s initial proposed revisions (underlined on the draft) are acceptable to Kaufman.
- Page 2: *Distinguished Status* needs to be clarified in this document. “However, formal distinguished status is not a requisite ...” or “It’s not necessary for the librarian to have ...”
- We could suggest that distinguished status lends itself to an automatic or expedited process of emeritus status, where the UL will automatically recommend distinguished status librarians for emeritus status.
- Executive Board discussed the need for efficiency in this process and the potential problem of making too many distinctions among librarians. In general, Executive Board thought this process could be more expedited, and did not recommend a separate procedure for librarians with distinguished status.

- There was a question about the difference between emeritus status and emeritus benefits.
- **ACTION:** Ariel will make suggested changes/clarifications and forward to J. Kaufman for subsequent distribution for membership comment.

### **5. Professional Development Committee: *Recommendations to Foster an Environment of Mentoring in the UCI Libraries***

- PDC revised the document in response to questions raised at the May 10<sup>th</sup> Membership Meeting.
- PDC did not want to set up a formal mentoring system – for fear of creating its own demise
- This is PDC’s final proposal on mentoring.
- There was a discussion about where the recognition for mentoring should fall – Criteria 1 or 3? Kaufman thought it should be Criteria 1. Palmer will follow up with Kaufman on this point – consensus in Executive Board that it would depend on the relationship between the particular mentor and mentee, but we tend to think of this as a Criteria 3 activity. Some on Executive Board thought that if the mentoring relationship was also supervisory, then that would be Criteria 1 for the mentors.
- **ACTION:** Palmer to follow up with JK on criteria document and will follow up with Executive Board on it, with proposed language.
- There was some discussion about how mentoring would be documented, and upon whose initiation would it occur.
- PDC is interested in getting this started and developing documentation as necessary.
- Executive Board wants to underscore the role of LAUC-I to provide opportunities for mentors and mentees to find each other.
- We agreed to revisit this in a year to reflect on it.
- We talked about a possible LAUC-I Program – talking about our experiences with mentoring – inside or outside the UCI Libraries. PDC can be charged with that next year – perhaps as a lunch with LAUC-I?

### **6. Librarian Rank and Step Information Availability**

- LAUC Executive Board passed a resolution at their May 14<sup>th</sup> meeting directing the President to ask each Division to assess whether its members are interested in making rank and step information of members available as is the current practice at UC San Diego.
- Is LAUC membership interested sharing the rank and step of UCI Librarians? If so, how would the information be disseminated?

#### **DISCUSSION**

- Would this make our review processes more transparent?
- Everytime LAUC wants to gather information, it’s always from scratch. There hasn’t been a good way to share or gather or retrieve data. Doing this on a regular basis would facilitate that.

- Others agreed that the information would be useful – for recruiting (at what level are people appointed?) or diversity issues/gender, etc.
- Data would help with equity issues. Might have to attach names to this. There were different perspectives shared on the names issue.
- To clarify: this is *public* information – but does LAUC want to make it more accessible?
- The most compelling reason to do this is for LAUC to have the information.
- We might want to add and track other demographics
- Should we take this idea to membership, and mention that there is some hesitation on Executive Board?
- If doing this revealed some equity issues – that’s important and useful for LAUC.
- What happened to the old charts about numbers and ranks per campus?
- LAUC should articulate why it wants to know this information, including whether and why to include names? The system-wide membership needs to grapple with this. Why does our professional association rely on HR departments for information about its ranks?
- UCB demonstrated that there are fewer librarians and more students and faculty. What do we want to know about UCI?
- **Next steps:** We will send Linda’s message to the membership, announce the formation of a sub-committee to investigate the collection of local data, and that sub-committee will prepare a presentation to LAUC-I membership. Out of all that would come a response to Linda as well as a local plan. Bill (Chair) Yvonne, Judy to form sub-committee.

## **7. Committee Reports: Draft Template**

- Ariel could only find two annual reports (ALC and PDC) from last year on the website and T drive
- Ariel prepared a template for future reports which Executive Board reviewed and liked.

## **8. Academic Personnel Procedures for Librarians: Revisions**

- Representing LRC, C. Riggs joined the Executive Board for further discussion of APP-L revisions.
- This year’s LRC found it would have been helpful to have the bio bibliography personal statement. Can it be put back into the file without the personal information?
- We discussed why the bio bib would be useful and asked the LRC to make a proposal that includes an explanation why a redacted version be useful to the committees’ deliberations. Alternatively, the LRC could propose the inclusion of a CV, and spell out the information it wants.
- We need to discuss this further and talk about other revisions. Ariel will ask for an extension on submitting proposed changes to J. Kaufman.

**Meeting adjourned.**