

LAUC-I Executive Board
Minutes (*approved 1-14-04*)
12-01-03

Present: Wilson, Urrizola, Ariel, Ruttenberg, Landis, Palmer, Jacobs, Manaka
Absent: Bube, Tunender

1. Agenda Review and Meeting Minutes

- Executive Board: November 10, 2003: Review and Approve
 - Minutes not yet completed – review postponed.
 - In the future, Chair and Secretary will jointly review draft minutes before sending them out to either Executive Board or General Membership; often advantageous to combine recollections and perspectives.
- Membership: November 17
 - Under item 8, final bullet: Add the date (10/27/03) of the Academic Senate Committees Transition Meeting.

2. Preparation for Fall Assembly

- The meeting packet included preliminary agendas for both LAUC Executive Board and LAUC General Assembly.
- Ariel also extracted and included those aspects of the 11/17 membership minutes pertaining to Assembly for the convenience of LAUC-I delegates.
- The Information Literacy and Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction Reports were straightforward from LAUC-I's perspective – there wasn't a lot of discussion, compared with Position Paper #1.
 - There was some confusion in the 11/17 minutes over LAUC-I's support of "Option 3" in the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction Report. Ultimately, the collective memory of the Executive Board on 12/1 was that there was no support in LAUC-I for Option 3.
- Position Paper #1 Suggested Revisions
 - Ariel sent (and included in the meeting packet) two drafts incorporating recommendations from LAUC-I – one with "track changes" displayed and one just showing the edited text.
 - Ariel summarized her edits as follows:
 - Moved all general language together and re-organized sequence accordingly
 - Included a general statement about career status – separate from Assistant to Associate move
 - Incorporated Kaufman's suggested introductory note in the text of the document
 - Ariel would like to send this edited document to Systemwide LAUC Executive Board – as well as the LAUC-I "Criteria Document" (for information), since it is a more substantial expression of similar issues.
 - FYI from Ariel: We have not yet received a response from Library Administration on either the "Criteria Document" or the Proposal for use of Rollover Professional Development Funds

DISCUSSION OF POSITION PAPER #1:

- Why call out the word “automatically” in reference to career status with promotion to Assistant to Associate? (Number 1 in numbered list under “Career Status”)
 - Explanation: The previous document was incomplete about Career Status, and this was meant to clarify a more general statement.
 - Executive Board decided that the language about Career Status in LAUC-I’s Criteria Document is clearer on this point. Ariel distributed the relevant text for review.
 - **Suggestion:**
 - Leave first paragraph of PP 1 beginning, “Career Status is achieved ...” but replace the numbered list with section 4 of the Criteria Document, beginning with the sentence “Assistant Librarians achieve ...”, dropping the parentheses. Cut the first sentence of paragraph two, and move the last sentence of paragraph one to the end. Footnote, rather than provide a text citation, for the MOU.
 - EB thought that the reference to the MOU was essential, since LAUC documents should apply to all librarians (represented and non-represented) and the cited points are not included in the APM.
 - In sending our suggestions to LAUC Executive Board, call out fact that we are moving MOU citation to a footnote.
- Ariel: The other major change was adding “and/or” to the paragraph above Career Status – to emphasize Criteria 2 OR 3 OR 4.
- Ariel: Are there any concerns about the last issue – discussion of promotion to the rank of librarian? Do we agree with inclusion of the “total” career of the librarian?
 - Executive Board discussed alternative wording, including “professional library career,” and “total library career,” and settled on “full professional career of the candidate” in order to capture other relevant professional experience, including teaching.
- Ariel: Are there concerns about the last sentence, “Advancement to the top of the Librarian rank...” What does it currently imply, and what do we wish to convey, about the still controversial (across the system) “distinguished step”?
 - If we remove the word “distinguished” does that imply a disagreement with the distinguished step?
 - Reminder that LAUC has discussed but does not have a Position Paper on the distinguished step, although various campuses do have statements, including UCI.
 - Distinguished is separate from outstanding and continuing, which is required for advancement at every step.
 - Executive Board agreed on two possible suggested word changes:
 - 1) “Advancement to the top of the Librarian rank should be predicated upon a career history of outstanding service and continuing achievement.”
 - 2) “Advancement to the top two steps of the Librarian rank should be predicated upon a career history and continuing achievements that can be regarded as distinguished.” This second possibility should include a recommendation to actually tackle, system-wide, the issues around and

criteria for distinguished step. (In other words, stick to the language of the APM or say clearly that “top” currently means top two steps).

3. Verano Holiday Project with LEA: Bube

See Rayne Hamre’s e-mail – the new deadline to contribute to this project is December 10. Ariel encouraged Executive Board to promote support of this project among LAUC-I members and other colleagues.

4. Issue from Membership: Retirement and Emeritus Status and Benefits

Ariel explained the printed e-mail messages included in the meeting packet, with some additional background on the discussion of emeritus status and benefits and UCI.

