



Berkeley

by Bill Whitson

The Pre-history

The history of LAUC-Berkeley is the history of the development of academic status—of a new, more challenging professional role for librarians. It was precipitated from the cloud of professional self-awareness that emerged nationally in the 1950s, when Library Council, the systemwide advisory group of University Librarians, recommended that librarians be administered within the University structure as academic appointees rather than staff employees. UC President Clark Kerr made the change on paper in 1962, but its actual implementation has been a very long, slow process—a process incomplete to this day.

Once the change in status was announced, lower-level librarians began to ask what academic status meant, and demanded fundamental change in their roles, to follow faculty models rather than those for staff.

There were over 175 librarians employed at Berkeley in the early 1960s, appointed to positions classified in a five-rank hierarchy. Beginning librarians and a few others worked as Librarian I. Most reference librarians, bibliographers, and catalogers performing basic library operations were classed as Librarian II. Unit heads, assistant department heads and those with more advanced special skills were normally Librarian III. Department heads and large unit heads might usually be Librarian IV. A few of the department head positions with the largest scope might be classed as Librarian V.

The University Librarian since 1945, Donald Coney, was a member of the Academic Senate, identifying more with faculty than with the librarians on his staff. Much collection development was still done by faculty members; the librarian-bibliographers were mostly language specialists working in the Acquisition Department. In his last annual report of 1967, the UL devoted five

of six pages to a detailed list of important acquisitions, and only on the last page mentioned developments having to do with the staff. Management was hierarchical, decisions were made at the top with little consultation or involvement of staff. Librarians felt themselves a low-status occupational group: underpaid, underappreciated and denied perquisites and opportunities for continuing education, professional leave and travel, participation in the University governance process, and so on, which would allow them to function as real professionals. Furthermore, political activism was in the air in the mid-1960s. The Free Speech Movement which took place on campus in the Fall of 1964 defined the era. Librarians too were ready to question authority and fight for their rights.

Unions had emerged as powerful agents for improved working conditions, achieving a peak of membership and respectability in the 1950s, though they chiefly represented skilled trades and industrial workers. Professional associations were strong—e.g., the American Medical Association, the American Bar Association, the Association of American University Professors and the National Education Association—but among the less advantaged professional groups the more militant approach of the union movement began to make inroads during the 1950s and early 1960s. Many of the younger public school teachers—the more independent thinkers, the politically liberal or radical—turned to the American Federation of Teachers. The AFT also began to grow on college and university campuses.

The Berkeley University Teachers Union (later renamed University Federation of Teachers), Local 1474 of the AFT, was founded in May 1963. Several librarians were among the organizing group, and one of them, Rudy Lednicky (Slavic Bibliographer), was the first Recording Secretary. The organization grew very rapidly during the year of the Free Speech Movement, 1964-65. Many faculty members were uncomfortable having librarians in their organization, however, and the concerns of the two groups were very different. So in 1965 the librarians, now 30 strong, formed a separate Library Chapter, and began to function independently. The Library Chapter grew to 50 members by May 1967, representing about one-third of the professional staff. In the Fall of 1967, the Library Chapter received its own charter as AFT Local 1795, with the name University Federation of Librarians (UFL). It was at that time the most prominent group of unionized librarians in the country.

Many of its early leaders had strong personal commitments to unions as a matter of political and social principle. Some came from labor union families with life-long commitments forged in the struggles of the 1930s. Most, however, were not so much committed to labor unions as simply interested in organizing effectively to achieve real changes in librarian status. Rudy Lednicky served as Chairman of the Library Chapter until the end of 1966. From early 1967 until later that year, the position was held by an ambitious middle manager, Eldred Smith, Head of the Search Division of the Acquisition Department, who represented the more "moderate" or pragmatic group.

The period from 1962 until 1969 was largely one of discussion and debate. The new "academic status" meant initially little more than a change in the manner in which campus offices handled our paperwork. In most respects librarians continued to be governed by staff personnel policies. Only at the end of the decade did concrete change begin to occur, and even then it was individual University Librarians who took the initiative. Campus and systemwide implementation of academic status did not really occur until the next decade, especially between 1973 and 1976.

Although the Library Chapter was by no means the only organization involved in this discussion, it did play an important role, especially up to the time LAUC was established in 1967/68. Under the editorship of Allen Covici (General Reference Service), it published 12 issues of a handsome 4-8 page newsletter, *CU Voice*, from 1965 to 1969. It served as a forum for developing a list of actions the librarians wanted, and began to put pressure on Library and campus administration to recognize the need for real change.

Several proposals were worked out in detail and submitted to Library and campus administrations, among them a proposed Grievance Procedure for Non-Senate Academic Employees, presented in July 1966. One substantial early proposal came from a librarian not involved with the union. In September 1966, John Emerson of the Music Library, a serious scholar in the field of medieval chant and liturgy, proposed a one-quarter sabbatical-like leave at two-thirds pay, open to anyone at the Librarian II rank or above, for purposes of research, continuing education or other professional activity, to be awarded by a committee of peers. The proposal was viewed quite favorably by University Librarian Coney and widely supported by librarians.

Other organizations in California were also debating academic status in the mid-1960s. The State College Librarians Round Table issued a position paper calling for full faculty status for librarians, which was formally adopted by the Board of Directors of the California Library Association (CLA) in October 1966.

CLA's College, University & Research Libraries Section (CURLS) appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Status, which included UC-Berkeley librarians Marc Gittelsohn (Agriculture) and Eloyde Tovey (Bancroft) and was chaired by UCLA's Faye Blake. Their "Position Paper on Status and Benefits for Librarians in California's Colleges and Universities" was based on the State College Librarians' paper. Its call for full faculty status specified eleven elements, which included equal salaries; sabbaticals; tenure; advancement to higher rank based on merit and independent of administrative position; scheduled workloads to allow time for independent research and other professional activities; access to grants, fellowships and research funds, including the right to serve as principal investigators; access to the same review, grievance and appeal procedures as other faculty; and full membership in the Academic Senate. The position paper was formally adopted by the CURLS Ad Hoc Committee at a meeting at the American Library Association's Conference in San Francisco in June 1967.

The Library Chapter of the Berkeley University Teachers Union made several efforts to provide input to the Hoos and Spiess committees following their appointments in 1966. It forwarded its proposed Grievance Procedure for Non-Senate Academics in September 1966, and a revised version in March 1967, along with eight other detailed proposals on the rights and privileges of librarians.

In March 1967 the University Librarian distributed a questionnaire to UCB librarians, based on one at UCLA, to gather information on librarians' concerns for the Spiess and Hoos Committees. The questionnaire was criticized by the union as inadequate and full of ambiguities, however, and there were only 30 responses. A second version, also from UCLA, was distributed April 21. The Library Chapter urged librarians to submit their own comments to the committees, and organized a special evening meeting for librarians to discuss their ideas. When the Hoos Committee held a hearing on the Berkeley campus, on April 17, 1967, the Library Chapter

presented a nine-page paper giving its general position and a number of specific recommendations. A number of librarians spoke, some from carefully prepared texts.

One of the more interesting aspects of this period was the way in which University Librarian Coney finally responded to the fast-moving developments with his own initiatives in early 1967. The union had begun pressuring him in the Fall of 1966 to attend a general meeting of librarians to listen to and discuss their concerns. He was adamant in refusing any such appearance, even if the meeting were sponsored by an ad hoc committee. For its part the union declined his invitation to send representatives to meet with him privately. In February 1967 it wrote to propose that he include three elected non-administrative librarians in his group of top-level managers, the Library Advisory Conference, to improve communication between the lower and higher levels of the administrative hierarchy. He replied that this idea, or an alternative, was already under consideration.

He then appointed a committee of five librarians, chaired by Music Librarian and Professor Vincent Duckles, to "design a professional liaison group which could discuss with him matters of mutual interest." On May 11 the committee submitted its report, proposing a Library Advisory Board (LAB) of 10 members. The University Librarian would chair the group and appoint one other administrative librarian. The other eight were to be elected by the professional staff, one representative from each of six administrative jurisdictions and two from a seventh. Library administration distributed ballots on May 25 and encouraged all to vote. 117 ballots were cast out of a potential total of 142. The elected members were William Berges (Forestry), Grace Dote (Graduate Social Sciences), Sheila Dowd (Map Room), Marc Gittelsohn (Agriculture), Ralph Hansen (Catalog), Catherine Moreno (Undergraduate Library Project), Eldred Smith (Acquisition) and Annette Voth, along with the University Librarian and AUL Helen Worden.

The Library Advisory Board met five times between October 1967 and April 1968. The focus of the discussions was Working Paper #1 on Librarian Classification and Pay Plan, issued by Library Council's Personnel Subcommittee, and, later, Working Paper #2. Its deliberations were captured in unusual detail in minutes recorded by Catherine Moreno. They provide an interesting snapshot of the issue of academic status as seen at the time of LAUC's formation, both from the vantage point of the old guard, represented by UL Coney, and from that of the leaders of the faculty status movement, including Eldred Smith.

The University Librarian presented an argument which seems to be as relevant today as it was then. He said that it was very well for librarians to want to gain in pay and perquisites by redefining their role to more closely imitate the faculty, but that this might mean having other staff perform jobs traditionally the province of librarians. Furthermore, he questioned whether those allocating funds to support library collections and services, the UC faculty and administration, would have any interest in employing a new class of librarian involved in scholarship, publication, teaching and professional activity. He felt they were really only interested in getting books on the shelves and making them available.

Though its discussions were interesting and probably had some influence on the thinking of librarians at Berkeley, the LAB was overshadowed by the founding of LAUC in mid-1967 and the work that was taking place at the same time to establish the new organization.

There was one other significant development in late 1967. A split developed in the librarians' union between those who continued to believe that a union was an effective way to challenge the University and force it to accommodate librarians' demands, and those who finally concluded that unions were inappropriate for professionals and wanted librarians to devote all their attention to the alternative offered by LAUC. Those who decided against pursuing the union option, led by Eldred Smith, resigned from the Library Chapter.

In 1969, Smith published an article in the *ALA Bulletin* on the organization of LAUC. In it he describes the new Association as a tactical choice made by UC librarians, the most effective way to achieve their goals. It rejected both of the alternative approaches: (1) the employee organization, which had been favored before the formation of LAUC, and (2) the CLA-affiliated association, which supported librarians in the California State Colleges as they worked to gain their objectives through the California legislature. He concluded that if LAUC does not lead to better benefits—improved status and a real voice in matters that concern them—librarians could always return to the alternatives originally rejected. In fact, a number of librarians maintained a different perspective from the start, viewing LAUC and the union as complementary, not competitive.

In 1967 the American Library Association held its annual conference in San Francisco. A number of people, most of whom had been active in the union, arranged a meeting of UC librarians. From that meeting emerged LAUC. Those uncomfortable with a union found it a far preferable alternative. It would function for librarians, as the Academic Senate did for faculty, as a vehicle for "shared governance" and enhanced status. At the same time, librarians committed to the union believed that LAUC could offer a second channel through which to work. As an officially supported in-house advisory body, LAUC could work from within University, campus and Library administrations to press for enhanced professional status, while the union continued to press from the outside using resources not open to LAUC, such as political action. UCB's Rudy Lednicky and Myra Kolitsch were members of the systemwide Steering Committee, which worked to establish LAUC as an organization through the summer and fall of 1967. At Berkeley, Library Administration extended a kind of informal recognition by authorizing in October 1967 an organizational meeting on work time. LAUC held its first systemwide election in December 1967 and elected Berkeley's Eldred Smith its President.

Organizational Development

LAUC-Berkeley members had approved a set of Bylaws by January 1968. Thirty-six librarians attended the first meeting on March 13, and nominated candidates for the first Executive Committee. The new committee met on April 1, with Myra Kolitsch (Undergraduate Library Project) as Chair, appointing committees on Recognition, Librarian Status and Library Policy.

In a letter of June 13, 1968 to Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs William Bowsma, Chair Kolitsch formally requested that LAUC-Berkeley be recognized as an official advisory organization. James Skipper, the new University Librarian, met with the Executive Committee on August 16. Dr. Skipper was immediately supportive, agreeing to authorize duplication and distribution of the LAUC-Berkeley Bylaws, ballots and other LAUC communications, and to allow its meetings to take place on Library time.

The UL was also presented with the union's Library Improvement Program, and met with union representatives in a series of meetings through the fall. In order to develop a program that would respond to both LAUC-B and AFT concerns and proposals, he appointed a Task Force on Academic Library Personnel, with Eldred Smith as Chair, Margaret Studhalter (Catalog) as a LAUC representative and liaison to the LAUC-B Executive Committee, Margaret Johnson (Education/Psychology), Kimiyo Hom (Astronomy/Math/Statistics), Ann Gilbert (Serials) and Frank Brechka (History Bibliographer).

A number of issues surfaced as the division began to define its purpose: What should be its stance toward the newly created Library Advisory Board? How could communication within the Library be improved, and what should be LAUC-B's role in providing a "voice" for non-administrative librarians? What should be done about the myriad of specific issues: tenure, grievance procedures, redefining librarians' job roles, etc.? Was LAUC really just an "in-house" union? How much work time could be spent on LAUC activities? Would the creation of LAUC lead to a sense of division between librarians and other staff?

A new Executive Committee took office in January 1969, with George Davis of Government Documents as Chair. The Task Force submitted its report in May, calling for LAUC to serve as the "main organizational vehicle for librarians to have a voice in library policy and procedures," and proposing a review process in some detail, including a Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Appeals. UL Skipper distributed the Task Force Report for discussion and comment, but in the meantime recognized LAUC within the General Library, adopted the Report's recommendations on the role of the Executive Committee, and agreed to implement the proposed academic review process within the General Library. Meetings to gather comment were held in September, the union presented a detailed response, the Report was revised and a final version issued on November 11.

John Emerson became Chair in 1970, a year in which LAUC-Berkeley really began to flower. The proposed "CAPA Guidelines" were revised and adopted, and the first Committee on Appointments, Promotion and Advancement (CAPA) was appointed February 13, 1970. Berkeley's Task Force Report was distributed to all of the other campuses, and in April 1970 the systemwide LAUC Committee on Privilege, Salaries, Conditions, and Security of Employment presented a revised version under the title: "Consensus of the Views of the Nine Campuses on the Systemwide Issues Contained in the Report of the Berkeley Task Force on Academic Library Personnel." It was approved by LAUC and forwarded to Vice President Taylor.

From the very beginning, there was concern on the part of Library administration about how LAUC-B as an advisory body would mesh with the hierarchical administrative decision-making structure responsible for managing the library. The union's Library Improvement Plan included a section recommending a host of specific improvements, and since LAUC's purpose was to serve as an advisory structure there was a natural inclination to form committees to advise on every aspect of library operations. To evaluate this approach and outline a proposed course of action, in March 1970 LAUC-B appointed a Committee on Academic Purpose, consisting of Jean Peck (Catalog, chair), Sheila Dowd (Map Room), Vincent Duckles (Music), Eleanor Engstrand (Government Documents) and Catherine Moreno. The report was serialized in *CU News*, beginning April 30. It recommended five standing committees, with charges covering the full range of library issues: Public Service, with responsibility for space utilization, reference

staffing, hours, bibliographic control, circulation and ILL policy, public information including leaflets and signage, and student relations (organized instruction, surveys, student library committee); Collection Building (later changed to Development); Staff Development, charged with career development for librarians; Library Operations, a channel for staff suggestions for improving operations; and Faculty Relations. All but the Committee on Faculty Relations were appointed at the end of June. Of the 168 librarians on the staff, 48 were serving on a LAUC-B committee.

About this time the division reached a high point in its influence within the General Library. At its 1971 Spring Assembly UL Skipper gave a "State of the Library" address to librarians and other interested staff. LAUC-B appointed an ad hoc committee in February of that year to work out a plan for the reorganization of the Main Library reference service; its report was submitted in June. The Collection Development Committee surveyed all library units for their collection development policies. The Public Services Committee made recommendations relating to reference services, the establishment of a Catalog Information Desk, and authority cards in the Author-Title Catalog.

LAUC-Berkeley also achieved visibility on campus. Responding to the atmosphere of street warfare in Berkeley in 1969, it adopted a resolution in May 1969 condemning the "current handling of the public unrest problem in Berkeley by University and local authorities." In 1970 it sent a letter expressing concern for employee safety when tear gas was used on campus against demonstrators. In Spring 1970, during the Cambodia crisis, it participated in the "reconstitution" of the University, but consciously adopted a "moderate" stance, endorsing the work of the steering committee set up to collect and distribute information on anti-war activities. Librarians were duly penalized along with others, however, when the Legislature denied a planned "range adjustment" (cost of living increase) for all academic employees, to punish UC faculty for their role in the strike.

