
LAUC-I Executive Board
July 12, 2004
Minutes Approved 8-2-04

Present: Wilson, Ariel, Palmer, Urrizola, Landis, Tunender, Ruttenberg, Bube

Absent: Manaka, Jacobs

1. Agenda Review

- Nothing added to agenda.

2. June 7th Meeting Minutes: Review and Approval

- On collecting information on rank and step: Ariel will inquire how other LAUC divisions are handling Linda Kennedy's message on this.
- LAUC-I will focus its sub-committee on investigating the collection of local data
- The sub-committee will come back to the Executive Board in September.
- *Minutes of June 7 accepted with revisions.*
- Ruttenberg will bring *broad* minutes from our supplemental meetings to the next Executive Board meeting on August 2.

3. Vice-Chair Report: Budget

- We were within \$8.00 of our budget this year after the laptop purchase.
- Landis will show us a yearly report on how much we spent on various things: such as \$550 on photocopying. He will also provide a breakdown for refreshments and other kinds of expenses. Executive Board will talk at our transition meeting about what LAUC-I spent money on this year.
- Landis distributed a preliminary draft report – including cost, member feedback, etc. – on the Spring program. He will send the final report to LAUC-I membership, as well as Melanie Hawks and Library Executive Council. Landis will report on this at the July 26 membership meeting.
- Planning documents from the Spring Program are on the LAUC-I T drive, in the Ad Hoc Committee folder. Landis will make reference to that drive in the report, as well as the number of other institutions represented at the program.

4. Secretary Report: Laptop

- In order to stay in budget, we had to sacrifice certain peripherals, such as a case.
- Landis will follow-up with Systems about getting it loaded and ready for use.
- LAUC-I will need to get a new case.
- FYI: LAUC-I went through the formal computer requesting process with Library Systems for this purchase.

5. Nominations and Elections: Update

- The deadline for LRC run-off election vote is July 17.
- We will be making committee appointments for Academic Senate and LAUC system-wide committees at our next meeting. Ariel, Landis and Ruttenberg will meet in advance of the next meeting on this issue.

6. LAUC-I Mentoring Proposal

- Palmer followed up with Kaufman about what review criteria mentoring falls within. Kaufman is fine not designating a single criteria at this point. It may need to be somewhat flexible depending on the circumstances.
- For the final draft, an attribution to the ARL Spec Kit on mentoring was added.
- On July 26, we will present this document to the membership to accept, file or reject it. Filing a document does not mean rejecting it – it's part of the record of the organization and can be used as information in the future. Filing might be a good action for this document, since it's low on specific action that needs follow up. This might give rise to a separate proposal, based on this document, that would be a formal action-oriented proposal for mentoring.
- Presenting and discussing the document with membership will put it in the collective memory of the organization, and filing it keeps it in the record. Let's recommend that it be an active working document for the Professional Development Committee.
- There was a side question raised about whether it was the responsibility of the Vice Chair or the Past Chair to orient new members to LAUC-I (this was raised because calling new members' attention to this mentoring document will be important). We will consult the by-laws on this responsibility.
- The Professional Development Committee *is* still planning a "parallel play" session for adding librarians' information to the Faculty Profile System.
- Under "Expectations of LAUC-I," suggestion to make reference to the PDC's responsibility to remember these ideas and work with the Program Committee to implement them.
- **We will present this document to membership on July 26 and recommend that the membership files the document for the future working document of the PDC.**

7. University Librarian Review

- Ariel shared a draft message to Killackey in response to his 7/2/04 email message re. upcoming UL review. Executive Board approved the draft and thought this message should come from Executive Board, with a CC to the LAUC-I membership. See text of message:
<http://listserv.lib.uci.edu/pipermail/lauci/attachments/20040712/a62e200a/attachment.htm>

8. Proposed Revisions to Professional Development Policies

- Departmental funds are becoming more limited.
- This proposal gives librarians additional options in spending their \$1,200 allocation. At the same time, there is some concern that the implication of this policy is that librarians will have to use their own funds, instead of departmental funds, to support *all* their professional activities.
- It varies whether professional organizations have their own funds, small organizations and committees might not, and various positions might not have access to those funds.
- Several people thought it would be useful to establish a minimum amount or threshold that departments would fund – beyond which the personal professional development funds are more appropriate.

- Can LAUC-I help those people who run out of money?
- There is a concern that this would be applied inequitably among departments.
- Let's ask: can we have a conversation about commonly understood departmental support for professional activities?
- Executive Board accepts this language but suggests a broader conversation about departmental funding at a later membership meeting.

9. Academic Personnel Procedures for Librarians:

- Executive Board and LRC should respond separately to Kaufman.
- LRC should report to membership on non-confidential issues related to their *process*.
- Revising the APP-L is a long term process – we have to decide what's important and work toward those things.
- Remember that there are three different streams of proposals: LRC, Executive Board, and Kaufman herself.
- It is problematic to incorporate certain procedural issues – such as timeliness and confidentiality -- into the APP-L rather than an appendix, since they really should apply to all participants in the review process.
- Executive Board wants a comprehensive report to membership from the LRC, including a statistical breakdown of review actions and other non-confidential concerns about the process. We could still consider that, separate from what's now being proposed for the APP-L.
- Anything the LRC would tell Executive Board should be appropriate to tell the entire membership. We are interested in substantive process issues.
- Should Ariel and Bube go through Kaufman's memo to LRC in May and make recommendations for what procedural issues should be extracted and put in appendix, and what are reasonable to keep in the APP-L? The LRC has not responded to Kaufman's May memo.
- On July 19, Kaufman will send out an updated matrix of her proposed suggestions to the membership.
- We briefly discussed the issue of letters for a first review.

DISCUSSION

- If it's not required, it probably won't happen.
- It used to be required in **all** reviews to get letters – it was simplified in part because of the workload issue. Some are concerned that this has meant that the supervisory review piece has become strengthened relative to the peer review piece.
 - Maybe we can just bring this up as something the membership should consider. If there are no letters, there can be no acceleration, even if up the chain someone thought an acceleration was justified.
 - Anyone can ask for feedback on their work at any time – especially in the climate of mentoring.

10. Planning for upcoming membership meeting: Will handle via email.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.