DISCUSSION

- There are two separate issues: PI and Emeritus/Retirement Benefits
- After some preliminary discussion and concerns about the issues expressed by Executive Board members, Ariel said she is inclined to consider following the suggestion of two of the LAUC-I members who brought their concerns to Executive Board that LAUC-I write a letter to Associate Executive Vice Chancellor Killackey expressing our concern about this issue.
- Clarification that these (restrictive) UCI policies are pre-existing – they are not in response to the new librarians’ contract – and they apply to non-senate academic appointees in general
- One member stated that it’s unclear what Library Administration can do -- existing policy is that when you retire, you lose your UCINet ID – that’s NACS’s policy, not the library’s. Other members felt more strongly that Library Administration could pursue other options for librarians, even under these existing policies, and also work to change the policies as applied to librarians.
- In communication with the libraries’ AFT Representative, Killackey indicated willingness to pursue the email issue with NACS.
- Executive Board liked the tone and approach the AFT rep’s e-mail to Killackey, “that this indicates an absence of policy rather than a denial of benefits to librarians.”
- All agreed that it ideally would be best to work collaboratively with Library Administration and that we will consult with J. Kaufman before any LAUC-I communication with Killackey. Our case would be stronger with Munoff’s support, if possible.
- Executive Board’s consensus was that LAUC-I needs to do some fact-finding:
 - We should investigate our own situation without worrying too much about other non-senate academic appointees – it is more relevant to investigate librarians at other UC campuses. Reminder that UCI librarians participate in Academic Senate and further that librarians intend to stay for a long time – we’re not explicitly temporary, we’re not (typically) grant-funded – and typically have a deeper and longer-term commitment to the institution/campus.
 - Question: Is UCI the only exception? How did this happen?
 - What are the implications of distinguishing ourselves from other non-senate academic appointees?

- How many non-academic senate appointees are there? That serve for 10 years or more? That are getting ready to retire? Palmer will obtain this information.
- Ariel will look into the criteria for faculty emeritus status – does it require (for librarians) getting faculty letters of review, as it does on other campuses?
- Executive Board wants to proceed, but understands that this requires some strategy vis a vis some of these issues.
- Consensus to proceed as distinct group from other non-senate academics.
- Ariel will begin drafting some language, but before that, set up a meeting with Judy Kaufman and as many Executive Board members as possible. Executive Board members felt this meeting should be scheduled as soon as possible.

ACTION ITEMS: Palmer to obtain information about non-senate academics, Ariel to obtain information about criteria for faculty emeritus status and to set up a meeting with Kaufman at a time when as many Executive Board members as possible can attend.

5. Activity/Status Reports: Committees, Task Forces and Members at Large

- **Academic Librarianship: Wilson**
 - Wilson distributed drafts of two surveys, both based on the charge in the Draft Strategic Plan on Career Recruitment and Outreach.
 - **DISCUSSION ON LIBRARIAN SURVEY:**
 - Make distance learning into its own question – ask about experience with library school distance learning programs. Prompt, “as a student” or “as an instructor?”
 - Add internships *or fellowships*
 - Have you ever supervised an intern or fellow, if so please describe?
 - Add “willing to act as a resource/consultant”
 - Add a question to librarians survey about research/professional interests
 - Add a deadline (12/22) and number the questions.
 - **ACTION ITEM:** Yvonne will send revised versions via e-mail, replies requested via e-mail to Yvonne.
 - **DISCUSSION ON STUDENT/STAFF SURVEY:**
 - Number questions
 - Add “dates” to “enrolled in library school”
 - Add “where” to thinking about attending library school”
 - Add “other information professional” to question about career goals
 - Add URL to HR page
 - Reorder questions
 - Get a list from Gates in HR of student supervisors and send separately
 - **OTHER DISCUSSION**
 - Include in librarian message that roster of librarians will be posted on LAUC-I website
 - Doesn’t matter where this information resides – everyone can link to it – but it should be determined who makes the most sense to maintain
 - Draft strategic plan does specify that maintenance issues will be evaluated later

- Executive Board will review results and determine how to collect and distribute the information, and what the maintenance issues are.
- **Library Review Committee: Bube** (not present)
- **Professional Development: Palmer:** Currently reviewing articles on mentoring
- **Membership: Urrizola:** Contacted 20 people who missed the previous LAUC-I meeting and got some responses, several noting scheduling problems. Sent meeting packets to those who missed the 11/17 meeting. Will think about barriers to participation in LAUC-I (desk service, e.g.)
- **Academic Senate Committees: Tunender** (not present)
- **T Drive/Web Task Force:** Postpone until next meeting.
- **Nominations Committee: Manaka:** Will send e-mail to membership, inviting people to participate, will send first to Executive Board to review. The committee has met and will meet again on Dec. 12. Manaka has met with MacLeod (past Chair of Nominations Committee), received our nomination suggestions and shared them with the committee. The e-mail will go out by December 5 – with a deadline for end of the year or early January – with a reminder e-mail after the holidays. Executive Board suggested that the committee deal first with elected LAUC-I committees and offices, and then subsequently deal with potential appointments to senate committees and LAUC committees. Explicitly encourage potential candidates to talk to current office-holders.
- **Program Committee:** Jacobs to send a Lunch with LAUC-I announcement for next week's discussion on stress management.

6. Bylaws Revisions (postponed to January 14 meeting)

7. Old Business

None

8. New Business

LAUC resolution honoring Judy Horn