On a more peaceful note, the division held its first annual joint dinner with the Stanford University Librarians Association, a tradition which continued until 1985.

Campus administration was less willing than the University Librarian to accommodate LAUC-B's initiatives. As an example, in November 1970 Dr. Skipper announced his resignation, effective June 1971. LAUC-B requested representation on the Search Committee to select his successor. The Vice Chancellor was reluctant to appoint anyone but a tenured faculty member. Happily, one librarian, Vincent Duckles, was also a Professor in the Music Department, and he was appointed to the committee. The Executive Committee did have an opportunity to meet with the Search Committee, and participated in the process as one of the interviewing groups.

On July 29, 1971, Vice Chancellor Robert Connick finally responded to LAUC-B's request for recognition by agreeing to a two-year trial period, contingent upon certain changes in the Bylaws: to return to a single organization for both the General Library and the Non-General libraries (the Bylaws had been amended a year earlier to provide for two separate sections), and to drop "concern for matters other than Library policy and governance" from its purpose.

Eldred Smith was appointed Acting University Librarian in July 1971. Rather than serve a caretaker role, Smith moved boldly ahead with new administrative initiatives. He appointed a Committee on Affirmative Action Program for Women, with Anne Lipow as chair. The committee's "Report on the Status of Women Employees in the Library of the University of

California, Berkeley," submitted in December 1971, became a landmark document in identifying a librarian salary inequity using comparable-worth arguments.

Smith's second major initiative was more problematic. He established a new Library Advisory Council (LAC), with administrative committees dealing with reference services, selection and the catalogs. Even though the LAUC-B Chair was made an ex-officio member of LAC, the establishment of parallel committees caused confusion and undercut the division's role in advising on routine library management. The parallel structure continued only until the arrival of the new University Librarian, Richard M. Dougherty, in July 1972.

Dougherty brought a strong commitment to participatory management and staff development, but felt that all committees advising on library operations should come under a single administrative umbrella. LAUC-Berkeley agreed to disband its three overlapping committees (Public Services, Library Operations, Collection Development) and make another recently appointed LAUC-B committee, the Ad Hoc Committee on Main Library Renovation and Expansion, a subcommittee of the Library Advisory Council. In exchange the new UL agreed to have LAUC-B nominate at least half the members of each advisory committee. LAC was reorganized to include regular LAUC-B representatives (in addition to the Chair, who was an ex-officio member) along with department head representatives and the top-level administrators. The Staff Development Committee became a joint LAUC-B/LAC committee, reporting to both groups.

Beginning in 1969, the University had proposed new sections (82 and 51-4) for the Academic Personnel Manual (APM), defining the librarian series as academic appointees and providing general policies for appointment, promotion and advancement. In spite of extensive comment by LAUC and the union on both the local and systemwide levels, and a lengthy process of reconsideration and revision, the final version of the sections was still considered unsatisfactory in important ways by many LAUC-B members. The 1971 and 1972 Executive Committees sent a joint letter to Chancellor Bowker in January 1972, protesting the lack of an adequate salary scale, true security of employment and a grievance procedure. The new sections were added to the APM nonetheless, effective July 1, 1972.

1973 was a year of budget cutbacks and reorganization in the General Library. LAC held a retreat in Strawberry Canyon in January, where it brainstormed ideas for changing priorities, cuts and new programs. There was a large across-the-board reduction in serials subscriptions. General Reference Service was merged with Collection Development, as a way of better utilizing librarian expertise and enhancing career growth by expanding the scope of responsibilities of each librarian.

In January the AUL for Technical Services, Joseph A. Rosenthal, announced the establishment of an administrative intern position, to rotate every six months among librarians in the several technical services departments. Other members of the Library administration were evidently planning to establish similar positions. The failure to consult LAUC-B, LAC or department heads provoked an angry letter of protest from the Executive Committee. Dougherty apologized for the oversight, agreed to review the change in six months, and dropped plans to create additional positions without compensating the home units. LAUC-B called for guidelines to govern the creation of new positions drawn from existing staff.

There was much discussion within the chapter of the need for guidelines dealing with reorganization and staff reassignment generally, and some sentiment that CAPA should be routinely consulted when more than one department was involved. No guidelines were developed.

Later in 1973 LAC itself was reorganized, discontinuing department head representation, except for the chair of the Department heads group, in favor of LAUC-B-nominated members.

In general, UL Dougherty was quite willing to consult with the Executive Committee in a meaningful way. But one problem with this openness surfaced in the campus discussion of the Report of the Library Task Force of the UC Academic Planning and Program Review Board, which recommended giving priority to Berkeley and UCLA in collection development, and asking other campuses to pare down their collections. LAUC-Berkeley appointed a subcommittee to analyze the report and prepare a response, and Dougherty was eager to meet with them; but he was also concerned that the matter be handled confidentially, to avoid friction between the campuses or the possibility of antagonizing the Legislature. It turned out that none of the other campuses was treating the Report in a confidential fashion, so the problem disappeared. But the incident made him fear that he might not be able to consult with the LAUC-B Executive Committee in quite the same way he could with his administrative cabinet, since it might sometimes be difficult for him to justify a demand that a given matter be treated as confidential. In fact, LAUC-B was quite sensitive to the issue of confidentiality; for example, there was a specific procedure for routinely bracketing items in the minutes that were not to be included in the version printed in *CU News*. After further discussion the Executive Committee assured the University Librarian they would always respect anything he asked to be kept confidential, though they might try to persuade him to change his mind if they disagreed with his judgment.

The issue of Executive Committee continuity arose in 1973, when only one of the 1973 members was re-elected to the committee in 1974. The Bylaws were amended later that year to provide for two-year terms (the first year as Alternate) for the General Library and NGL (Non-General libraries) representatives, and for the election of a Vice Chairman/Chairman-Elect. The Secretary's title was changed to Secretary-Treasurer, the Vice Chairman and Secretary-Treasurer were included in the delegation to systemwide LAUC assemblies, and CAPA was established as a standing committee. One proposed amendment, to change the title of the Chairman and Vice Chairman to Chairperson and Vice Chairperson, was defeated 40-22. In 1976 there was another Bylaws revision, principally to change from a calendar to academic year basis, following systemwide LAUC, and to change the name from Librarians' Assembly to Librarians Association. This time, the membership agreed to adopt the neutral term "Chair." The Executive Committee for 1977 served from January until August, and the next committee took office in September 1977.

Recognition

1974 was the year LAUC-B had its most extensive interaction with campus administration, as Vice Chancellor Mark Christensen was forced to come to terms with LAUC-Berkeley's peer review guidelines before he could bring himself to officially approve them. He had a number of lengthy joint meetings with the Executive Committee and CAPA, along with the University Librarian and others from the administrative cabinet, to debate both the philosophy and concepts involved in the faculty peer-review process and the specific provisions of the Berkeley librarian

review procedures. He then rewrote the procedures himself, approved them and promulgated them as official policy, before leaving his position in July 1974.

This was one of LAUC-B's busiest years. The Executive Committee met weekly for the first two months, then every two weeks. It held five assemblies instead of the usual two. The debate over peer review standards and performance expectations, especially on what it would take for a librarian to be promoted to full librarian, led to the production of LAUC-B's largest report, the "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion Review," which was labored on by more than 50 librarians.

From 1972 to 1974 there was a gradual increase in the number of support-staff members appointed to advisory committees. The Staff Development Committee was evenly divided, with four from the support staff and four librarians, and there was support-staff representation on the Library Advisory Council. When an Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Structure of LAC proposed abolishing the Council, replacing it with a five-person planning committee and allocating other functions either to the administrative cabinet, the department heads group or the LAUC-B Executive Committee, there was strong opposition. Much of it came from support staff, who feared they would lose some of their representation in advisory groups. The proposal was eventually dropped in October 1974.

The following year, 1975, the LAC Steering Committee pushed through a reconstitution of LAC, this time reducing the number of LAUC-B appointees to four and creating a separate Nominating Committee for LAC and its advisory committees. The division no longer appointed members directly to any advisory committee, but rather selected two members of the Nominating Committee. It was deemed responsible for professional standards and status issues and issues that were systemwide or regional in scope, while LAC was responsible for library policies and programs. Some support staff questioned the very "legality of the professional concept as a whole."

In 1975 LAUC-Berkeley was officially granted recognition, along with systemwide LAUC. It wrote to Provost George Maslach requesting input into the search for a new Dean of the School of Librarianship. Finally, rather than requesting a LAUC-B member on the Search Committee, it sent a letter asking that the Search Committee be expanded to include members representing women in the profession, graduates of the School, local employers of graduates of the School, and/or librarians on the University staff. The request was rejected, but the Executive Committee felt it had made campus administration more aware of the division's availability in an advisory role.

A notable accomplishment of 1975 was the adoption of a local appeals procedure for performance review decisions. LAUC-B resurrected the proposal for such a procedure, which had been dropped two years earlier, developed a less ambitious one without an appeals board, and submitted it to Vice Chancellor Heyman. The document, "Administrative Review Procedures for Librarians Requesting a Reconsideration of a Salary or Promotion Decision," was issued as a supplement to the "CAPA Guidelines" in July 1975.

The restructure of the librarian salary scales, and incorporation of a salary inequity adjustment, occupied much of LAUC-B's energies in 1975, as it had the preceding three years. Berkeley librarians had played a major part in the development of the issue, ever since the union conducted the first survey of comparison institutions in 1966. The union had played a prominent role in the lengthy (1972-1975) legislative campaign for a salary inequity increase, and two

representatives from Berkeley were on the UC administration's systemwide Committee on the Restructure of Librarian Salaries: Gwendolyn Lloyd of the Institute of Industrial Relations, representing LAUC, and William Wenz, the Library Personnel Officer, representing personnel administrators.

Policy Advice

With most of the work to achieve recognition, peer review and salary restructure nearly completed, the division began to talk about going beyond concern for its own status, standards, organization and procedures, and providing advice on broad library-related concerns. One of the first important issues to surface was the choice of BALLOTS (later RLIN) or OCLC. LAUC-B sponsored a forum for all staff to explore the issue of automated bibliographic control, with UL Dougherty, AUL for Technical Services Rosenthal and Systems Head Susan Martin as speakers. In 1976, it prepared a detailed analysis of the Salmon Plan, holding two meetings with UC Vice President for Library Services Steve Salmon present for questions and discussion.

Interestingly, the librarians employed in systemwide UC's Library Systems Development program (later the Division of Library Automation) decided in 1977 that they preferred not to deal with the ramifications of academic status, especially peer review, choosing rather to be reclassified into other job titles.

In 1976 Jane Flener resigned as AUL for Public Services, and two LAUC-B representatives, Geri Scalzo (Graduate Social Sciences) and Dorothy Gregor (Public Health) were appointed to the search committee for a new AUL. The Executive Committee interviewed seven candidates, of whom Elaine Sloan was chosen, to begin 1977. Other less successful advisory initiatives sought input into the Library budget for 1977/78 and the College Curriculum Committee.

In October 1977 the Library Advisory Council again redefined itself, becoming the Advisory Committee to the University Librarian, dropping the LAUC-B Chair as an ex-officio member and reducing the number of divisional members on the Nominating Committee from two to one. The division protested the reduction of its advisory role, and the 1977 Executive Committee spent several meetings debating the change. Several of its members, led by Chair Richard Cooper (Middle Eastern Bibliographer), argued that LAUC should concern itself only with professional governance and development matters, not with library operations; others, such as Julia Cooke (Library School), argued just as strongly that it should tackle the full range of issues confronting librarians as professionals, including those involving library operations. The two chief problems complicating LAUC-B's role in advisory committees were the fact that the committees had to include support staff, which LAUC could not represent, and exclude Non-General librarians, who were LAUC members.

In 1978 University Librarian Dougherty resigned; Joe Rosenthal became Acting UL in July. LAUC-B again requested participation in the UL selection process, with at least two librarians on the Search Committee. The Vice Chancellor agreed, asking for five to seven nominees. Richard Cooper and Rita Kane (Biology) were the eventual appointees.

Rosenthal was appointed University Librarian in October 1979. ACUL, with seven appointed members serving staggered 3-year terms, along with the UL and AULs as ex-officio members, now had no LAUC-B participation. The division argued that to exclude its Chair was to thwart

the legitimate advisory role assigned to LAUC, and asked that the Chair be made an ex-officio member. It also wanted the minutes to be more widely distributed.

Rosenthal agreed to distribute minutes through *CU News*, but refused to allow LAUC-B representation, even ex-officio. Meeting with the Executive Committee in December 1979, he outlined his view of LAUC as responsible for defining and maintaining professional standards and professional development through CAPA and through career development programs. In his view, participation in policy-making was a part of every librarian's responsibility, so there was no longer a need for LAUC to play this role. He told the division that if it wished to have a role in policy advice it could take the initiative, but it must also be sure its role was effective, not redundant.

In April 1980, however, he suggested that the LAUC-B Chair might join the Department heads group, and the Executive Committee agreed to try that approach. The standing committees—e.g., Reference Services, Collection Management and Development, Bibliographic Control—continued to function under ACUL, and the UL did agree to allow the regular appointment of NGL representatives on each of the committees. The Staff Development Committee continued to be responsible jointly to ACUL and LAUC-B.

For several years the Executive Committee had been concerned about better communication with members, and providing them better information about LAUC. In 1975 a communication tree was developed, each Executive Committee member having responsibility for direct contact with certain library units. In 1976 an Information Packet for New Members was issued, and in early 1980 this grew into a binder-sized LAUC-Berkeley Handbook, which was sent to each member. The 1979/80 Executive Committee also instituted a program for welcoming and orienting new librarians; each was taken to lunch by two Executive Committee members.

The Executive Committee itself, after periods of weekly meetings in the early 1970s, settled into a twice-monthly pattern which continued for the most part until the mid-1980s, when it went to a monthly schedule. A resolution was passed in 1979 requiring that monthly summaries of LAUC-B minutes and concerns be published in *CU News*. The 1980/81 Executive Committee recommended the adoption of "Goals for Annual Review" as a means of focusing LAUC-B efforts over a period of time, by defining objectives and steps to achieve them.

The Executive Committee interviewed candidates for a new AUL for Technical Services in May 1980, and for a new AUL for Public Services in early 1981. Dorothy Gregor and Rita Kane assumed their respective positions in July 1980 and April 1981.

Continuing the effort to become more of a presence on the campus and beyond, the 1981/82 Executive Committee adopted a goal of exploring the possibility of LAUC-B representation on Academic Senate committees, and reciprocal faculty representation on LAUC-B committees. It also favored the idea of having the division and the University Librarian become more active in the political arena, writing letters to legislators on library-related legislation. At this time there were 163 LAUC-B members: 125 from the General Library, 30 in the Non-General libraries, three systemwide librarians and five employed on a temporary basis.

Administrative stipends was one of the most controversial systemwide issues receiving attention in 1981/82. A local ballot on the advisability of stipends at UCB yielded 34 in favor and 51 against. The LAUC-B position was that a systemwide policy was needed; that stipends

might be permissible if tied to additional duties; that they should be temporary, not simply an adjunct of administrative or supervisory responsibilities; that they should be granted in consultation with CAPA; and that appointments be for only two years, with renewal options thereafter.

A proposed Library Specialist Series was first discussed in 1980, in response to reports of Library Council's Personnel Committee on the restructure of the Library Assistant Series. LAUC-B objected strongly to the overlap proposed, and to the confusion between the Specialist and librarian series, fearing that the University might begin using the Specialist Series to fill librarian jobs. The proposal was also criticized for emphasizing basic librarianship skills, rather than specialized technical skills. LAUC-B did agree that a higher pay scale was needed for top Library Assistant jobs. In 1981/82 there were further objections to the proposed Library Unit Head Specialist. On the other hand, Berkeley reactions to the first efforts in 1982 of the LAUC Committee on Definition of a Librarian were also rather negative.

Jack Leister (Institute of Governmental Studies) chaired a systemwide LAUC committee on the Northern Regional Library Facility in 1979/80, and was appointed the LAUC representative on the Facility's Board in December 1981. LAUC's decision to have a regular voting member on the Board engendered some controversy. The Board Chair, Berkeley's UL Rosenthal, initially opposed the idea, but eventually the Board recommended that LAUC be given one non-voting member, on the same basis as the UC Academic Senate. Rebecca Martin of the Biology Library was appointed to a three-year term in February 1983.

