

Librarians Association of the University of California  
Fall Assembly 2006  
Tuesday, November 14, 2006  
University of California Davis  
Walter A. Buehler Alumni & Visitors Center  
Alpha Gamma Rho Room

**(Approved 5/30/07)**

**Present:** Lise Snyder President (LA), Bob Heyer-Gray Vice President/President-Elect (D), Jennifer Reiswig, Past-President (SD), John Sisson, LAUC Secretary (I), Dean Rowan, Parliamentarian (B), Lucia Diamond, Chair (B), Armanda Barone, Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect (B), Jennifer Nelson, Secretary (B), Susan Garbarino, Affiliated Representative (B), Sandy Vella, Chair (D), Barbara Hegenbart, Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect (D), Bernadette Swanson, Secretary (D), Yvonne Wilson (I), Linda Murphy, Vice-Chair (I), Katherine Harvey, Member-at-Large (I), Maureen Russell, Chair (LA), Heidi Sandstrom, Chair-Elect (LA), Andrea Lynch, Representative at Large (LA), Deborah Whiteman, Representative at Large (LA), Eric Scott, Chair (M), Sara Davidson, Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect (M), Melissa Conway, Chair (R), Patricia Hargis, Chair-Elect, (R), Michael Yonezawa, Elected Delegate (R), Catherine Nelson, Chair (SB), Janet Martorna, Delegate (SB), Gary Johnson, Delegate (SB), Ann Hubble, Chair (SC), Kerry Scott, Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect (SC), Tammy Dearie, Chair (SD), Duffy Tweedy, Vice-Chair (SD), Paul J. Weiss, Delegate (SD), David Owen, Chair (SF), Min-Lin Fang, Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect (SF)

Absent: Diane Bisom (SLASIAC)

1. Called to Order 10:30
2. University Librarian's Welcome: Marilyn Sharrow
3. Announcements
  - Meeting logistics
  - Thanks to UCD Local Arrangements Committee
  - Introduction of LAUC officers and Parliamentarian.
4. Preliminaries
  - a. Roll Call of Divisions and Delegates: J. Sisson  
All delegates present
  - b. Approval of Minutes, Spring Assembly 2006: J Sisson  
Minutes approved without changes
5. [President's Report](#) - L. Snyder  
Available on LAUC website: <http://www.ucop.edu/lauc/president/fallreport06.pdf>  
Other comments:
  - Lise has forwarded to SOPAG possible candidates for LAUC Representatives to LTAG, and the RLF Board. She has not heard back yet.
  - IL Common Interest Group Representative will be Karen Munro (UCB) (2 year term ending in Aug 2008).
6. Presentation by Gary Lawrence, Director of Library Planning and Policy Development

- He has just recently been asked to serve as LAUC liaison to UCOP and will need to learn more about LAUC's relationship with the Office of the President. At this time he has no specific report to give. He will be happy to forward to Academic Personnel any questions or concerns. He will work to provide useful responses to our questions. Feel free to email him at [gary.lawrence@ucop.edu](mailto:gary.lawrence@ucop.edu).
- Questions from the delegates:
  - How do you relate to CDL and ULs?  
The Department of Academic Affairs is no more. It has been reorganizing for the past 2 years. He has responsibility for strategic planning for the UC Libraries. He is not part of CDL but does report to Dan Greenstein in his expanded capacity. Things are still in transition – additional new appointments may be announced at the Regent's meeting the next day.
  - How will any of these changes affect LAUC as an organization? Are professional grants, contacts, or logistics changing?  
He is waiting for the decision if Academic Advancement will still administer the LAUC budget. LAUC research grant money comes through the contract so it will still be there. That LAUC money is a line item in the budget.
  - Librarians retirement funding is changing. Is it true that the UC is shifting 2% of our pay in summer 2006 to retirement?  
Initially, money previously going into employee CAP fund accounts will be redirected and serve as employee contributions to UCRP so there should be no net pay change. He will make sure that Lise receives any new information he gets about this transition.

