

---

LAUC-I Membership Meeting

7-26-04

MINUTES

---

**Present:** Ariel, Bisom, Collins, Dooley, Ford, Frank, Gee, Gelfand, Goldberg, Grahame, Harvey, Hughes, Jazayeri, Kaufman, Kiehl, Landis, Love, Manaka, McAdam, Murphy, Novak, Riggs, Ruttenberg, Sisson, Sorrell, Tanji, Tsang, Urrizola, Vick, Wilson, Yu

**Absent:** Bell, Bube, Clancy, Crooks, Hammett, Hildenbrand, Jacobs, Kjaer, Lessick, MacLeod, Munoff, Palmer, Snow, Stringfellow, Tunender, Vecchiola, Wong, Woo.

**1. Call to order and approval of agenda**

- Welcome to the 5<sup>th</sup> membership meeting of the 2003-2004 LAUC-I year.
- Manuel is our honorary parliamentarian for the day
- There will be one more Executive Board meeting this year
- Ariel and Landis will both attend the LAUC system-wide transition meeting in Oakland on August 20<sup>th</sup>.
- LAUC-I will also have a local divisional transition meeting, on August 23rd.

**2. Membership Meeting Minutes May 10, 2004: Review and Approve**

- Add the actual LAUC-I allocation (\$3,775.00) to page 1
- Minutes approved with two minor grammatical adjustments.

**3. Chair and Executive Board Report**

• **LAUC-I Budget**

- Allocated \$3,775.00 – we went \$72.00 over budget
- Landis displayed breakdown of how money was spent: refreshments, copies, etc. Photocopying was a big expense – next year’s Executive Board will look at this expense next year. This is the first year that LAUC-I had a copy code – previously this was absorbed by departments.
  - i. Suggestion for LAUC-I to continue photocopying rather than have departments absorb the cost of copying
  - ii. Some documents need to be reviewed in advance of the meeting – we just need to all agree on the practice and adhere to it.

• **Spring Program, June 15<sup>th</sup>**

- LAUC-I was given a budget of \$3,000 for this event from Executive Council – we don’t have final figures, but we spent around \$2,400.
- Joan prepared an evaluation form which was used and Landis will distribute a report with details including the tabulations of the evaluations.
- Members should start thinking of new program ideas for next year
- Comment that it was nice to have an outside facilitator for the program this year.

• **Career Recruitment**

- Ariel will be meeting with the Career Center on July 30 to plan a campus program on careers in libraries and archives, which will probably be scheduled in fall quarter.
- Ariel will also meet with the “internship hub” at the Career Center on August 10 – trying to get plugged in to that group, with the possibility of expanding internships in the libraries. Contact Joan if interested in this activity.

- Executive Board has approved the Annual Report template included in today's meeting packets. Please complete reports by August 13 so the new Executive Board has them at the August 23 transition meeting
- Final call for volunteers for Senate and LAUC Committees – talk to Judy R., Bill or Joan at the end of this meeting, if interested
  - Sisson will represent the Professional Development Committee for LAUC-I, Systemwide.

#### 4. 0304 LAUC-I Nominations and Elections

- Manaka thanked everyone for participating and read the names of the newly elected positions, and those continuing to serve:
- LRC
  - If Heather wins the runoff election, she will decide whether to accept the position or remain Secretary
- On July 29 by 5:00 PM, the ballots will be distributed. They will be due August 13, and results available by August 19-20.
  - There was a request to have the results well in advance of the LAUC-I transition meeting on August 23rd.
- Ariel thanked Pauline and the committee for their work

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

- Sisson addressed concerns of membership in presenting the final draft of the mentoring document.
  - Institutional Rewards: The introduction was modified to reflect that it's the responsibility of the organization to reward mentors. This is repeated in the "goals" section.
  - No real way to address issue of offering management experience, with regard to this mentoring proposal – no way to incorporate that idea into this document
  - This document does not address next steps
  - This will not be a matchmaking program – people will need to be proactive in establishing these mentoring relationships
  - Question from membership: Are these relationships formalized? Part of the annual plan?
    - That is encouraged by this document – see mention in Goals section
  - Question: Are these about librarians only? Or students/LAs also?
    - Not specifically addressed here – but there is an assumption in this document is that the mentor and mentee are both librarians
  - **Motion to accept document passed.**