There was an October 1982 letter from the Chair of the Program Committee, Becky Mason (later Lhermitte, Executive Library), to LAUC-B Chair Don Williams, inquiring on behalf of the committee whether the "brown-bag" lunch programs on peer review could be conducted on "work time," if they spilled over the one-hour lunch period. This was indicative of the fact that, even though librarians had been academic employees for twenty years, most still felt as constrained as any staff employee to adhere to a strict eight-hour schedule, and viewed participation in such informal LAUC activities during regular working hours to be something that was still questionable and had to be justified. In the view of the union, one of the most important gains reflected in the Memorandum of Understanding, in 1984, was the omission of any definition of the normal work week, and the establishment of the concept of the professional "discretion" in the "flexible use" of one's time.

Internal recruitment became a major issue in 1982, when the Library decided to restrict application to the vacant position of Education-Psychology Library Head to persons within the General Library. An Ad Hoc Committee on Internal Recruitment was appointed, and the issue debated extensively. The final decision was that internal recruitment was better than an internal transfer, but that the norm should be external recruitment. UL Rosenthal agreed that internal transfer or recruitment should be used only when needed to solve a personnel problem or take advantage of an opportunity created by a vacancy, or because finances require it. The Ad Hoc Committee drafted a set of "Guidelines for Handling Vacancies in Librarian Positions," which was forwarded to CAPA, the University Librarian and Vice Chancellor George Maslach in late 1982. A revised document, "Guidelines Governing Internal Recruitment and Transfer for Professional Positions at UC Berkeley," was scheduled for discussion in Spring 1983, but tabled pending the resolution of the collective bargaining question, since UC was now prohibited from

consulting with LAUC about any matter which might be within the "scope of representation" of an employee organization. LAUC-B attempted to revive the issue in 1983/84, but without effect.

Again in 1984/85 the Executive Committee resurrected the document, revised it, and adopted it as a LAUC-Berkeley position paper "Guidelines for Filling Vacancies in Librarian Series at U.C. Berkeley." In July 1985 it was sent to the University Librarian, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the UC Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. Although UL Rosenthal said in November 1985 that he accepted the guidelines "in theory," acknowledged that they were substantially "in effect" in the General Library, and proposed to Vice Chancellor Roderic Park that they be adopted as a campus administrative document in July 1986, no action was apparently taken. The 1986/87 Executive Committee again discussed, revised and adopted them in April 1987, but there is no further mention of them in the record.

In July 1979, campus unions had begun petition drives to require collective bargaining elections. The ruling that most librarians supervising other librarians at UCB be excluded from the Librarian bargaining unit caused a division within the LAUC-B membership between those who would be covered by the provisions of any union contract and those who would not.

University Federation of Librarians President Bill Whitson sent letters to LAUC-B Chair Gail Nichols (Documents) in early 1979 addressing a number of union concerns, including the effect of workload considerations in promotion and merit reviews, and a proposal for an optional 10-month year, similar to what was now provided librarians in the CSU system. At the suggestion of Acting UL Rosenthal, the Executive Committee, CAPA, ACUL, the LAUC Ad Hoc Committee on CAPA Guidelines, the AULs, department heads and the Library Personnel Officer held a joint meeting that March to discuss the issues raised with UFL representatives Bill Whitson, Anne Lipow, Betty Todd, Charles Shain and Mary Blackburn.

The 1982/83 and 1983/84 Executive Committees had to contend with the general uncertainties about LAUC's role in the context of collective bargaining. The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), signed in October 1984, provided a new framework for LAUC's role, since professional and governance concerns were reserved to LAUC, while salary, benefits and working conditions were covered by the MOU. One consequence of the new environment was that LAUC had to take responsibility for the allocation of funds for research and professional development. The responsibilities of the Committee on Research—which became the Committee on Research and Professional Development—were therefore enlarged, and the Staff Development Committee narrowed its focus to the needs of support staff.

The Executive Committee met with UL Joe Rosenthal, Vice Chancellor Park and University Council-AFT President Phil Hoehn in June 1984, to discuss LAUC's future role in peer review and professional development, given the evolving separation of "Tier 1" and "Tier 2" issues in the nearly completed contract negotiations.

In early 1984 the Search Committee for a new AUL/Technical Services consisted of one AUL (Sheila Dowd), one LAUC-B representative (Ivan Arguelles, Catalog), one department head and one support staff representative. The LAUC-B Executive Committee served as one interviewing group. Sue Rhee was selected to replace Dorothy Gregor.

The advisory committee structure underwent further changes in the mid-1980s. In September 1983, Library administration decided to suspend ACUL, have the advisory committees report

directly to the Library Administrative Group, and assign to the LAUC-B Executive Committee responsibility for nominating librarians for the standing committees. The University Librarian would consult monthly with the Executive Committee on library policies and programs. LAUC-B welcomed the change as a potential strengthening of its role.

A year later, Library administration proposed that the division take responsibility for the Library Policy Advisory Committees. A Subcommittee on Committees was appointed to evaluate the proposal. Following the recommendations of LAUC-B and the Library Administrative Group, the Library defined a new General Library Policy Advisory Committee structure in 1985, which has continued to the present day.

The division nominates librarians for certain "slots" on each committee, and the Staff Development Committee nominates support staff for other slots, but the committees are appointed by the University Librarian and report to the Library administration. Non-General librarians are also appointed to each committee, based on nominations from the Committee on Non-General Library Affairs (which has one member on the LAUC-B Nominating and Elections Committee). Each committee was to designate one librarian as liaison to the LAUC-B Executive Committee. In addition to the policy advisory committees there were a number of strictly administrative committees, such as the Public Services Advisory Group to Technical Services, Cataloging Council, and any task forces that the Library administration might appoint. LAUC-B also had several of its own committees, though they did not deal with Library policies and operations.

In 1983/84 the campus finally began to allocate a discrete fund (\$4,500) to cover travel and meeting expenses for the LAUC-B Executive Committee, which had previously been funded from the General Library administrative budget. In 1985/86 the division submitted a comprehensive budget request to the Vice Chancellor for the first time, totalling \$6,700; nearly the full amount, \$6,000, was approved.

The 1983/84 Executive Committee was very concerned with problems of communication with the UL, the Vice Chancellor and the faculty, as well as with the general lack of participation by LAUC-B members. To improve matters, it developed a 2-page outline of objectives and goals. The following year it set up a regular schedule of meeting every six months with the Vice Chancellor, which in 1986/87 changed to once a year. A similar schedule was set with the University Librarian, in addition to separate meetings with the Chair and Vice Chair every other month.

The UC Presidential Statement on the Status of LAUC, issued in September 1985 to conform to the redefinition of the Association's role embodied in the Tier 2 "Compact" of the collective bargaining agreement, clearly gave LAUC a role in advising campus and library administrations on the "operations and policies of the libraries," and in "the planning, evaluation and implementation of programs, services or technological changes in the libraries of the University." Despite this, most of the development of LAUC-B's role in the late 1980s involved efforts at reaching out to establish new links with campus bodies beyond the Library.

One effort which produced tangible results involved campus parking. Although the parking privileges granted librarians might seem clearly a "benefit" which should have been the province of the union, LAUC-B took strong action in February 1986 (along with the union) to protest a revision of Central Campus eligibility which eliminated Central Campus parking privileges for Associate Librarians. Eventually, nearly all the librarians who lost their eligibility were

re-granted their privileges on an exceptional basis, and LAUC-B, with the help of the Library administration, was able to gain representation on the Campus Parking Committee. Catherine Cortelyou (Transportation) was appointed to the Committee in 1987.

In 1985/86 Chair Patricia Kreitz (CDRS) wrote to UL Rosenthal on behalf of the Executive Committee, opposing the General Library's intention to develop separate "work rules" for Library employees that differed from those already covering all University staff. Later, LAUC-B was enjoined by the University administration from discussing the issue, since it was deemed to fall into the domain of the union and the MOU. The proposed work rules, however, were eventually dropped.

In the same year LAUC-B appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on Librarians Teaching in the Library School (Ivan Arguelles, Susana Hinojosa, Norma Kobzina), because the Library was no longer reimbursing units for time lost when librarians were teaching in the School of Library and Information Studies (SLIS), thereby making it impossible for most units to allow them to engage in this very worthwhile professional activity. The matter was cleared up, and Library administration reverted to its previous practice of reimbursing the units affected.

It may have been this action that prompted the University Librarian, in his spring 1987 meeting with the Executive Committee, to suggest expanding relationships with the Library School and the Academic Senate. The Executive Committee met that summer with Dean Robert Berring of SLIS to discuss having faculty members serve on advisory committees, establishing a mentor program for Library School students, expanding the intern program, recruiting minorities, incorporating bibliographic instruction in the curriculum, and developing a recommended LAUC-B reading list for Library School students. Over the next two years, all these initiatives were explored; one tangible enough to be finally realized was the "LAUC-B Notable Books" list, completed by Gary Handman in 1988.

In the late 1980s, LAUC-B was responding to an increasing number of campus and systemwide plans and recommendations dealing with libraries and automation. In 1986/87 it tackled the proposal of the California Library Networking Task Force for "multitype library networking," the reorganization of the Division of Library Automation, MELVYL development plans, the report of the systemwide Task Force on Academic Computing, a revised Library Plan for Development and the Library Automation Review Committee report. In 1988/89 there was a major report on the future of the UCB libraries for the WASC accreditation visit, and Library Council's "Electronic Database Access Proposal."

Another major initiative on the campus level was the first Spring Symposium on "The Right to Know: Access to Federal Information," which was held in the Boalt Hall Auditorium in April 1987. The all-afternoon program included prominent faculty members and outside speakers. Three of the five papers were later published in *Government Information Quarterly*, thanks to efforts by Marc Levin (Institute of Governmental Studies). The second Symposium, held in October 1988, dealt with "Information, Knowledge and Wisdom: the Library in American Education and Culture." Although it was an all-day program and enlisted speakers as notable as Alexander Astin (UCLA), Theodore Roszak (author), Patricia Holt (*San Francisco Chronicle* Book Review Editor) and UC Vice-President William Frazer, the attendance was disappointing.

Another outreach initiative was the establishment of a UC- Berkeley "Public Communication Liaison," to publicize LAUC-B through articles in *UC Focus*, *UC Notice* and other channels, in the way Jean Smith (UCSD) had begun to do for systemwide LAUC. Ellen Meltzer (Moffitt) served the first year (1987/88), and Barbara Glendenning (BioSciences) the second.

Better relations with the Academic Senate Library Committee were recommended by UL Rosenthal in a fall 1987 meeting, and this initiative was pursued over the next several years, beginning with an informal "brown bag" lunch meeting of the Senate Library Committee and LAUC-B Executive Committee in August 1988. The idea of representation on the Senate Library Committee, in an "observer" or non-voting capacity, was discussed in 1988/89, and in October 1989 incoming LAUC-B Chair Pete Evans wrote to the Committee, which accepted the proposal. The Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect was made an ex-officio non-voting member. Ron Heckart, the 1989/90 Vice-Chair, was the first to serve.

When Vice Chancellor Park appointed an 11-member Commission on the Future of the Berkeley Libraries in early 1989, it included only three librarians--the University Librarians from Berkeley and Davis, Joe Rosenthal and Marilyn Sharrow, together with Nancy Van House, of the School of Library and Information Studies. LAUC-B requested representation, and also recommended appointing someone to the Commission representing the Ethnic Studies departments. Ellen Meltzer, past Chair of LAUC-B, was appointed to the Commission in September 1989, and Lily Castillo-Speed, Head of the Chicano Studies Library, in November. The Commission submitted its report in the spring of 1990.

The late 1980s saw a number of LAUC-B activities relating to cultural diversity. Recruitment of minority librarians was the focus of discussions in 1987 and 1988 with the Library, the Vice Chancellor and the Library School. In October 1988 the Executive Committee discussed the work of CLA's CSL Library Recruitment Committee with UCB librarian Susana Hinojosa, and considered a proposal from Colette Myles for an ad hoc committee on minority recruitment. When UL Rosenthal requested advice from LAUC-B on the same issue in October 1989, Chair Pete Evans appointed an ad hoc committee to develop guidelines for recruitment of minorities, consisting of Ellen Meltzer, Armanda Mason, Diane Brown and Lily Castillo-Speed. The Committee submitted a lengthy set of recommendations to LAUC-B, involving action by the Library, LAUC-B, the School of Library and Information Studies and other systemwide and national minority groups.

On the initiative of Ellen Meltzer, 1988/89 Chair, LAUC-B joined with the California Academic and Research Librarians (CARL) and California State University chapters of CLA, to co-sponsor a program at the November 1989 CLA Annual Conference on "Cultural Diversity in the Curriculum: Radical Reform or Institutionalized Change." The following year, LAUC-B sent four representatives to the LAUC Cultural Diversity Workshop, held at UCLA in October 1990.

The stress of the continual budget squeeze led the Library to hold a major retreat in October 1988. "Target 95" attempted to identify ways the Library could trim operations to maintain excellence in an era of declining resources. LAUC-B did not participate, since planning of that kind was deemed the responsibility of administrative units. One advisory committee, the Committee on Bibliographic Control, had been dissolved earlier (May 1988) in order to eliminate unnecessary committee work, and in meetings with LAUC-B following Target 95, UL Rosenthal urged further scrutiny of committees and of the peer review process to the same end. In fact, he

appointed the Task Force on the Librarian Review Process (described below in the section "Peer Review") with this objective in mind. The major outcome of Target 95, however, was the development of new policies restricting service to non-primary clientele, about which LAUC-B commented in November 1989.

Sheila Dowd, the AUL for Collection Development, retired in September 1988, and the Executive Committee appointed a 4-person subcommittee to interview the five candidates for the position. David Farrell was appointed in the Spring of 1989.

Two Delphi Questionnaires were distributed in 1988/89 to gather comment from the divisions on the priorities LAUC should assign possible kinds of activity it might undertake. Eleven categories were identified and ranked by 30 respondents: the role of the professional, electronic information access, staff retraining, minority recruitment, UC systemwide planning, improved financial support for individual librarians, library budgets, equity in performance review, and other miscellaneous issues.

In 1989 Patricia Vanderberg (Catalog) asked the Executive Committee to request that a librarian, as a LAUC-B representative, be included in the academic procession at the Berkeley Convocation, rather than march as a Library representative in the staff group, as had always been the custom. The Chair, Pete Evans, attempted to explore the issue with the campus, but was unsuccessful. Vanderberg decided to participate, but was compelled to march in the staff group. The case served as a reminder that in a great many matters in which employees are categorized as faculty or staff, librarians are still treated as staff. LAUC-B's efforts were rewarded, however, when Milt Ternberg and Alison Howard, the first two recipients of the Distinguished Librarian Award, represented LAUC-B in the academic procession at the inauguration of Chancellor Chang-Lin Tien in the spring of 1991.

The 1990/91 Executive Committee welcomed a new Chancellor, Chang-Lin Tien, and Vice Chancellor, John Heilbron. The Chancellor was invited to speak at the Spring Assembly, and the Vice Chancellor first met with the Executive Committee and UL Rosenthal in October, resuming the tradition of holding such meetings annually. One topic was the possibility of LAUC-B representation on Academic Senate committees other than the Library Committee, e.g., those dealing with instructional planning and academic computing.

The University budget crisis and the loss of staff from the first Voluntary Early Retirement Incentive Program (VERIP), also known as "Plus 5," dominated much of LAUC-B's agenda in 1990/91. Both the University Librarian, Joe Rosenthal, and the AUL for Public Services, Rita Kane, announced in late 1990 that they would be retiring under VERIP. The Executive Committee discussed with UL Rosenthal proposed ideas for handling the impending AUL vacancy, and recommended individuals the Committee felt might be appointed to fill the position on an interim basis. Eventually, the Assistant University Librarian for Collections, David Farrell, was made Acting Associate University Librarian for Public Services and Collections.

The Vice Chancellor also solicited suggestions for LAUC-B representatives on the Search Committee for a new University Librarian, and submitted a draft position announcement for the division to review. The Executive Committee also expressed concern about arrangements for an interim UL, and willingness to discuss the matter, but the issue became moot when UL Rosenthal was recalled on a part-time basis to continue as UL until December 1991, shortly before the arrival of his successor.

Ron Heckart and Camille Wanat were appointed to the 7-member UL Search Committee, the latter as Co-chair with Arnold Leiman, Chair of the Academic Senate. The Executive Committee sent a letter with its views on the qualifications and skills a University Librarian ought to possess.

Since the Library would lose a great many librarians with VERIP and campus administration did not intend to replace them, there was a likelihood of increased workloads and reassignments. In December 1990 the LAUC-B Executive Committee began a series of discussions regarding the ramifications for both reassignment and recruitment, and for expectations and criteria in the review process. A 2-page analysis, "Personnel Options in the Wake of the Plus 5 Early Retirement Program," was developed to promote a common understanding of what could be done under the existing policies and procedures.