#### 7. Committee Reports:

- Nomination Committee announcement - L Snyder and J. Reiswig  
Lise introduced committee members. J. Reiswig (committee member) asked for suggestions for candidates for VP and Secretary. Limitations are: no VP candidate from Davis or LA. No Secretary candidates from Berkeley, Davis or Irvine.
- Research and Professional Development Committee Update – B. Heyer-Gray  
They distributed the 9/29 first call for research grant proposals and the 11/6 final call. There is a 1/10/07 deadline for proposals to be sent to division chairs. There will be an in-person meeting of the LAUC R&PD committee the week of 2/19/07 to review the applications. The current amounts available are: \$24,300 (bargaining unit) and \$8,100 (non-unit). Additional charges are:
  1. Guideline for University-wide research grants for librarians. Do they need to flesh-out wording for significance of projects?
  2. What happens to project products when complete? Currently one goes to LAUC archive, and the other to OP (but where?) What are other potential locations for the product? Perhaps an E-scholarship deposit?

#### 8. LAUC Representative Reports (*submitted*)

- SLASIAC didn't submit report - Diane Bisom had just met with them 11/3 and gave a summary. She will submit a formal report when the minutes are official
- SOPAG- Library Privacy Liaisons ACG disbanded. HOPS will monitor privacy issues now. Deanna Johnson thanked for being our LAUC Representative.

- Role of the LAUC Representatives to Advisory Committees. There is an overwhelming sense we need a document that clarifies LAUC expectations for our Representatives. We also need to inform the Advisory Committee Chairs of our expectations regarding our representatives' full participation on these committees.

#### 9. Committee on Committees Rules and Jurisdiction

- Discussion of current charge of revising LAUC Bylaws  
The committee will be building on the work of the previous committee. Their main focus will be identifying what parts of the current Bylaws would be better as standing rules. Standing rules can be changed more easily. Also, currently we have five standing Committees. Do we want/need to keep all of these? What is their focus and are they important to the way we do our business? Would we be better served by ad hoc committees to react, gather information and forward it to the Board?

##### Comments:

- UCB- Does not understand all the reasons for these changes, but don't get rid of Diversity committee. Local one has been very active.
- UCD- Looking for easier way to make changes. Like standing rules ideas. LAUC President visited in Sept. and discussed these possible changes. Interested in exploring Standing committees vs other structures. We are open to new ways of doing things.
- UCI- People have complained that they didn't do anything on their committees. We need ways to increase people's involvement with LAUC and understand its value.
- UCLA- They have been looking at all the versions of bylaws over the years and the responsibilities of committees over time. They were important in past issues such as MELVYL vs OCLC. On the other hand Ad Hoc Committees draw new members to be involved with LAUC because of their limited focus and time period. One value of standing committees is that it is important to have continuity in conducting LAUC business. The 2 year overlapping appointments allow that. The committees also allow the LAUC President to take forward initiatives through committee charges. These charges should come from the membership and the President. Membership has a responsibility to communicate what they want LAUC to focus on. Membership must participate or LAUC will die.
- UCM- Thought the issues of bylaws and standing rules had been voted down. To reopen the process we need clear goals for the outcome.
- UCR- We support simplifying the bylaws. What is the outcome/goal? We support standing committees.
- UCSD- We also support simplification, and eliminating committees if not working. We should separate bylaws and standing rules.
- UCSB-Simple is always good.
- UCSC-Haven't discussed the issue. LAUC should orient librarians to what LAUC is, especially now.
- UCI – CCJR representative should report to the local division and get feedback about possible changes.

- UCSD-The issue came up as "Why bother? Statewide doesn't do anything." People like LAUC grants as an idea (but not many apply). What influence does statewide have? We need to be better at giving feedback on outcomes of statewide work and communicate that to local divisions.
- UCSB-We wanted to add a LAUC charge of looking at funding for libraries. How libraries are funded on a campus by campus basis. There is an advantage of being issue focused with ad-hocs.
- Perceptions of LAUC:
  - Does LAUC have any power if we don't have any influence? Is this cultural perception or real? Do we feel empowered locally? Does LAUC have a contentious relationship with ULs? We feel low morale. No matter what LAUC does or says makes no difference.
  - Our relationship depends on the particular ULs. Different ULs bring different personalities and their own goals when we are trying to work together.
  - We need to look at LAUC authority vs LAUC influence.