#### 6. LAUC-I 0304 Review and Assessment

- Ariel recalled the Spring 2003 poll asking membership about its preferences for meeting frequency. In response to that poll, we've met 5 times, basically quarterly, on a trial basis this year.
- Ariel called for an assessment of this schedule, also keeping in mind the new initiative "Lunch with LAUC-I"

#### DISCUSSION

- Quarterly meetings have been good – this should be evaluated annually

- One member thought Membership should meet every other month – given amount of business that’s conducted (assemblies, etc.)
- Given the expansion of Executive Board – how did this impact communication and the organization?
- Executive Board will review this question – it’s a significant commitment for the committee chairs
- From chair’s perspective, it was great, very advantageous; it is hoped that the time commitment is no greater on balance, given the reduced number of Membership meetings.
- From incoming chair’s perspective, it was great – good to have regular discussion, meetings already on everyone’s schedule
- Now the expanded Executive Board is part of the LAUC-I bylaws
- Lunches – these could be bi-monthly, along with the meetings which should be bi-monthly
- Support for lunches, nice to have a regular slot for it. Suggestion to give slots at the beginning of the year to the various committees – keeping in mind the need to be flexible as issues arise as well
- Set the quarterly meeting schedule – and have a lunch on the alternate months, playing with balance between formal and informal meeting
- We could and would have called a membership meeting at any time if we needed to. Please forward such suggestions to Executive Board, if there is such a need for a meeting and what should be on the agenda. Example: A LAUC-I member raised the idea of telecommuting.
- Send any other comments on this schedule issue to Executive Board via email. Executive Board will be meeting on August 2 and setting the calendar for next year.
- System-wide: New development: Fall assembly is a bad time for committee reports. Next year, the fall assembly will have a program and the spring assembly will be primarily for business. The fall meeting will be at UCB. New Provost will be invited, as will reps from SOPAG.
- LAUC-I committees should elect chairs as soon as possible.

## **7. APP-L**

Kaufman presented the final draft of her matrix of “*Proposed Changes to the Academic Personnel Procedures for Librarians*” (July 16, 2004)

Kaufman clarified that the *Academic Personnel Manual* (APM) contains University-wide policies that govern all academics except those represented by a union. Union-represented academics are governed by “memorandums of understanding” (MOUs) between the bargaining unit and the University. Most of the APM sections that apply to librarians are also in the MOU. The APM and the MOU don’t include all the procedures for carrying out their policies. Therefore, each campus is expected to develop local procedures. The local procedures for faculty are contained in the *Academic Personnel Procedures* (APP). The local procedures for Librarians are contained in the *Academic Personnel Procedures for Librarians* (APP-L). The librarians’ MOU allows for local procedures to be revised annually after consultation with LAUC-I.

The following discussion is based on the July 16 draft matrix:

### **APP-L, p. 2. Section I.A. 2.a.**

- Termination **was** delegated from the EVC. See the Executive Board’s matrix for additional clarification: “Agreed per July 14, 2000 Delegation of Authority, IDA317, Academic Actions for Librarians.” (<http://www.policies.uci.edu/da/ida317.html>)
- Termination is one of the possible outcomes of a review. The APM has language about notification time – the MOU is silent on this issue.
- Same grievance procedure as any other review outcome.
- What’s missing: criteria for termination, e.g. “at least one no action” (just an example)
- It’s worth thinking about this very different outcome in terms of special procedures/guidelines, etc.
- See p. 18 of APP-L for information about an off-cycle review, which may be called for when a librarian with career status has performance issues.

**APP-L, p. 11. Section I.B.8.a.**

- This doesn’t rule out acceleration, it just clarifies “normal” procedures.
- Should we add acceleration throughout? Or should we add the word “normal” here?
- There was a question and clarification at this point in the meeting that this process is for LAUC-I to provide input into these procedures. The final revised version of the new APP-L will be available when the call for reviews goes out for 2004-2005.

**APP-L, p. 27. Section I.F.2.b.**

- In response to communication from LAUC-I Executive Board.