Criticism of the advisory committee structure had been developing for several years, exacerbated by the desire to eliminate unnecessary activities and meetings that wasted time. Some changes were being proposed; the AUL for Collections outlined a plan for reorganizing the Collection Management and Development Committee. In the summer of 1991 the LAUC-B Nominating and Elections Committee, chaired by Bill Whitson and charged with nominating librarians for advisory committees, conducted a survey of what members thought about divisional and Library committees, to provide background information for any review of the advisory committee structure.

While respondents generally felt that LAUC-B should continue to play a role in the structure, they preferred committees that had important work to do (such as CAPA), that had well-defined tasks, that were well-run by their chairs, and—in the case of advisory committees—that were listened to. The chief complaints were of poor committee management; administrators who didn't take committee input seriously, or failed to organize or clarify the decision-making process; and the difficulty some librarians found in securing committee assignments, which they attributed to bias or favoritism. The LAUC-B Executive Committee reviewed the report, found it useful, and agreed that review of the committee structure was needed. Before taking action, however, it decided to await the arrival of the new University Librarian.

The following June, Susana Hinojosa brought another survey to the Executive Committee: the report of a Communication Task Force appointed by the Library administration, which had distributed questionnaires to all Library staff. The survey revealed a deep alienation between support staff and librarians, confusion about the committee structure, a sense that management often did not allow people to contribute, a desire for direct communication with the top and for effective management training.

In February 1992, LAUC-B established an e-mail reflector, for distribution of announcements, agendas, minutes and other communication. Although 30 LAUC-B members still did not have e-mail at the time, the campus was moving rapidly to provide it to all staff.

Communication has always been a problem for LAUC-B, because of its size. In the early years, divisional Assemblies generally involved a great deal of discussion—and even the use of parliamentary procedure, to control motions and debate!—and there were often more than two scheduled during the year. But by the late 1970s they had settled into a pattern of two per year, and were generally rather formal: mainly reports from the LAUC-B and committee chairs and from representatives to systemwide committees. At times, efforts were made to change the pattern by providing reports in print form, or by carefully scheduling a period for discussion of

a pressing issue, but to little effect. In recent years guest speakers have frequently been invited, so that the Assembly has become part "program."

Because of its ineffectiveness as a forum for discussion of issues, "LAUC-B" has generally come to mean the LAUC-B Executive Committee, since that is the only group in the division that meets regularly to discuss LAUC issues. Agendas are now distributed by e-mail and the meetings are open, but not many outside the Executive Committee ever attend. There is little sense among Berkeley librarians generally that they belong to or participate in the association, except through work on LAUC and LAUC-B committees, and many issues come before the Executive Committee and evoke a "LAUC-B" response without most of the members being much aware of them.

In 1992 The Executive Committee met with Vice Chancellor John Heilbron in March, with Acting SLIS Dean Nancy Van House in April, and with the new University Librarian Dorothy Gregor in May. Professor Arnold Leiman spoke at the Spring Assembly.

In March of that year, Chair Becky Lhermitte wrote on behalf of LAUC-B to Provost Judson King to support "the continued presence of the School of Library and Information Studies as an integral, vital part" of the University. At the same time, three LAUC-B members—Beth Rebman (Music/SLIS faculty), Susana Hinojosa (Moffitt/Minority Mentoring Program) and Andrea Sevetson (Government Documents/LAUC-B Mentoring Coordinator)—working with Associate Dean Charlotte Nolan, developed a proposed Library School Mentoring Program, involving both the division and the Library.

In September 1990, there were 154 members of LAUC-B. By August 1991 the number had declined to 128. Twelve months later it had dropped still further, to about 115, and the prospect in spring 1993 was that it would continue to fall, as the most severe budgetary crisis in the University's history imposed "downsizing," reorganization, reassignment, and the increased utilization of lower-paid staff to perform jobs once done by librarians. One cannot help but be reminded of UL Coney's warning that it might be very well for librarians to redefine their role as closer to the faculty model, and thereby justify higher pay and status, but ultimately the University might not be willing to pay us to perform such a role, and would simply hire others to do what we used to do.

In February 1992 Dorothy Gregor, recently UL at UC-San Diego and earlier a participant in the history of LAUC-B, arrived to replace Joseph Rosenthal as University Librarian. She assumed leadership of a library and staff faced with unprecedented challenges and a rocky transition into a new era, with new roles for both librarians and LAUC-Berkeley.

PEER REVIEW

The Task Force Report

The peer review system in place at Berkeley today developed from the Report of the Task Force on Academic Personnel, first released in May 1969 and issued in final form on November 12 of that year. It was in turn derived from elements of the faculty review system in the APM, and from the various position papers of the University Federation of Librarians and the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Status of the College, University and Research Libraries Section (CURLS) of the California Library Association.

All these called for peer review in appointment, tenure, dismissal and grievance decisions. They also insisted that appointment and advancement should be based on professionally defined standards, criteria and procedures, and that advancement be open to non-administrative librarians. But the Task Force Report was the first statement to take the existing faculty provisions of the APM and adapt them to the needs and aspirations of librarians. It defined the librarian series, with Assistant, Associate and Librarian ranks; it defined criteria and procedures for appointment to the series, for promotion and advancement review, and for review resulting in security of employment. The procedures all involved peer review by committees of librarians appointed by LAUC-Berkeley or by the University Librarian.

The original proposal was different in several respects from what was eventually adopted. The most critical area dealt with openness vs. secrecy. In the Task Force proposal, candidates were given access to all reports and recommendations concerning them; were informed of the membership of their review committees, given the right to appear before them, and had the right to see their reports. While such a system will appear radical to most Berkeley librarians today, it is found elsewhere; indeed, it has been followed for a long time at San Francisco State University, where the Peer Review Committee performs the tasks assigned to our "review initiator." The assumption of the Task Force was that professional employees should be expected to take responsibility for their actions and judgments, and deal in a mature way with the knowledge of the judgment of colleagues as well as supervisors. The other chief difference was a Committee on Appeals, separate from CAPA, and a special review process for cases involving demotion or dismissal of librarians with security of employment, including a hearing before a peer committee.

But when the proposal was submitted for comment to the Senate Library Committee, its chairman, Delmar Brown, responded that in the opinion of the faculty this degree of openness would render the reviews perfunctory and nearly always favorable, since no one wants to be "known as the one who voted against the promotion of a colleague." It recommended instead that the membership of the (ad hoc) Review Committee be kept confidential; that the departmental report (recommendation), the Review Committee report and the CAPA report all be kept confidential; and that in the case of denial, a special report or explanation be prepared jointly by the Director (the University Librarian) and CAPA.

It also recommended one academic non-librarian on any three-person review committee. On the whole, however, the Library Committee found that the Task Force Report "recommends some truly constructive personnel changes—many that are long overdue...especially...your move to provide meaningful participation in the formulation and implementation of library

policy...your clear statements of rights and privileges for librarians." It was also impressed with the appeal procedure, which, "for promotion appeals, moves beyond anything we have in the Senate."

John Wagner, Campus Personnel Manager, also reviewed the Report and made a list of comments. Among his concerns was the use of "just cause" as the only basis for dismissal. He pointed out that "just cause" is normally used in union contracts and is much stronger than "arbitrary, capricious or unreasonable actions by administrative officers," which was the basis for filing a grievance in the non-Senate academic appeals procedure.

The Report was also submitted to each of the other campuses, and in April 1970 the systemwide LAUC Committee on Privilege, Salaries, Conditions, and Security of Employment presented a somewhat revised version of it under the title "Consensus of the Views of the Nine Campuses on the Systemwide Issues Contained in the Report of the Berkeley Task Force on Academic Library Personnel." The Consensus omitted most of the detailed procedural and appeals elements mentioned above, leaving such matters to campus-level development.

CAPA Guidelines

The first Berkeley review procedures were based on the original Task Force Report, modified by the considerable comment and discussion which took place in summer and fall 1969. There were initially two documents: the 2-page "CAPA Guidelines for the Appointment Policy, Criteria, and Procedures," approved by the Executive Committee on February 24, 1970, and the 6-page "Advancement, Promotion and Review for Academic Library Personnel, The General Library, University of California, Berkeley," adopted by the Executive Committee on March 3, 1970. The provisions of both documents were fairly terse, and closer in most respects to the pared-down, more conservative recommendations of the Consensus statement than to the more ambitious proposals of the Task Force Report.

The definition of three academic ranks does not appear, since librarians were still classified in the five-rank system, and no mention is made of tenure, security of employment or appeals. Criteria for appointment took some pains to establish the M.L.S. degree as a minimum requirement, while allowing for exceptions. Criteria for advancement and promotion cited four categories, of which the first was "professional service in the library," adding only that "reasonable flexibility is exercised in weighing the relative merits of these criteria, particularly in their relation to the...position."

CAPA consisted of five members, appointed for staggered three-year terms. Apart from reviewing all candidates for appointment, its duties included selection, in consultation with the University Librarian, of the Promotion Review ("ad hoc") committees; reviewing cases involving advancement of more or less than a normal step; assisting ad hoc committees by gathering additional material; and consulting with the UL on questions arising in specific cases. There was no peer review for normal merits, and no CAPA review of promotion cases. The ad hoc committees were made confidential, but their reports, with committee members' names and signatures removed, were given to the candidate. Non-librarian academics could be appointed to ad hoc committees.

The procedure for promotion involved submission by the department head of a job-description card and a letter of recommendation. The latter included a comprehensive assessment of the

candidate's qualifications, after discussion with the candidate. The Promotion Review committee could ask CAPA for additional documentation, but all materials other than the department head's recommendation were kept confidential, and destroyed after the appeal period expired. The recommendation of the ad hoc committee was sent to the candidate and department head, as well as to the University Librarian, and a copy retained in the personnel file. The UL could meet with the Review Committee if the two parties' decisions differed. An Associate University Librarian might be included in the meeting with the agreement of the Review Committee.

Section 82

At this very time, on April 1, 1970, UC librarians were asked to respond to the first draft of Section 82 of the APM. The contrast with the Task Force Report and the first CAPA procedures is striking. The University Librarian acted as reviewer, consulting with "appropriate professional library personnel," and made recommendations directly to the Chancellor, who would consult with a standing committee appointed by him, composed of representative Senate and non-Senate members. Appointments to the Assistant rank were to be for fixed terms of not more than two years each, with a maximum of six years of University service in the rank—the appointment pattern still used for faculty, although their maximum period is eight years. Appointees in the series were specifically granted neither tenure nor security of employment. Appointments at the Associate and Librarian ranks were simply "continuing during satisfactory performance of duties."

The division found the proposal "so deficient in content and structure that it rewrote the entire document." It incorporated its own proposed changes, and submitted them directly to Vice President Angus Taylor on May 13, 1970. However, since the LAUC-B revision was generally compatible with the structure and content presented, the Section 82 document, even with the changes, still contrasts markedly with the Consensus document. The most important changes were the addition of tenure for the Associate and Librarian ranks, provision for dismissal only for cause and after review by a peer committee, and provisions for the University Librarian to consult with a peer committee of librarians before making recommendations in merit and promotion cases.

Vice President Taylor took LAUC's Consensus document quite seriously, and incorporated much of it into a revised Section 82 proposal in the summer of 1970. The Berkeley division, while grateful for the improvements, still expressed serious concern about the lack of a grievance procedure, the lack of a revised salary structure and the issue of tenure or security of employment. It worked extensively all year to discuss proposals and counterproposals, both with University Librarian Skipper and campus administration, and with systemwide LAUC and University administration. The UFL was also contributing lengthy comment, to both LAUC-B and various levels of administration. Another draft of Section 82, issued in April 1971, shortened the document, gave campuses greater autonomy in devising their own procedures, gave greater leeway for the Chancellor to delegate authority to the University Librarian or other administrative officers, made appointments "indefinite" at the Assistant level, and introduced the terms "career status" and "potential career status." A new Section 51-4 defined criteria for appointment, promotion and advancement and the review procedures.

Implementation

In the meantime, LAUC-B began to implement peer review on its own, within the General Library. The first CAPA, consisting of Kimiyo Hom (chair), Rudy Lednicky, Sondra Shair, Naomi Held and Margaret Studhalter, was appointed in February 1970 and served until September 1971. Kimiyo Hom was also at this time Berkeley's representative on the LAUC Committee which was working on the Consensus document, and both she and Margaret Studhalter had been part of the Task Force on Academic Personnel.

The first CAPA reviewed 11 merit cases of more or less than a single step, and 46 applications for seven positions above the Librarian 1 level. The 1971 Annual Report notes some problems with the process: "many still feel the department head can evaluate better than a committee of peers," and "lack of confidence between the administration and CAPA." In fact, in February 1972 Acting UL Eldred Smith reported to the Executive Committee that some dissatisfaction had been expressed with peer review, and the suggestion made that there be two avenues available: either a peer review or a purely administrative review. The Executive Committee felt that more staff had expressed favorable comments than unfavorable ones, and that more than one year's trial was necessary.

The first full review cycle took place in 1971/72, with Rudy Lednicky as CAPA chair. Sixty-six candidates were reviewed either by ad hoc committees or by CAPA. Acting UL Smith disagreed with eight of the recommendations (four positive and four negative), and in three of the negative cases the committees rewrote their evaluations and recommendations after meeting with him. Richard Dougherty, the new University Librarian, arrived near the end of the cycle, and chose to reverse two of the other five recommendations.

A number of improvements in the procedures were proposed in 1971 and 1972, as people began to gain experience with the process. The arrival of UL Dougherty in June 1972 also occasioned a series of meetings to discuss peer review and other issues. Some of them also included the new AUL for Technical Services, Joseph Rosenthal, Eldred Smith and Personnel Officer William Wenz. A new version of the "CAPA Guidelines" was developed, combining the document on appointment with the one on advancement and promotion review. The new 9-page document, "Appointment, Promotion and Advancement Review for Academic Library Personnel," was adopted by LAUC-B in February 1973. Although it was further revised over the years, it is essentially the same as the campus "Procedures for Appointment, Promotion and Advancement" still in use today.

Because of the large number of cases, it was decided to allow a single ad hoc committee to handle more than one, and this soon proved to serve the positive purpose of providing a broader perspective. Because documentation was inadequate to furnish the ad hoc committee with sufficient basis for an evaluation, the Guidelines now required the candidate to submit a self-evaluation, along with supporting documentation, and suggest up to three names from whom letters of evaluation could be requested. The procedures were modified to include librarians in the Non-General libraries, and CAPA was expanded by the addition of two NGLs.

Since inconsistencies had been observed in the application of standards by the various ad hoc committees, CAPA was given the additional responsibility for "assessment of the parity and equity of all judgments," through a review of all ad hoc committee recommendations and consultation with the appropriate administrator. CAPA could add its own comment to each

dossier, evaluating the "parity" of the ad hoc committee's judgment. When this parity was in question, the University Librarian or other administrator might meet with CAPA.

Following complaints that insufficient emphasis was being given to the primary job assignment—essentially, that review policies were moving too rapidly toward a faculty model while most librarians were still operating in the old mode—the "Criteria" section applying to advancement and promotion was in 1972 revised to provide that the candidate would be "judged on the basis of the first of the...criteria, and, to the extent they are relevant, on one or more of the last three." The main criterion thus became "professional competence and quality of service within the library."

Library administration agreed to train department heads in evaluation. The UCLA review model, in which the Vice Chair of LAUC appointed ad hoc committees from a 12-member panel, was considered as an alternative, discussed with UL Dougherty and dropped. LAUC-B and Dougherty agreed that no one should serve on ad hoc committees but librarians. The new Section 82 would not allow the candidate to see the review committee's report, which was in conflict with UCB procedures; Dougherty agreed to advise the Vice Chancellor that our practice was more appropriate for librarians and that we would continue the Berkeley practice.

Since the Guidelines had omitted any grievance or appeals procedure, LAUC-B appointed Lisa Cziffra (chair), Jack Leister and Carlene Brown as a committee to work on an in-house appeals procedure, to resolve "grievances resulting from failure to be advanced, demotion or firing, and dissatisfaction with library operation." A first draft was completed in August 1972, and a final version accepted at the end of December and recommended to the 1973 Executive Committee. In the spring, however, Dougherty raised objections, arguing that the procedure, including a standing Appeals Board, was unnecessary and unwieldy, and that the existing APM 191 grievance procedure should be adequate. The proposal was dropped.

An issue excluded from the CAPA Guidelines aroused much debate in 1972: the extent to which CAPA should be involved in appointments which were in effect internal reassignments, especially to positions which might be newly created through administrative reorganization, or when the reassignment included promotion. Members generally felt that past administrative actions demonstrated a need for explicit guidelines insuring fairness and consistency. Library administration felt that everyone would be best served if it were allowed flexibility to match individuals with positions.