10. Overview/historical perspective of LAUC – Miki Goral

**12:25 – 1:00 LUNCH**

11. Repositioning the UC Libraries as a Destination Place – Discussion/Planning

How can LAUC have “influence”. Is it as we were in the past or is there a new role? What are the issues we need to address regarding retention and recruitment? Lise spoke to local LAUCs, and individuals to formulate these questions:

What is a destination place? Is a destination an end or a stopping place?

What is positive about UC? How can we promote recruitment and retention?

We need to identify what the issues are rather than let the problems keep us from thinking about them. We need to work on making certain that our libraries attract the caliber of librarians that we want, that the librarians who come want to stay for a good period of time and contribute to our continued growth and development, and that those who leave for other opportunities are sought by others because they come from a UC library.

Process for afternoon discussion:

- Each division reports back what their campus has said
- Each division gives a written copy of feedback to Executive Board
- Breakup into groups with 2 campuses represented in each group
- Groups report back

A. Division reports on questionnaire results

- UCSC - Responses were individual since they didn't meet as group. Same issues as 2002 UCSC recruitment and retention report. Some individual feedback included issues of concern such as: childcare, housing costs, cost of living, and CSU vs UC salary difference. Suggestions for improvements included supporting staff going to library school and addressing the Lib Asst. to Librarian pay difference. Problems are: prestige of working at UC is not there any more. We are not cutting edge. It takes 2 weeks to get an email account. Professional development opportunities are good. University environment and Collegiality of system is a positive. Is there disconnect with expectations? Takes forever for

things to happen in the system. There are too many layers of decision making to implement a new idea. Fear of making a mistake. LAUC - SC buddy system is a good idea.

Comment; Think about how role of women in the profession has changed in the last 40 years.

Comment: UC more bureaucratic than US govt.

- UCSB - Responses gotten from replies to an email. Both long time and new librarians responded. Felt that expectations are met. Enjoy promoting research and scholarly pursuits. In the 1970s we had discrete responsibilities, now we do all 3 ref/bib/education. Positives include: fabulous colleagues, many electronic resources. Worst is worrying about funding for collections. Can't build what we want to. We spend lots of time playing with budget. New librarians attracted by prestige of UC, and a good job interview. Expected lots of mentoring and got it. Many events through LAUC-SB activities. Ability to go to conferences. Networking. Workload OK. Salary and COL are a problem in SB. It affects diversity, less families, less outside of work life. Families can't afford to come. Single women administrators. CSU vs UC salaries. Fringe benefits at CSU attending conferences. Prestige tax for working at the UC. LAUC can work with ULs to orient to LAUC statewide for new librarians. Need to look at reasonable salaries for each campus. Faculty-like benefits needed : Research leave, job sharing, and job training.

Comment : We may not have all negatives because new librarians won't want to speak up at public meetings.

- UCSF - Good things. Still have prestige. Their professional schools are very highly ranked. Work with talented people. Collaborate with faculty. Innovative projects. Opportunity but understaffed to do anything. Good support for professional development. Richness of resources among the UC campuses. Housing situation out of control. Big issue for recruitment and retention is not providing a salary for living in Bay area. Pressure of understaffing. New librarian is tired without clear priorities. More support for increased staff so they can accomplish their goals. Have a hard time filling openings, especially middle management. Have had to reclassify out of librarian series to offer more pay. Comment: Reclassifying positions out of Librarian series in order to offer higher salaries disadvantages the campuses that aren't able to do this. This makes it even harder for them to hire good people.

Comment: Forcing people to take a salary cut to work for the UC is not in our best interests.