**APP-L, p. 29. Section I.F.4.b.**

- **Peer letters:** This has been controversial. This proposed change retains the word peer (but doesn’t define it) and also allows for letters from others that are not librarians or other academics.
  - Take peer out? Or keep the words “peer and other”?
  - It was Executive Board’s sense that librarian reviews are peer reviews, and it is important to preserve that in this language.
  - Kaufman stated that the peer aspect of the review process is provided by the review committees, which, unlike letter writers, have access to the entire review file.
  - LRC doesn’t bring in additional knowledge – just what’s presented in the file.
  - LAUC-I members are all peers
  - Executive Board feels strongly that *academic peer letters* should be privileged over other kinds of review letters
  - Retain the word peer to make sure that file always includes peer letters
  - LRC can always ask for additional information
  - But requests from LRC *can* be denied
  - There is some support in LAUC-I for the language “peer and other”
  - Question: Is peer defined? That would be important to define, since clearly we have different definitions in operation. Some of us don’t think peers need to be academics. “Peer and other” introduces the need for a definition in a future discussion.

**APP-L, p. 29. Section I.F.4.d.**

- Reviewee continues to get a copy of this letter

**APP-L, p. 35. Section I.F.10.a.**

- Revised to take into account Executive Board’s proposed language, but doesn’t adopt that proposed language word for word.

**APP-L, p. 35. Section I.F.10.e.**

- This was in response to a concern raised by Executive Board

**APP-L, p. 38. Section I.F.13**

- To codify current practice
- If a reviewee responds to the RI's letter after it leaves the RI, the response doesn't go to the RI – but to whatever review level has the review file at that point
- Anytime something is added to the file – the reviewee is notified, but not the RI
- This does raise the question of deadlines – Kaufman expressed reluctance to ever tell a reviewee that he or she can't submit something to the review file at any time, even though allowing that seems to undermine the seven day calendar deadline. Make it clear that the seven days refers to guaranteeing that the RI sees the reviewee's response. But what about giving an RI a chance to respond if the reviewee submits a response after the file has left the RI?

**APP-L, p. 40. Section I.H.I**

- When a person other than the UL is in two places in a reviewee's supervisory chain (sometimes one of the places is an acting role) that person should perform the review functions of the lowest supervisory position he or she holds in relation to the reviewee (this is based on advice from Academic Personnel)

**APP-L, p. 53. Section I.K.7.a**

- Should help the process and bring into line with other campus practices
- Trying to be consistent with MOU and APM, focusing on major events

**APP-L, p. 60. Section I.O.**

- Question on 2: Can a discussion emanate from LAUC-I? Kaufman will add LAUC-I to the list of initiators of this discussion.
- It hasn't actually been that long that we've had this manual – it will get less laborious to review and revise. There is support for LAUC-I's ability to initiate input. Prediction that the need for many revisions will taper off.
- Can we hold off on this issue because LRC has apparently not responded, or there is confusion about whether they responded – a technical error.
- If Kaufman and Munoff don't agree with input they receive, the input doesn't get reflected in their draft proposed revisions
- All of LAUC-I has the opportunity to provide input on Kaufman and Munoff's draft proposed revisions
- If LRC input is not included – will that come back as a written response to LAUC-I or to the LRC?
- LAUC-I can have this discussion anytime – there needs to be better communication between LRC and the membership
- An advantage with this more flexible proposed process is that Executive Board would have access to more non-confidential issues that emanate from the LRC
- Suggestion for LAUC-I members to copy the membership liaison when they submit suggestions to Kaufman.

**Regarding the Proposed Revisions to the LRC Procedures in the APP-L**

- Kaufman explained that because of the short time period between her receipt of the Executive Board's recommendations and her deadline for issuing the final draft proposed revisions, she did not have sufficient time to consider the Executive Board's recommendation to move some of the proposed revisions to the LRC procedures from the body of the APP-L to an appendix. Kaufman suggested that we postpone the LRC discussion for another year, as she has to produce a revised APP-L in time for the start of 04-05 review cycle.

- What about the section in which members of the LRC can or can't write letters?  
Executive Board was in agreement that these could be part of the document, not the proposed appendix.
- This discussion will take place at future LAUC-I meeting.
- Agreement that we need to have a discussion on these changes.

**Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.**