Finally, the need for a private office for CAPA and the Executive Committee became critically important on CAPA's assumption of the responsibility for soliciting and handling confidential letters and other supporting documentation. Even though the Personnel Officer argued that he was in the best position to handle this responsibility, LAUC-B felt very strongly that CAPA should be responsible for the review materials. Although CAPA argued simply that too many librarians distrusted the Personnel Office, responsibility for the materials was in fact a symbolic reflection of overall responsibility for the review process. In a later meeting UL Dougherty reopened the question, insisting that the Personnel Office solicit the letters. As a compromise the division agreed, with the condition that letters were to be returned to CAPA by the review committees, for it to hold and destroy at the end of the appeal period (if an appeal process were adopted). Room 493 was finally assigned to LAUC-B and CAPA in early 1973.

An interesting historical footnote is that the matter of evaluation of supervisors by their staffs was raised in several of the meetings, after Dougherty wrote an additional paragraph for the

criteria section, providing that librarians with supervisory responsibility were to be evaluated for their performance in that capacity. Dougherty did not wish to provide for staff evaluation of supervisors at that point, but said that he expected it to come, and "noted that if done well it can be of value."

The revised CAPA Guidelines were submitted to the new Vice Chancellor, Mark Christensen, in February. They were returned with suggestions for minor changes in May, and resubmitted shortly afterwards. At that point further objections were raised, chiefly having to do with improving the expansion of the review process to cover NGLs. Laurel Burley, an NGL representative and Vice Chair of the Executive Committee, worked on the changes, and another revision was returned in November 1973. In 1974 the Vice Chancellor began to devote greater attention to the Guidelines, and held a number of special meetings with the Executive Committee, CAPA and Library administration, to hammer out once and for all the changes he would require.

Vice Chancellor Christensen insisted that the procedures parallel those of faculty more closely. CAPA should function like the Senate Budget Committee, adding its own written evaluation to each review rather than just commenting on the recommendation of the ad hoc committee. Most important, he was adamant that ad hoc committee reports must be only summarized, not sent verbatim to the candidate, and that ad hoc committees be appointed by the UL, not by CAPA. He also decided that the Vice Chancellor should be the final decision maker, so that NGLs and librarians in General Library would be treated in the same way. The UL was to discuss disagreements only with CAPA, rather than with the ad hoc committee. Vice Chancellor Christensen actually revised the "Procedures for Appointment, Promotion and Advancement" (the CAPA Guidelines) himself, and promulgated them as official campus procedures in June 1974.

The proposed changes were presented and explained to the divisional Assembly of April 25, 1974. There was much opposition among the 43 librarians present to the substitution of "summaries" for the verbatim reports of the ad hoc committees. A motion to protest this change was passed with only four negative votes, and Chair Bill Whitson sent a letter to the Vice Chancellor and other interested parties communicating and explaining the division's sentiment. University Librarian Dougherty wrote back criticizing the Chair for the letter's assertion that "the majority of UC-B librarians continue to feel that the academic peer review procedures at UC-B [to which librarians were being asked to conform] provide for an unwarranted degree of confidentiality." Dougherty did not believe the 43 librarians attending that meeting represented the views of librarians as a whole. The Executive Committee therefore sent out a straw ballot in October, on this and other requirements of the Vice Chancellor's changes: that CAPA do its own review and that the UL discuss disagreements only with CAPA rather than with the ad hoc committees. An overwhelming proportion of the 54 members voting opposed the changes, but the straw ballot was deemed inconclusive because of alleged bias in the wording of the questions. LAUC-B abandoned its efforts to oppose the changes, the Procedures were issued officially by campus administration, and peer review was fully established.

The AHCPR Report

The Procedures were barely on their way to approval when a new crisis erupted over performance standards. Meeting with LAUC-B in March 1974, the University Librarian asserted that promotion to Librarian should *not* be a normal expectation, but happen only in exceptional

cases. LAUC-B resisted the proposal, but finally agreed that the rank of Librarian requires more exceptional qualities than that of Associate Librarian.

Next, Dougherty began asking for documentation to support normal merits as well as accelerated merits and promotions. Meeting in early April, LAUC-B objected to the timing of the change and to fact that this was not then required by CAPA Guidelines, but agreed it should be added in the future.

Then, also in April 1974, the UL complained that there would be 17 candidates for promotion to Librarian in 1974, and 11 more were expected the following year, but that there was very little to differentiate them since cases were based chiefly on job performance. He saw little in the way of development of specialties and accomplishments beyond the primary assignment which would justify promotion at this level, especially for those without major management responsibility, and concluded it would be premature to promote most of the candidates—even though at this time only 14% of the librarians were at the full Librarian level. His statements, both verbal and written, precipitated a great deal of discussion. Seventy-one librarians attended the May 16 Assembly to debate the issue, which included the ways librarians differ from faculty, the 40-hour week and the limited relevance of research and publication. Dougherty wanted more concern with professional growth, and a willingness to work more than 40 hours a week.

In May 1974 LAUC-B articulated general principles underlying promotion criteria, and went on to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion Review (AHCPR), "to develop career models which could serve as guides to both promotion review committees and to Berkeley librarians planning their own professional growth; to draft policy statements regarding the levels of performance [expected] in various career specializations...; and to develop guidelines for effective documentation." Neal Kaske chaired the committee, whose other members were Allen Covici, Richard Cooper, Louise Eastland, Ann Gilbert, Catherine Moreno and Kent Schriefer. The AHCPR in turn appointed 5 subcommittees, so that 35 librarians were actually involved in what became a monumental effort over the next few months.

A 70-page report was submitted in November. It was debated at length, accepted by LAUC-B, but not officially adopted due to the complexity of the contents. In spite of all the committee's work, in the end it proved impossible to prescribe career models and standards for performance in the way some had hoped. The Report did provide an array of useful material, from suggested formats for the self-evaluation, biography and an annual statement of goals, to discussions of career models and specializations, and suggestions for preparing documentation. There were a number of appendixes with information about librarian advancement patterns at Berkeley, including some comparisons with UCLA. While the material in the Report could give librarians an idea of the kinds of things expected, they were still left with the responsibility to develop their own individual career patterns, and each case would have to be evaluated in its own terms.

In 1975 the appeals procedure proposal was resurrected. This time it limited itself to an in-house reconsideration of a promotion or merit-increase decision. The new "Procedure for Librarians Requesting Reconsideration of a Promotion or Salary Decision" was adopted in July and added to the Procedures document.

At the initiative of Library Administration, AUL recommendations were added to review dossiers on an experimental basis in the 1974/75 cycle. LAUC-B recommended that copies be made available to candidate and supervisor, with the candidate given the opportunity to meet with the AUL and respond; Library administration insisted they be treated as confidential.

When the experiment was evaluated at the Fall Assembly, there was strong member sentiment for continuing to include AUL recommendations but making them available to candidates. Vice Chancellor Michael Heyman replied that he wished to continue to include the AUL recommendations, but that they must be confidential at least until the general issue of confidentiality was resolved at the systemwide UC level. President Saxon had in fact appointed a special group to study academic confidentiality in personnel records.

In January 1976, LAUC-B recommended continuing to include the recommendations for another year (rather than dropping them altogether), in order to at least give CAPA and the review committees the benefit of knowing the AULs' position and responding to it.

The Procedures were amended in 1976 to provide that the mandatory review of Assistant Librarians for career status and promotion be moved from the third to the fourth year in the series. In the same year the Library administration proposed disqualifying Assistant Librarians from review committees, and allowing only Librarians on committees for promotion to Librarian. LAUC-B resisted the suggestion, and reached a compromise to limit committees to librarians with career status, and to require two Librarians on review committees for promotion to Librarian. At the same time, the Executive Committee persuaded campus administration to accept changes in the CAPA Guidelines to give the Executive Committee clear responsibility for policy changes in the review process. CAPA's role was to be strictly limited to implementing the policy.

In the spring of 1976, Vice Chancellor Heyman decided to change the responsibility for the final decision, so that he would no longer be both final decision-maker and officer of appeal. For the General Library he delegated the role to the University Librarian, and for NGLs to various provosts, deans and systemwide administrative officers. Since he failed to consult LAUC-B and made the change on March 15, in the middle of the review cycle, the division met with him and objected to the timing of the change and lack of consultation; Heyman agreed to postpone the matter till the following year. In 1977 he proposed making the University Librarian the final decision-maker in all cases. Non-General librarians protested strongly. They voted 15 to 1 to continue with the Vice Chancellor as final decision-maker, and 14 to 1 in favor of an appropriate Provost or Dean, rather than the University Librarian, if the Vice Chancellor insisted on delegation. They prevailed; in the end the Vice Chancellor named the University Librarian the final decision-maker for the General Library, but continued to serve himself in that capacity for the NGLs.

In response to a general impression that UL Dougherty was imposing more stringent standards than were being required on other campuses, the 1976 Executive Committee decided to ask systemwide LAUC for a comparative study of review procedures, as described in Part 1. Berkeley's Ingrid Pfeiffer (Law), after serving on CAPA, began compiling a table, "Librarians Employed Statewide, as of Fall [1982], by Rank and Step," publishing it for the first time in *CU News* in December 1982. She continued compiling the statistics for a number of years.

On a more immediate practical level, in 1976 LAUC-B organized its first local program to assist librarians in the preparation of dossiers, which became a regular adjunct to the review process. Over the years since, it has held "brown-bag" lunch programs nearly every fall to brief librarians on the procedure and to answer questions, has held half-day programs several times (in 1981, 1986 and 1992), as well as a number of others dealing with specific aspects of peer

review and career development. As time went on, these became an almost routine responsibility of the Program Committee.

In addition, LAUC-B developed a number of written guidelines to explain the process. CAPA wrote two 1-page sheets, "Guidelines for Candidate's Self-Evaluation" and "Guidelines for Supervisor's Evaluation (Full Librarian Merit Review)," which were adopted by LAUC-B, distributed in October 1979, and cited by the University Librarian in his administrative cover letter initiating the 1979/80 review cycle.

In 1976 CAPA was reviewing only promotions, merits more or less than normal, and normal merits at the Librarian level. It did not review normal merits at the lower levels because of a general reluctance to allow the review process to become too much work. A librarian up for promotion review could request no more than three letters, partly because CAPA feared librarians would abuse the privilege, and it would take reviewers too much time to deal with more. In early 1977, a candidate for a regular merit asked that letters be solicited. LAUC-B decided that "such requests should be honored, but it should be made clear that they are not required and the practice is not encouraged."

The University Librarian, on the other hand, was constantly pushing for fuller documentation, in order to better evaluate librarians and differentiate between significant and routine accomplishments. In 1976 he raised a flap by asking for documentation to support normal merits. Although LAUC-B disputed the timing and manner of his request, they agreed it should be added in the future.

But the final pressure came neither from the UL nor the division. In 1978/79 the Berkeley representative on the LAUC Committee on Comparative Standards for Peer Review, Bill Whitson, discovered that Berkeley was violating the APM not only in the solicitation of letters, but also in the APM requirement to involve a peer committee in every review action, including normal merits. In fact, this had been a violation from the first adoption of APM 82 and 51-4 in 1972, but it had apparently never been noticed. Berkeley's argument for having peer committees deal only with career status, promotion and special merit reviews was always that, with so many librarians, reviewing normal merits would create an untenable workload for CAPA. On the smaller campuses there had evidently never been such a problem, and UCLA had from the beginning structured its review system so that no one peer committee had to review every action.

Still nothing happened until 1980, when Berkeley's omission came to the attention of Assistant Vice President for Academic Personnel Edward Blakely. Blakely was greatly surprised, and ordered the correct procedure implemented. The 1980 Spring Assembly approved the change and recommended that the wording of the APM be clarified. The local procedures were modified, and CAPA reviewed all merits for the first time in 1981/82.

In spring 1991 Chair Ron Heckart and the Executive Committee developed a position paper, "Peer Review Standards in a Time of Retrenchment," with three recommendations: that candidates and review initiators should note constraints on outside activity and that these constraints should be considered by other reviewers; that the proper emphasis in evaluating professional activities should be on quality and impact, not whether they occur on the national level; and that all reviewers should be more flexible and accommodating in their approach to standards during this period. The paper underwent prolonged review and revision, partly in order

to reach some agreement with the Library administration, which initially reacted negatively. A revised draft, now titled "The Librarian Series and Peer Review: A Reassessment for the 1990's," was forwarded to the Vice Chancellor and to incoming UL Dorothy Gregor in December 1991. A final version, somewhat softened and qualified, and titled "The Librarian Series in the 90's and Beyond," was issued April 30, 1992, and distributed to Vice Chancellor Heilbron, UL Gregor, CAPA and the LAUC-B membership.

Confidentiality

In the mid-1970s---the post-Vietnam, post-Watergate era---there was a national movement to enact legislation at the federal and state levels providing for the privacy of public records on individuals. After a flurry of legislative and University activity, the Information Practices Act of 1977 was finally passed and signed by Governor Brown. It gave all employees the right to see any materials written by persons "in a supervisory position with respect to the individual." In the case of solicited letters or other confidential materials, the individual had the right to see an edited copy of the text or a comprehensive summary.

In the University, chairs of academic departments were not considered to hold supervisory positions, thus the University was within its rights to allow only comprehensive summaries by such officials. There was however some question about whether this could be applied to the reports of known committees such as CAPA and the Budget Committee, or to recommendations by library department heads, AULs or other administrators. Nevertheless, the new Section 82-35 provided that the summary "shall not identify separately the evaluations and recommendations ...of review committees or administrative officers."

Because LAUC-B found the wording ambiguous in the case of librarians, it sent a strong request in April 1977 that all evaluations written by any person in the supervisory chain earlier than peer review be non-confidential, i.e., made available to the candidate. The division's general conclusion in the confidentiality debate was that peer review recommendations should be confidential, but those of administrators should not. Thus, even though the new Section 82 allowed the option of making the recommendations of AULs or other administrators such as department heads above the level of the review initiator either available to the candidate or confidential, LAUC-B and the Library administration agreed that at Berkeley such evaluations were to be considered supervisory and would be made available to candidates.

One interesting consequence of these changes for Berkeley was the clarification of the concept of "review initiator." This party was defined as the person responsible for soliciting letters and other relevant documentation, conducting a comprehensive assessment, discussing the review with the candidate and providing oral or written summaries of confidential materials, and making a recommendation.

In fact, as early as 1972 the CAPA Guidelines had provided that the department head would initiate the review and provide a "comprehensive assessment of the candidate's qualifications and performance," and Vice Chancellor Christensen's 1974 revision added the phrase: "and achievements in all criteria (described in Section 51-4...)." But the practice at Berkeley was generally for the department head or supervisor to evaluate performance within the library only. If letters were solicited, they were solicited from names submitted by the candidate, and the letters were actually requested and received by the Personnel Officer and added to the review

packet before it went to CAPA. Thus the department head had little practical means of evaluating accomplishment beyond the primary assignment.

Another related change clearly provided that the review initiator, not the review committee nor the Personnel Officer, would solicit letters, including a reasonable number from a list of names submitted by the candidate. Unfortunately UL Dougherty, in his cover letter to department heads informing them of the new policies, focused on the requirement that librarians be allowed to inspect their review files—and apparently, although he did not mention it, to receive summaries of any confidential materials. He informed department heads that the Personnel Officer would meet with any librarians who wished to inspect their files, and would continue to solicit letters at the request of candidates and add them to the files before they were sent to the AUL or CAPA. Thus, local practice with regard to the handling of letters continued unchanged until the 1986/87 cycle, when the review initiator was finally allowed to solicit any number of letters, including a reasonable number from names submitted by the candidate.

Demotions and terminations

Another issue that dragged on for years was that of local procedures for the review of "unsatisfactory performance," or for handling terminations and demotions. Section 82 had originally provided for termination in the event performance was judged unsatisfactory, but had not spelled out any special procedures. Beginning in 1976, LAUC-B was asked to develop such procedures for addition to the CAPA Guidelines. The Executive Committee began work on the matter, but a number of questions arose. Finally it sent a memo to the LAUC President asking about the experience of other divisions, specifically raising the possibility of appointing librarians from another campus to a special UCB committee to advise on the proposed termination of a librarian with career status. While the 1977 Executive Committee put the topic on the agenda several times, it decided to await word back from systemwide LAUC.

In early 1978, the issue resurfaced as a crisis. UL Dougherty called the LAUC-B Chair, Arthur Waugh, into his office to inform him that he was considering terminating a career status librarian, and needed to have LAUC-B draw up appropriate local procedures as soon as possible, including guidelines for demotion as an alternative to termination. The whole matter was kept confidential, but the Executive Committee and CAPA held two joint meetings with the University Librarian, and agreed that a subcommittee consisting of Waugh, Linda Beaupré and Jim Kantor would draft a set of proposed mechanisms and procedures.