- UCSD - Responses from email replies and membership discussion. UCSD is the destination rather than UC. Note, we are asking people who chose to stay and not leave. New librarians are more positive. Older had more disappointments. Having the AULs in meetings kept negatives down. We are not getting career librarians. We hire new librarians who after a few years move on. They go because they have families, need cheaper COL, or tuition help. Biggest problem is low pay and a high cost of living. UC is unlike any other system, it has a built in community. It has a good reputation and resources. Librarians are well respected on campus. We are losing people because of the pay scale, parking costs, or distance from their family. We are also losing to CSU because of higher pay there.

Comment: There is a growing prevalence of second jobs among new librarians. Many seem to be taking a second job in order to work for UC.

- UCR - Responses mailed back through campus mail. Money is the main problem for many. Their expectations have been met OK. Cost of housing is also a worry. Most seem to think that UC is a good place. They also like the system-wide colleagues. There is a worry that we are not paying enough so we aren't going to be recruiting the people we need.
- UCM - 5 working librarians. 4 are Assistant or Associate. Recently average housing price topped \$400,000 in Merced. There is no cheap place to live in California anymore. UCs offer great professional development. We like working with quality faculty. Bureaucracy of the UCs is impressively complex (even compared to the Army). Salary is the big issue, you can't wait to work through steps to get to a living level.
- UCLA - Responses from email and membership meeting. Issues are: cost of living, help with housing and access to childcare on campus. There is not enough professional development funding. Other problems are bureaucracy and lack of community. Positives are: Colleagues, richness of collections, world class faculty. Some people have been waiting for years to work at UCLA. There are also differences between have and have-nots among libraries on campus. Librarians take the low pay for UCLA reputation then they move on other places with that reputation.

Comment: Attracting the people you need requires a combination of methods.

Often you can hire someone as a temporary librarian, sometimes you lure them to do a task (with an offer of higher pay) if you don't have the in-house skill.

Comment: We can't just pay them off scale to get something done. So hire them out of librarian series at the start.

- UCI - Responses from Executive meeting and membership meeting. Posed question as: "What would you like to see LAUC do around the issues of recruitment and retention?" New librarians said why they came to UC. We should talk about personal experiences/stories of being librarians. We should advertise consortial opportunities available at UC. We should highlight our work with Google, and our stand against Elsevier. We should also emphasize the uniqueness of each campus. Show off the UC family friendly policies. We have built a "Librarians at UCI" page.- New hires are using that page to show off the community. We know that the work/life balance is most important to Gen X. UC should take a lead in this issue. Morale has improved, and there are less temporary assignments lately.
- UCD - Response from 22 librarians at a membership meeting. Positives are: good resources, and excellent colleagues. Big negative is cost of living has gone up so much. Housing is at 400-500K and new families can't live in Davis. New single librarians have to resort to expensive apartments. People like living and working here. They don't want to be at a CSU. Professional development has become expensive and is hard on newer people. Bureaucracy keeps us from moving quickly and trying new things. This is especially hard for newer people. Bifurcation from faculty 94-95 untied our benefits and salary from faculty. Hiring librarians is much harder. Professional development money could be

better. Conditions have changed a lot in the past 3-5 years in job conditions. We need succession planning.

- UCB - Responses from taking email to Executive Committee. They discussed it and restructured it as email. Asked librarians to send some ideas. Working at UCB is prestigious. It has world class collections, faculty, and librarians. Things they want are: Mortgage loans, access to temporary faculty housing, and tuition assistance. Problems are increased workload, childcare costs, and salaries of CSU vs UC. Too common now to pull people out of the Librarian series. We want recognition as academics and relief to be scholars. We need PI status. Problem continues to be increasing workload and lack of pay.

**B. Questions for small group (2:30-3:00)**

What hinders the libraries being thought of as a destination place??

How can we improve libraries as a work environment?

How can LAUC work with ULs to make the necessary changes?

Groups wrote up their comments and they will be synthesized later.

**12. Adjournment at 2:58**