At Dougherty's request, the Chancellor's Office had also drafted procedures for termination of a librarian with career status, which he wished to submit for the subcommittee's consideration. The draft essentially provided that the AUL would prepare the review and recommendation, and after giving the librarian 10 days to respond, would send it to the University Librarian. The UL would refer it either to CAPA or to a special 3-person review committee, then make a decision, which the librarian could appeal via Section 191. A similar agenda was to be developed for Non-General librarians.

The LAUC-B subcommittee investigated procedures used for the faculty and a proposed procedure for librarians at UC-Santa Cruz, worked with the draft from the Chancellor's Office, and developed a set of proposals for termination review. They were a bit more elaborate than those from the Chancellor's Office, included more safeguards, such as specifying the period of

time over which unsatisfactory performance had been a problem, and envisioned a 5-person termination review committee appointed by CAPA---again defined in various ways to insure experience and impartiality. The proposal was sent to UL Dougherty in the summer of 1978, but he never responded, and the matter was dropped. The Executive Committee attempted to follow up after Dougherty left, but files from the University Librarian's Office did not include the LAUC-B proposals.

In February 1980, four months after systemwide LAUC---on the initiative of the Berkeley division---appointed an Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate Terminations and Demotions, UL Rosenthal reminded LAUC-B of its responsibility for developing procedures, saying he would edit the latest version of the draft and forward it. In May the LAUC Assembly rejected the concept of demotion as a less severe alternative to termination, and left the divisions with the responsibility for developing their own procedures for both demotion and termination review. In June, UL Rosenthal reported that the Chancellor had given him the power to demote, and asked CAPA to devise procedures. CAPA deferred the matter to the Executive Committee.

The 1980/81 Executive Committee, under Charles Martell, appointed an Ad Hoc Committee to Prepare a Position Paper on Demotions and Terminations (Barbara Kornstein, Chair; Tom Alexander, Jim Gault, Jean Peck, Virginia Pratt and Robert Starrs), which submitted a report in May 1981. Basing its work on the earlier systemwide report, the committee set forth local "Principles and Guidelines" for both demotion and termination. But it recommended against adopting the procedures for demotion, since it found no such procedure for any other academic employees, and thought it unwise for librarians to be singled out in this manner.

The proposal recommended that demotion should be considered a most serious action, to be undertaken only after documented findings of unsatisfactory performance in at least two previous reviews; that it should relate solely to the first criterion, professional competence and quality of service within the library, and be based on demonstration that the unsatisfactory performance has resulted in a serious deterioration of services or operations; that it should be undertaken only after offering the librarian every opportunity for improvement, including, if appropriate, a change in assignment; and that review should parallel that for promotion, involving both CAPA and an ad hoc committee. The guidelines for termination were the same, except that termination should be considered an "extraordinary and grave" response to "repeated and gross failure...to carry out assigned responsibilities," and a "history of extremely unsatisfactory performance."

The Executive Committee agreed to drop the issue of demotion, and continued discussions with the University Librarian to work out mutually agreeable guidelines for termination. A revised set of "Principles and Guidelines for Termination Actions---Librarian Series" was approved by a 61-9 vote of the membership in early 1982, and on March 18 of that year the University Librarian and the LAUC-B Chair sent the "Principles and Guidelines" to Vice Chancellor Maslach in a joint letter, requesting that they be approved and added to the local review procedures.

The final version retained most of the original elements: "extraordinary nature," "repeated failure," "documented history of extremely unsatisfactory performance." Unsatisfactory performance was defined as that which "significantly impedes the effective functioning of the Library..." resulting in a demonstrated "deterioration of services or operations," or can be inferred when it is demonstrated that other staff were forced to assume the librarian's responsibilities in order to prevent such a deterioration. Finally, wording was added to clarify

that failure to make a contribution in areas beyond the primary assignment, while it might result in a denial of merit increase or promotion, should not be considered grounds for termination.

In April Vice Chancellor Maslach referred the proposal to the Labor Relations Manager Phil Encino for review by employee organizations. This is the last record of the matter in the divisional files. The "Principles and Guidelines" were never formally adopted, and the matter never resurfaced as a topic of LAUC-B discussion.

Overlapping steps

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, there were a number of discussions of problems which were a consequence of the overlapping steps at the top of the Associate Librarian range. These had originally been created in order to allow a decent level of lifetime career earnings for those whose performance levels did not justify promotion to full Librarian. Normally, librarians devoting most of their attention to their primary assignments rather than to making a wider professional contribution might expect to advance to the top of the Associate Librarian level, and find there a "natural stopping place."

Some librarians, who consciously decided to opt for a natural stopping point at Associate Librarian VII, or for other reasons did not believe they were likely to be promoted, preferred to forego promotion review and be considered instead for normal merit increases to steps VI and VII, simply to save unnecessary time and effort. Others wished to defer the promotion review until they could make a stronger case. But many librarians, especially administrators and those who had served on CAPA, believed that everyone ought to undergo review for promotion at the normal point, Associate Librarian V, either because it was implicit in the structure, because it would insure consistent standards, or because it might result in promotion after all, even when the librarian had doubts.

Furthermore, an unwritten interpretation was evolving among reviewers, which required higher standards at each step of the Librarian rank. Thus, it was generally considered more difficult to win promotion from Associate VI to Librarian II than from Associate V to Librarian I, and even more difficult to move from Associate VII to Librarian III. Librarians were better off, therefore, if forced to undergo review for promotion at the earliest opportunity, because it would become harder the longer they waited. On the other hand, some librarians who were not quite among the "high achievers" feared they might move to Librarian I and be stuck there, unable to demonstrate the increased levels of accomplishment required for advancement within the Librarian rank; whereas, if allowed to remain Associate Librarians, they might advance more easily to Associate VII (and a salary equal to that at Librarian II). LAUC-B finally decided that promotion review should be mandatory at Associate Librarian, Step V. Everyone would be forced to undergo the comprehensive career review involved at least once, at the time logically prescribed by the salary scale. The CAPA Guidelines were revised accordingly in 1979.

There were problems with mandatory review at Associate Librarian V. One was that at Berkeley, unlike some of the other campuses, there was still at this time an enormous distinction between the review processes for merit increase and promotion review. Normal merit reviews at the Assistant and Associate levels were still essentially administrative. They required no letters, little or no supporting documentation, and were not reviewed by CAPA or any other peer committee. Thus, the challenge of preparing for one's first promotion review at the full Librarian

level appeared more daunting than was probably the case at campuses where the process differed less.

As time went by, mandatory review was increasingly challenged as unnecessarily restrictive, and it was confirmed that Berkeley was indeed the only campus with such a requirement. At the division's Spring 1991 Assembly, Chair Ron Heckart recommended its elimination, and a straw vote approved. So the wording was changed from "mandatory" to "customarily reviewed...", which was approved by the Chancellor's Office and implemented in the 1990/91 review cycle.

There was also the problem of the continuing inconsistency between the application of standards. Those being applied for advancement from Associate V to VI, and from Associate VI to VII, were less stringent than those for advancement from Librarian I to Librarian II. Was it fair then that a librarian at Associate VII was earning the same as another at Librarian II? And if someone were promoted from Associate VII to Librarian III, would that person have had an easier time of it than one who had attained early (normal) promotion and had to undergo two merit reviews at the Librarian level?

This latter problem continued to bedevil CAPA and other reviewers. One response was to impose higher standards for advancement to Associate VI and VII. The University Librarian began to deny normal merits at this level in cases where there was little evidence of accomplishment beyond the primary assignment. Another solution the UL introduced in the mid-1980s was the "lateral promotion," in which a librarian was granted a promotion to Librarian without a pay increase. The librarian received the benefit of the recognition, the title, and the opportunity to advance within the Librarian rank in the future, but it was less than a full promotion. In 1989, responding to complaints from librarians affected by the policy, UFL President Susana Hinojosa sent the Executive Committee a long letter asking LAUC-B to look into the matter and asking, among other questions: (1) When had the practice begun, and why? (2) How many cases were affected? (3) How were promotion statistics being reported? (Were lateral promotions included?) (4) Were such promotions made on any other campus or in any other academic title? (5) Why had the practice never been discussed with, or even reported to, the LAUC-B membership? After investigation and discussion, both CAPA and the Executive Committee concluded that the lateral promotion served a useful purpose, and did not respond to any of the union's questions. The practice has apparently not been followed in recent years.

Interpretation of the Criteria

Another attempted solution to the mandatory review problem in 1984 was CAPA's issuance of an informal statement, "CAPA Interpretation of Criteria for Merit Increase and Promotion...during the 1983/84 review cycle," which clarified in greater detail the criteria being used in the review process. The Executive Committee released the statement to LAUC-B members, and it was used in several subsequent peer review workshops as a helpful and generally accurate reflection of how reviewers were interpreting the standards for advancement at various levels of the career ladder.

The purpose of the original author of the statement, Bill Whitson, was to publicize to all that Berkeley was requiring progressively higher levels of achievement at each step of the Librarian rank, in the hope that LAUC-B would then seriously examine or debate whether such an

approach was necessary or desirable. It was his contention that, though a higher level of accomplishment was required for those at the Librarian rank than for those remaining at Associate, there was no need to require *progressively higher* levels of achievement at each step of that rank, only continuing professional growth and achievement.

Even though LAUC-B appointed an Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Peer Review Issues in October 1984, there was little disagreement with the statement's interpretation of the criteria. The Subcommittee recommended better communication: bag-lunch meetings, and an in-depth program reviewing the history of peer review, to be given in 1985. The first bag-lunch meeting generated concern that, rather than having a single "natural stopping place" at the top of the Associate rank, Berkeley now had several "resting places" in the upper ranges of Associate and at Librarian III, and that it was harder to advance at these levels. Kimiyo Hom called for a longitudinal study of librarian advancement patterns, and Ivan Arguelles agreed to carry the proposal to the Executive Board. A peer review "brown bag" the following year revealed concern about the fact that merit reviews at the full Librarian level now appeared to be nearly equivalent to promotion reviews, with solicitation of letters and full documentation as normal expectation.

Refining The Procedures

CAPA issued "CAPA Interview Procedures for Appointments to Librarian Series" in March 1985. Besides clarifying the procedures, it addressed the issue of whether CAPA was supposed to simply certify that candidates met the minimum qualifications for appointment as a librarian at UCB, or whether it should attempt to weigh the qualifications of each candidate and make a judgment about which was the strongest. The policy carefully allowed for discretion, but clearly provided that CAPA should normally evaluate the candidates and judge among them. The issue returned in 1989/90 when, on behalf of CAPA, chair Alison Howard recommended to the Executive Committee that CAPA limit itself to certifying minimum qualifications.

In March 1985 the Committee on Programs for Professional and Career Development (Mari Miller, Chair) sponsored a 90-minute-long Forum on Peer Review, "How Peer Review is Changing," to re-examine and reassess developments over the preceding 15 years. Sixty-five librarians attended, seven current and former CAPA members spoke, and 25 submitted written evaluations of the review process. Much dissatisfaction was expressed, and LAUC-B appointed a subcommittee (Pat Davison, Pat Maughan, Catherine Moreno, Deborah Sommer, Barbara Radke) to follow up. The subcommittee recommended an orientation and training session each November, better local and systemwide peer review statistics, a peer review fact sheet, and a series of brown-bag lunches on specific aspects of the review process.

In November 1985, a document providing Non-General Library administrators fuller instruction about their role in peer review was developed by the Committee on Non-General Affairs, revised by the Academic Personnel Office and forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for approval and distribution.

In 1985/86, CAPA found that too many review initiators were still not carrying out their role in the review process in the manner prescribed in the APM: failing to review the entire career in promotion cases, to provide a comprehensive assessment including activities beyond the primary assignment, to interact with the librarian in the review process, to provide feedback and

guidance. The Executive Committee asked the University Librarian to provide more instruction and guidance to supervisors about their responsibilities as review initiators.

To sharpen the focus of the review documentation, the University Librarian proposed in the fall of 1982 that candidates be required to include in their dossiers the letter he had written them at the conclusion of their previous review, so that they could explicitly address the extent to which they had followed his advice. After discussion with CAPA and the Executive Committee, he dropped the suggestion in favor of expecting the candidate to take the initiative to see that the substance of his last letter was addressed in the self-evaluation and in the evaluation and recommendation by the Department head.

CAPA worked with the Executive Committee in 1986/87 to establish more explicit guidelines and procedures for its selection and operation. "Criteria for CAPA Membership" provided the Nominating and Elections Committee and the Executive Committee with criteria for CAPA appointments, including "conflicts of personal and professional interests." A "CAPA Procedures and Policy Manual," describing its working procedures, was discussed with the Executive Committee. Later, in 1989/90, CAPA again asked the Executive Committee to establish clear procedures for the appointment of its members and chair.

A Task Force on the Librarian Review Process (Geri Scalzo, Ellen Meltzer, Ron Heckart) was appointed by UL Rosenthal in 1989 to recommend ways of streamlining the process, to save time and work. The Task Force submitted a report in September calling for improved information: an update of a booklet on the review process last issued in 1981, with the addition of appendixes including LAUC Position Papers #1 and #3, a chart outlining the process, and guidelines for self-evaluation and supervisory evaluation, and for peer and administrative reviewers. The Task Force also recommended that the review initiator be specifically identified in each case, and that ad hoc committees and administrative reviewers be allowed to simply express concurrence with other statements in undisputed cases.

In 1989/90 a new edition of the local review Procedures, to replace a 1981 version known as the "yellow book," was about to be published. In anticipation of its issuance, the Executive Committee identified two problem areas that deserved attention. One was mandatory review for librarians at Associate Librarian, Step V, related above; the other, the identity of the "review initiator." The Committee recommended addition of a definition, so that it would be clear that the review initiator is always the supervisor to whom one reports, even when a librarian is requesting a review. However, after discussing the matter with both Coordinator of Academic Personnel Roberta Aasen, who handled the paperwork for affiliated librarians, and Human Resources Director Janice Burrows, the Executive Committee recommended that summaries of confidential material be prepared not by the review initiator, as dictated by the APM, but by either the Human Resources Department or the Academic Personnel Office.

Associate and Assistant University Librarians

AULs were given a framework for appointment and evaluation through the adoption of APM Section 83 in 1975, which was discussed thoroughly by systemwide LAUC. The matter came to LAUC-B's attention in 1978/79, when the University Librarian at UC-San Francisco asked LAUC-B to suggest the names of UC-Berkeley AULs who might serve on a review committee for one of his AULs. LAUC-B consulted each Berkeley AUL, but found none willing at the time

to serve on such a committee. It also questioned UCSF's unilaterally adopting such a procedure, and imposing an obligation on another campus's AULs without first consulting that campus. At Berkeley the University Librarian had developed very simple procedures involving an administrative review every two years, with documentation consisting of a self-evaluation and a recommendation by the UL to the Vice Chancellor.

LAUC-B again discussed the issue of retreat rights for AULs and ULs in fall 1982, and its Executive Committee met with UL Rosenthal to discuss the AUL review process he had developed. In spite of the fact that both Dougherty and Rosenthal had made comments supporting the concept of evaluation of supervisors by those working under them, no procedures have ever been pursued which would provide such an option.

In 1990/91 the issue of review procedures for AULs reappeared, when UL Rosenthal asked the Executive Committee to serve as a reviewing body for promotion of an AUL. LAUC-B found it unfortunate that no clear, written procedures had ever been developed to provide for AUL review, even though they are required by APM 365-80-a. A survey by the LAUC Professional Governance Committee found that only five campuses had them. The following year Pat Stewart (Public Health) was appointed to chair an ad hoc committee to establish procedures for review of AULs as required by the APM, and to investigate the feasibility of procedures for the upward review of other supervisors.

Other Matters

Responding to the proposed revisions of APM 140 (on appeals procedures) and the proposed new APM 150 (corrective action and dismissal), the Executive Committee wrote Vice Chancellor Heilbron that both policies seemed to reflect principles more appropriate to staff personnel than faculty, especially in failing to provide for peer review, or for formal or informal hearings. The Committee also reaffirmed its strong support for the development of a Code of Conduct for librarians, as an important complement to any other procedures relating to corrective action or dismissal.

A proposed University policy change on employee access to confidential academic review records was the subject of a request for comment from the Vice Chancellor in early 1991. CAPA expressed some concern about allowing separate identification of CAPA recommendations, found no problem with access to those of ad hoc committees as long as their membership remained confidential, but had strong objections to allowing access to even edited or "redacted" copies of solicited letters, since it was unlikely that their confidentiality could be preserved. Such letters would inevitably become less specific and frank, and therefore much less useful. The Executive Committee concurred, and Chair Ron Heckart wrote a letter on its behalf, reflecting the CAPA comments.

LAUC-B was the source of a charge to the systemwide LAUC Professional Governance Committee in 1991. The Committee was asked to clarify whether a "reasonable trial period" of "not more than six years" in the provisions relating to potential career appointments of Assistant Librarians meant six years' probation or five. In the only Berkeley case in which an Assistant Librarian was dismissed after failing to achieve career status, the librarian had actually been required to undergo final review for promotion in the fifth year, because Library Administration determined that "not more than six years" applied to the period of actual employment, and the

APM requires that librarians dismissed under this provision be given at least six months' notice. To allow such notice it was therefore necessary to either conduct the final review in the fifth year or have it done out of the normal schedule. The University Federation of Librarians, which originally raised the issue, contended that the wording does not apply to the period of employment, which in such a case could well be six and a half years. Since the relevant provisions are part of systemwide policies, it was deemed a matter requiring clarification on the systemwide level. The issue is still unresolved.

In 1990/91 and 1991/92, severe problems developed in the progress of dossiers through the peer review pipelines. While there had occasionally been individual librarians or reviewers who were late in submitting or passing along dossiers, tardiness had never before been endemic. Now the number of review cases far behind schedule reached crisis proportions. CAPA found it increasingly difficult to conduct its work efficiently, since it could not group cases to review similar actions at the same time.

Until this time the final decisions had always been announced by the end of the fiscal year, in June, so that any changes could take effect July 1, and it was rare for a case to remain undecided into the summer. In October 1991 the divisional Chair, Becky Lhermitte, reported complaints from a number of librarians who had still not been notified of the outcome or status of their reviews from the previous year. The CAPA Chair, Barbara Kornstein, wrote the Executive Committee to request that the 1990/91 CAPA, which would normally conclude its term in October, be extended until November 30, and be allowed to reconvene as necessary thereafter in order to act upon cases still incomplete from the previous cycle.

The Executive Committee decided in October to write the University Librarian, asking him to make completion of the 1990/91 reviews a top priority, to develop guidelines for a reasonable extension of the calendar so as to be in compliance with the APM, and to forward the CAPA letter. The matter was still alive the following January, when the Executive Committee agreed that it was unnecessary to continue reconvening the former CAPA to deal with the held-over cases, but that the present CAPA could take them under advisement.

While it was never clear to those not privy to the confidential review process exactly who was most at fault, the matter came up repeatedly at general meetings. We were told the blame was widely distributed: some of those undergoing review were late in submitting dossiers or responding to requests for further information; a number of review initiators, department heads and AULs were also late in taking the actions required of them. There were two excuses readily apparent: staffing reductions had greatly increased the workloads of many of those involved, especially at the department head and AUL levels; and the pressure to complete the process by June was dissipated by a University decision that academic merit increases and promotions effective July 1, 1991 would not in any case be funded.

As librarians retired on VERIP, some were "recalled" or re-employed on a temporary basis, 49% time or less, in order to finish projects or fill a role until a successor could be appointed. The Executive Committee reviewed the issues involved and recommended to the Vice Chancellor that CAPA be consulted in the decision to make a post-retirement appointment, and that the appointee be subject to peer review after one year, and every three years thereafter.

At the July 1992 Executive Committee meeting, both the Ad Hoc Committee for Upward Evaluation of AULs and Supervisors (Pat Stewart, Elizabeth Byrne, Sonya Kaufman and Susana Hinojosa) and the Ad Hoc Committee to Develop Guidelines for the Extension of the Peer Review Calendar (Phil Hoehn, Ginette Polak and Deborah Sommer) submitted reports and recommendations, which were endorsed with minor changes and forwarded to administrative officers for comment.

The AHC for Upward Evaluation submitted a lengthy draft policy and procedures document, similar in form to the local librarian review procedures, entitled "Criteria for Appointment and Review of Assistant and Associate University Librarians and Equivalent Titles at U.C.B.," along with a 4-page report on upward appraisal as a personnel practice, and the feasibility of incorporating the concept into our review structure.

The recommendations of the AHC on the Peer Review Calendar provided for timely review of a librarian who failed to submit a dossier, required that a letter be added to the file of any librarian who complied with the timetable as reviewee or reviewer, gave the Library and Academic Personnel offices responsibility for monitoring timetable compliance, required annual peer review workshops, and committed the Executive Committee to developing procedures for requesting extensions. The Executive Committee endorsed the report with minor changes, and forwarded it to administrative officers for comment.

During this 25-year period, LAUC-B's most important activity was the regular work of the Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Advancement. Every year CAPA interviewed applicants for positions, recommended names for ad hoc committees, read dossiers, agonized over recommendations and oversaw the review process. There were nearly always new problems to be resolved and policy issues to be debated. In the 1989/90 annual report, chair Alison Howard reported reviewing 55 dossiers: 42 merit (two accelerated), 7 promotion, 3 career status and 4 special reviews. Four ad hoc committees were constituted. CAPA also reviewed 9 job descriptions for appropriate reflection of professional responsibilities and level, and interviewed 30 candidates for 12 positions. The committee monitored postings of temporary librarian positions, advised on the proposed conversion of a temporary to a potential-career-status position, considered several changes in the review procedures and wrestled with a dismissal case. It met an average of once a week throughout the year, aside from the time spent reading and writing. It is ultimately this ongoing work which constitutes the history of peer review.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT & RESEARCH

Travel

LAUC-B's first order of business in the spring of 1968, interestingly enough, was to propose to Library administration a special orientation program for new employees, focusing on "underprivileged members of minority ethnic groups." The campus had made a special outreach effort in the mid-1960s to recruit employees from minority groups, and a significant number of African Americans were hired into paraprofessional positions in the Library. Most had only high-school educations and no familiarity with a university environment. Myra Kolitsch, the first LAUC-B Chairman, developed a personal interest in the issue, and eventually transferred from

her positions as head of the Morrison Room and selector for the Undergraduate Library Project, to become the Library In-Service Training Officer and permanent member of the Staff Development Committee.

The Committee on Staff Development (SDC), consisting of Myra Kolitsch (Personnel, chair), Gerald Giefer (Water Resources), Margaret Johnson (Education-Psychology), Janice Knouse (Catalog) and Catherine Moreno (Catalog), was appointed by LAUC-B in July 1970. The Committee on Academic Purpose, which developed its charge, acknowledged that leave and funding for professional meetings and conference was "granted generously, sometimes with per diem and travel expenses being paid." On the other hand, it found that "there has been no active attempt to encourage individual development." There was no leave comparable to sabbaticals, and few librarians below the department head level actually attended conferences and workshops. Further, because of the "workload problem," "consulting of professional literature [was] not encouraged to any degree." SDC was to conduct an active study of career development needs and the factors that inhibit librarians from addressing them.

The committee's first task was to write guidelines for applications for leave and funding support. They would entail written requests submitted through the department head to the University Librarian, which were then referred to SDC for review and a written recommendation back to the UL. In the 1970 Guidelines, the policy was to reimburse registration or travel within the U.S., Canada and Mexico, but not per diem expenses in the case of librarians only attending a meeting or conference. The type of participation was to be considered, along with its relationship or importance to the Library, the campus, the University and the profession. Funding could support the professional development of both librarians or staff personnel. Reduced allowances might be considered to accommodate more applicants.

The "Guidelines for Granting and Allocating funds for Attendance at Professional and Scholarly Meetings" were approved by the Executive Committee in May 1971, and after modification and approval by the Library's Administrative Cabinet, were published in October in *CU News*. Along with his introduction of the Guidelines, Acting UL Eldred Smith called for staff to submit requests for the whole of the 1971/72 academic year, so that all might be considered at the same time.

In January 1971, SDC advertised in *CU News* for "two or three career staff members in staff personnel positions" to participate in the work of the committee, which met about twice a month. SDC had believed from the outset that staff personnel should be included in any such program for leave and funding support of career development, intentionally included them in the Guidelines, and persuaded the Executive Committee that they should be added to the committee. Ken Legg (Circulation) and Diane Chamberlin were appointed in the spring of 1971. Yet in an August memo to Acting UL Smith on the Administrative Cabinet's changes in wording, Myra Kolitsch felt it necessary to point out and justify the inclusion of support staff. In a subsequent memo, reporting the results of a survey, she again remarked on the invaluable contribution made by the two support staff members, and urged LAUC-B to consider adding support staff to other divisional committees.

The draft Guidelines were actually approved by UL James Skipper on a preliminary basis in December 1970, so that SDC could recommend action on requests received in 1970/71. Ironically, one of the first University budget "freezes" occurred that same year, and in December

1970 the Chancellor forbade spending General (19900) funds on any out-of-state travel, except for department chairs and faculty members giving papers at conferences.

SDC's first major effort was the distribution of a questionnaire to all professional and support staff in both the General and Non-General libraries, to identify problems the committee should address and to determine priorities. There were at this time 94 librarians in the Main Library, 44 in branches and 27 in the Non-General group. Support staff respectively numbered 218, 76 and 16. The response rate was 51% from librarians and 35% from support staff. Although there were obvious differences in the responses of the two groups, those of the professionals revealed a widespread concern for inequalities of workload (favoring the Main Library) which prevented people from serving on committees and engaging in self development, as well as a lack of promotional opportunity—a general sense that people's capacities were greater than their opportunities. Also mentioned were the lack of advancement opportunities for women compared with men, and experiences of racial discrimination. Some librarians expressed misgivings about the peer review system (50% approved, 30% opposed), citing its secrecy elements and doubt that review committees could have sufficient appreciation of a librarian's performance without the opportunity to interview the candidate. Fifty-nine percent expressed interest in sabbaticals.

In the fiscal year 1971/72 the committee acted on 48 requests from 37 persons, including 5 support staff. Leave was approved for all 37, registration fees in 27 cases, transportation in 16, and per diem in 5. The approvals were recommendations to the Library administration, which made payments from a "Professional Travel Fund" and an "Institutes and Workshops Fund." A separate fund supported administrative travel expenses, which were not reviewed by SDC.

In 1972, with the reorganization of the administrative and LAUC-B committees under incoming UL Richard Dougherty, the Committee on Staff Development was renamed the Staff Development Committee, was required to report jointly to the Library Advisory Council (LAC) and to the LAUC-B Executive Committee, was given a revised charge and an expanded membership.

The first product of the expanded SDC was a comprehensive, 13-page working paper, "Organizational and Staff Development Program," which was distributed for staff comment in December 1972. In addition to comment from the staff in an open meeting, and comments from the Library Union Caucus (a group representing both AFSCME and AFT), Library Administration hired an outside consultant, Peter Hiatt, who met with the committee, studied the matter and made a number of recommendations.

The Program included the first systematic proposal dealing with rotations and reassignments, a topic which was to recur time and again. A Subcommittee on Rotation (Peggy Stern, Leona Salwen, Jim Gault, Eva Chang) was established to develop guidelines. A document entitled "Rotation, Exchanges, Reassignments, Job Pool—Recommendations" was worked out over the next year and forwarded to the Library administration in February 1974. The experiment with rotational assignments of librarians to serve as Assistants to the AULs raised questions about similar rotational assignments for support staff. In fall 1979, SDC developed a "Proposal for a Clearinghouse for Staff Rotations" providing guidelines for rotational assignments, and calling for an annual listing in *CU News* of all librarians and support staff interested in rotations, with their qualifications, so that the process of selecting for such rotational opportunities would be more "above board." The Executive Committee strongly endorsed the plan.

In 1972/73 SDC reported receiving 108 requests for leave and funding from 77 persons, including 15 staff personnel. All 88 librarian leave requests were approved; 50 were given registration, 39 transportation and 15 per diem; 6 were denied registration, 5 transportation, 16 per diem. Fifteen of the 17 staff requests were only for registration; only three were for transportation.

The following year the committee dealt with over 70 requests, and began to find the needs exceeding the funding available. The guidelines were revised for 1973/74 to eliminate all per diem and ground transportation to and from airports, allow no funding for the CLA Conference in San Francisco, limit funding to one person per library unit or department where two or more wished to attend an event involving substantial expense, and allow a maximum of \$200 per person for either the ALA Midwinter or ALA Annual Conference. The problem was discussed with UL Dougherty, and efforts were made to find additional monies and reassess administrative and SDC priorities for supporting various kinds of professional development and travel. A revised set of "Guidelines for Funding and Leave Support" was worked out in 1974 in consultation with LAC, sent to the Executive Committee for approval, and adopted in time for the 1974/75 funding cycle.

Even though SDC at this time was a joint LAUC-B/LAC committee, it dealt only with Library Administration in the matter of funding for travel and workshops. In fact, even though it was composed equally of librarians and support staff, the librarian members were appointed from a slate nominated by LAUC-B, and there was a nominal "reporting" relationship to the division's Executive Committee, from 1972 on SDC really functioned as an administrative advisory committee.

In 1976 Myra Kolitsch gave up the chair of the Staff Development Committee. Jan Powell (Librarian's Office) succeeded her for a short time, but when she resigned in April to take a position elsewhere, Pat Jemerson (now Imani Abalos) became the first staff person to chair the committee on a regular basis.

As the pressure mounted on librarians to become more active professionally, the number of travel requests increased, and the difficulty of financing them became an increasingly troublesome issue. At several meetings in 1976, LAUC-B and SDC debated whether to give full funding (transportation only) to fewer people, or partial funding to more, and whether to consider all previous funding, the previous three years, or the previous year, in judging whether an individual request should be discounted in favor of a person who had not previously received support.

SDC presented LAUC-B with a new set of "Guidelines and Procedures for Leave and Funding Support" in 1978, to accompany its "Request for Leave/Funding Support" form. By this time, the Guidelines limited funding to lowest-rate air fare or registration (whichever the larger), excluded transportation to and from airports, excluded per diem, limited funding to one ALA conference per year, and granted no amounts smaller than \$50 for Associate Librarians and above. Preference was given to those with a formal role, and those attending for the first time.

SDC reports of requests received combined those for local workshops, paid from the "Institutes and Workshops Fund" mostly to support staff, and those for professional meetings, paid from the "Professional Travel Fund" mostly to librarians and in much larger amounts. In 1977/78, the amount budgeted in the Professional Travel fund was \$7,500; \$7,635 was actually

allocated to 31 recipients, all but three of them librarians. The amount for ALA was \$262, and the average allocation was \$246. In 1981/82 SDC reviewed 91 travel requests, recommending a disbursement of \$10,745.

The following year the Staff Development Committee still administered the requests. Chair Judith Levy reported receiving 154 during the year ending March 31, 1984. The Committee generally awarded air fare or registration for one meeting per year. When funds proved insufficient, they limited funding to those attending the ALA annual conference and those with a formal role.

1984/85 was a transition year. The LAUC-B Committee on Research (Gail Nichols, Chair) expanded its role to take responsibility for allocating moneys provided under the Memorandum of Understanding (for unit members) and by the campus (for non-unit members) for both research and professional development, including travel and conference attendance. SDC gave over its remaining funds, together with responsibility for the allocations, in January 1985. The Committee on Research followed SDC's guidelines for the remainder of the year.

Renamed the Committee on Research and Professional Development in June 1985, it developed new guidelines for awarding research and professional development funds. The Staff Development Committee's charge was changed, so that it no longer dealt with librarian leave and funding requests, and a Staff Development Policy and Program statement, first drafted in 1983 but tabled because of the uncertainties over collective bargaining, was resurrected. The SDC became less relevant to librarians, who found it less and less satisfying. In May 1990, the number of librarian positions on the committee was reduced from four to two. In 1989 the Non-General librarians recommended that their place be filled by a support staff member from an Affiliated Library.

It is worth noting that the Staff Development Committee made a genuine effort to evaluate each travel request, and to make a recommendation based on the merits of the individual case and the criteria being applied at the time. There is no record of disagreement with Library Administration, or of Library Administration rejecting any of the committee's recommendations. There is occasional mention of the time-consuming nature of the process—even though requests were generally received and reviewed throughout the year, a few at each meeting.

When the Committee on Research and Professional Development assumed responsibility for the process, there was an implicit assumption, based on the requirements of the MOU, that each librarian should be allowed the discretion to decide whether or not a particular professional activity was worthwhile. Since it would therefore have been inappropriate to deny a request, there was no need to evaluate each one on its merits. The work of allocating the funds became largely one of determining the criteria to be applied to fairly objective elements of each request: which types of expenses to cover, standard rates to be applied, extent of funding for various kinds of participation, the number of requests to be funded for a given individual, etc. It is perhaps ironic that during the era when the Library administration in fact delegated effective decision-making to a committee, librarians made up only half its membership, but when the process was delegated to a true "peer" committee, the effective decision-making was left with the individual librarian.

The MOU allocated \$28,000 for unit librarians at UCB in 1985/86. Based on this, the campus gave another \$17,300 to cover non-unit librarians, for a total of \$45,300. At the recommendation

of the Committee on Research and Professional Development, \$5,000 was earmarked for research projects, the rest for travel. Although the MOU provided that the funds were to be given out on the campus "according to the established procedures," with the understanding that this meant "by a LAUC committee," Vice Chancellor Park delegated to the University Librarian the authority to actually dispense the funds, in consultation with the Committee on Research and Professional Development.

While figures for 1984/85 are not available, the earlier record indicates that the money allowed for professional travel up until this time was probably never more than \$10,-15,000. The figure of \$10,745 in 1981/82 covered staff funding for workshops as well as travel, and the figure of 154 requests in 1984/85, while an increase from the 91 requests of 1981/82, also included the workshop requests. Thus the allocation in the MOU of \$28,000 and later \$31,000, especially when the amount necessarily provided to give non-unit librarians equivalent support is added, represents a very substantial increase in the funding of professional travel. It may have been the most important tangible gain attributable to collective bargaining.

By November 11, 1985, the Committee had received 153 requests for travel funding from 82 individuals—16 of them from 13 NGLs. The amount requested totaled \$79,000, with only \$40,300 actually available. The following year, the MOU allocation was increased from \$28,000 to \$31,000; Vice Chancellor Park allocated a total of \$48,600. By May 1987, 91 persons had been funded for 164 activities.

Under its 1988/89 chair Cris Campbell (Public Health), the Committee on Research and Professional Development proposed a number of changes in the travel funding criteria, to encourage the maximum number to take advantage of professional development activities. The requests were now graded into three levels of participation (major role, participant, attender), with the more important roles reimbursed for larger percentages of the expenses; and for those requesting reimbursement for more than one activity, progressively smaller percentages were supported for each. In this year, when 188 requests were received, \$44,272 was budgeted; the total amount requested was \$132,457.

In 1989/90, Chair Kathleen Vanden Heuvel reported slightly more funds available (\$48,000), and a similar amount in requests (\$133,000). At the first meeting, Category 1 recipients (president of an organization or new librarian attending first meeting) were granted 52% of expenses, Category 2 recipients (committee members or speakers) 43%, and Category 3 recipients (just attending a meeting) 35%. For the second or third activity during the year, the percentages for each category were further reduced, so that some requests, though supported, might be reimbursed at a rate of 20% or less.

Research

The first effort to support librarians' research projects was a proposal by Myra Kolitsch in late 1974. SDC developed a set of "Guidelines and Procedures for Project Assistance" for providing clerical support to staff working on projects. After revisions by LAC and LAUC-B, the Guidelines were approved and Library administration agreed to set aside \$5000 from a special staff development allocation. Ann Basart (Music), who already had a project underway, which could be facilitated by the assistance of a work-study student, received the first grant in July 1975.

In July 1979 the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act went into effect, and in 1981/82 the University allotted \$30,000 in funds for librarian research, of which \$3,525 was given to Berkeley. Catherine Cortelyou (Institute for Transportation Studies) and Tom Alexander (Public Health) began working on guidelines, and in 1980/81 a Committee on Research was established, comprised of Annegret Ogden (Bancroft) as Chair, Barclay Ogden (Conservation), John Emerson, Catherine Cortelyou, and Yuki Ishimatsu (East Asiatic).

Three workshops on writing grant proposals were held, as required by the University, and three Berkeley librarians received funding for their research proposals: John Emerson, who was one of the earliest proponents of support for librarian research; Edward Kasinec, newly appointed Slavic Bibliographer, who left for another position at Harvard before expending his funds; and Charles Martell, a doctoral student in the School of Library and Information Studies, who worked for periods of time in the Librarian's Office and the Education-Psychology Library, and served as LAUC-B Chair in 1980/81.

In the 1982/83 cycle the University's allocation for research dropped to \$10,000, and all was allocated on a systemwide basis. Four of five proposals were funded, three of them from Berkeley. In 1983/84 Vice Chancellor Maslach provided \$4,500 for UC-B research grants, but only two proposals were received, one after the deadline was extended. Committee on Research chair Maryly Snow reported concern that there seemed to be so little interest in the program, and proposed "encouraging or assisting" librarians to apply for paid leaves in conjunction with research grants. UL Rosenthal and the Executive Committee advised against this course, however, advising the Committee on Research to simply point out to individuals the APM section dealing with Leaves of Absence.

In 1983/84 LAUC-B Chair Don Williams even undertook to investigate the possibility of publishing a LAUC research journal, a proposal originally made by 1980/81 Chair Charles Martell. After other campuses proved lukewarm, the idea was abandoned.

In 1986/87 four research proposals were received. One was rejected, one was referred to the statewide Committee on Research, and two were funded by LAUC-B: Walter Brem (Bancroft) was awarded \$1,445 for "Official Publications of Mexico," and Ann Basart (Music) received \$3,555 for "Publishing Opportunities in Music: A Guide."

An "Early Bird" (general forum) was devoted to LAUC research grants in August 1987. In February of the following year the University of California Press published a book by John Emerson which was funded in part by a LAUC Research grant in the early 1980s: *Catalog of Pre-1900 Vocal Manuscripts in the Music Library*.

Programs

In 1973 the Staff Development Committee proposed an experimental program for supervisory evaluation, and worked with AUL for Public Services Jane Flener to develop a Supervisor Evaluation Form, solicited volunteers to participate in a trial, and submitted a report on the experiment in February 1974. The process involved the submission of anonymous evaluations to the supervisor of the supervisor being evaluated, who summarized the comments and discussed them with the reviewee. The experiment was inconclusive, partly because most of those who volunteered to participate either as supervisors or evaluators already had fairly good relationships. There was a general feeling, however, that the summarizer needed to talk with the evaluators,

in order to be sure their written comments were understood, since the summarizer in most cases had no direct knowledge of the working environment involved.

Communication was a top priority for UL Dougherty, so SDC appointed a subcommittee to work on a Communication Seminar. In 1973 Library Administration brought in two outside consultants—Brenda Dervin from Seattle, Washington, and Helen Ross—to meet with SDC and outline the kinds of Communication Seminars they could conduct. Ross was selected, and two seminars were held in February 1974. The Committee had to select the 80 participants from 102 staff who volunteered. A second Communication Seminar was held in June 1975.

In 1975, LAUC-B and SDC considered a proposal for a committee to provide career counseling. Although there was agreement that it might be useful, the fact that no one could guarantee that initiative would actually be rewarded undercut the appeal of the concept, which was abandoned. The following year it reappeared in a new guise. LAUC-B asked SDC to fund a series of LAUC-B Seminars on Career Development, to bring in noteworthy outside speakers for half-day colloquia in the Strawberry Canyon meeting facilities. SDC allotted \$800, and three programs were given in fall 1976: Page Ackerman (UCLA), William McCoy (UCD) and Archie Kleingartner (UC administration). Another took the form of a panel of former CAPA members. In 1977 the Seminars were run by a committee consisting of Richard Cooper (chair), Lan Dyson (Moffitt), Geri Scalzo, Dorothy Gregor and Rita Kane, and a series was held every two weeks on CONSER, CLASS, management and library planning.

In 1977, to formalize its commitment to programs for career development, LAUC-B established a Program Committee. There were however two other groups also involved with programs. SDC also began a program of Seminars for Staff Development in 1977, with Willa Baum of the Regional Oral History Office as the first speaker. Then in 1978, on the recommendation of SDC, ACUL also established a Program Committee, which was supposed to work in conjunction with SDC to provide a forum for reports from those attending professional meetings.

In 1980/81 there were programs on work enrichments, library services to the disabled and stress management, a speech by Richard Dougherty on "The Impact of Technology on the Roles of Academic Librarians," and workshops on the peer review process.

A major, morning-long "Peer Review Workshop" was held at the beginning of the 1981/82 review cycle. Later that year, three more programs were given on faculty peer review, one of them with Archie Kleingartner from UC administration. Anne Lipow spoke that same year on "Principles of the Online Catalog." The annual forums presenting staff members' reports on national meetings attended, begun under the ACUL Program Committee in 1978, were made a responsibility of SDC beginning in 1982.

Programs in 1982/83 featured the "natural stopping place" on the salary ladder, the new Library Development officer speaking on fund raising, and an exhortation by State Librarian Gary Strong for LAUC to become active in the political process, lobbying for legislation supporting libraries.

In 1991/92 the group now called the Committee on Programs for Professional and Career Development sponsored a talk on NREN (the National Research and Educational Network) by Clifford Lynch; a panel of UCB librarians on professional ethics in a time of retrenchment; and a program on the future of the School of Library and Information Studies, with Acting Dean Nancy Van House.

Other Professional Development Activities

LAUC-B assumed responsibility for a Mentoring Program for new librarians developed by the General Library in late 1984. An article about the program in *CU News* triggered a mention in *Library Journal* (July 1985) and some national attention.

It also instituted a program of small group orientation tours for new employees, given by committee members to complement the formal tour and introductions provided to each new staff member by the In-Service Training Officer.

LAUC-B first conceived the idea of a Librarian's Special Recognition Award in 1986, and discussed it with the Vice Chancellor that summer. The following year Ruth Tucker (Catalog), Terry Dean (Institute of Governmental Studies) and Jum Spohrer (Collection Development & Reference Services) were appointed a committee to plan a Distinguished Librarian Award program. It was developed over the next two years, endorsed by Library Administration, and approved by the Vice Chancellor and the campus Academic Council in June 1989. The Award would recognize excellence in librarianship, specifically as it furthered the teaching and research mission of the University, and would include prominent recognition and a cash payment. Nominations were to be solicited widely, from librarians, faculty, staff and students, with supporting documentation based on specific criteria and guidelines. The nominations would be kept confidential, and the award decided by a Distinguished Librarian Award Committee.

That committee was appointed in 1989/90, consisting of Ellen Meltzer (chair), Terry Dean, Norma Kobzina, Carl Bengston and faculty member Alan Weinstein. A satisfying number of nominations were submitted. The first honorees—Milt Ternberg, Head of the Business and Economics Library, and Alison Howard, Head of the Optometry Library—were presented with their awards in an elaborate and elegant ceremony and reception in the Morrison Library, following the division's Fall 1990 Assembly. The 1990/91 Award recipients were Elizabeth Byrne, Head of the Environmental Design Library, and Tom Reynolds, of the Law Library.

Along with the augmentation of salary levels achieved during the restructure and inequity adjustments of 1972, the substantial increase in the funding of professional travel is probably the most important improvement seen at Berkeley in the realm of compensation and perquisites. An enormous amount of effort was also invested in various kinds of orientation and career development activities and programs. For the most part, it is likely that these would have occurred without LAUC-B. There have always been a variety of similar programs over the years sponsored by other groups or by Library administration. Furthermore, throughout this history, career development efforts always seemed most meaningful when they were directed toward staff personnel. On the professional level, it is more difficult to tell where simply "keeping up" leaves off and career development begins. Most of what we have thought of as career development could also be viewed as simply providing informative programs or orienting individuals to the review process. While useful, such programs may be difficult to distinguish from other new information we all receive through professional channels.

AFFILIATED LIBRARIANS

Berkeley is unusual in having a large number of campus libraries which are administered by schools, departments, institutes and centers, independent of the central library system under the jurisdiction of the University Librarian. The central system was called the General Library until the late 1980s, when it became simply The Library. Librarians working in independent libraries are members of LAUC, and the term Non-General Libraries (NGLs) was adopted to signify those independent libraries with one or more staff classed in the librarian series. The designation was changed to the more felicitous "Affiliated Libraries" (ALs) in 1988.

There were 15 affiliated libraries for most of this period. The number of their librarians was 37 in 1972, 40 in 1978, 34 in 1990. The Law Library always accounted for a large number (14 in 1990); of the others, only the Institute of Governmental Studies and Institute of Transportation Studies have had three or more.

The group has always felt a common interest and identity, as outsiders vis-a-vis the General Library, and organized itself within LAUC-B from the beginning. In 1969 the Bylaws were amended to create two Sections within the Berkeley Division, each with its own Bylaws, officers and activity, but joining through the Divisional Executive Committee to deal with common concerns. The number of NGL Section representatives on the Divisional Executive Committee was increased from one to two. Early leaders of the NGL section were Tom Reynolds, who served on the first Executive Committee, Gwendolyn Lloyd, who was on the 1970 Executive Committee and chaired the NGL Section that year, and Laurel Burley, who was the second NGL member on the Executive Committee.

When Vice Chancellor Connick agreed to recognize LAUC-Berkeley for a two-year trial period, from July 1971 to May 1973, one of his conditions was that the separate NGL section be dropped. The change was made, and the election held in December 1971 combined the General Library and Non-General Library sections into one LAUC structure. Jack Leister proposed a standing committee consisting of all Non-General librarians, with a Subcommittee on NGL Peer Review, but no action was taken.

The group continued to meet informally to discuss common concerns. In 1977, they formed the Association of Non-General Librarians (ANGL/B) as a means of communicating separately among themselves. This evolved into an organization within LAUC-B headed by a 5-member Committee on Non-General Library Affairs, which later became the Committee on Affiliated Library Affairs. The senior Affiliated Libraries representative on the Executive Committee serves as Chair of the Committee on Affiliated Library Affairs, and the alternate representative serves as Vice Chair. The LAUC-B Vice Chair serves ex officio, and there are two other NGL members. The Committee holds Fall and Spring assemblies of Affiliated Librarians, organizes programs on issues of common concern, and works as an organization on behalf of the interests of the Affiliated Libraries. Beginning in about 1986, at the initiative of Joan Howland (Law), a separate informal NGL Administrative Heads group was formed. Although it had no formal relationship to the Committee on Non-General Library Affairs, a report from the Administrative Heads was routinely featured on the agendas of the Fall and Spring NGL Assemblies from 1986 on.

The group published a *Directory of Non-General Libraries and Librarians* in 1977, with revised editions in 1978, 1982, 1985 and 1989. A brochure describing the Non-General Libraries

was issued in 1984, and a revised edition, "A Brief Guide to Affiliated Library Collections, University of California, Berkeley," was published in 1988. During her year as chair, in 1984/85, Nan Sand issued a regular NGL newsletter.

Peer Review

Two areas of LAUC-B activity from which NGLs were initially excluded were peer review and library advisory committees. Up to the time the CAPA Guidelines were accepted and officially adopted by the campus in 1974, they were only in force within the General Library because University Librarian Skipper had chosen to follow them.

The exclusion of the NGLs from peer review caused a mini-crisis in late 1972, when the Law librarians decided to develop their own review process under an elected CAPAL, which would review all merit increases as well as career status and promotion cases, with ad hoc committees which might include faculty members. The LAUC-B Executive Committee and CAPA met with the Law librarians in an emergency session to assure them they would be included in the campus librarian review process very soon, and persuade them that it was better to be part of a single system.

In the discussions with Vice Chancellor Christensen over the approval of the CAPA Guidelines the following year, LAUC-B was instructed to revise the Procedures to incorporate the NGLs. Laurel Burley (Rhetoric), who had been an NGL representative on the Executive Committee in 1970 and 1971, rewrote the relevant sections, which were submitted in November 1973. The next year the revised CAPA Guidelines were promulgated, expanding CAPA by two. The first NGL members, Beverly Hickok (Transportation) and Kent Schriefer (Law), took their places on the 1973/74 Committee.

The chief problem NGL librarians have had with the review process over the years has been dealing with a supervisor or higher-level administrator who is not a librarian. Such directors, deans and department chairs are generally unfamiliar with librarians' work and review procedures. In a discussion of peer review confidentiality in 1977, for example, many Non-General librarians reported that they were not even seeing their supervisory evaluations. Over the years, a variety of initiatives have been undertaken to improve supervisors' understanding of the librarian review process and insure adherence to established policies and procedures.

Advisory Committees

The first policy advisory committees, established in 1970, were concerned with operations of the General Library only, with the exception of the Committee on Staff Development, which included Gerald Giefer of Water Resources. When the committees were reconstituted under the Library Advisory Committee in 1972, NGL representatives were invited to several of them as permanent guests: Gregg Atkins (Law) on the Staff Development Committee; Michael Kleiber (Transportation) on the Reference Services Committee; Jack Leister (Governmental Studies) on the Selection Committee. Gregg Atkins withdrew from SDC shortly after, however, and was not replaced, and participation on other committees was also eventually discontinued.

When the Non-General librarians organized more formally in 1977, they urged that library advisory committees be made LAUC-B committees so that they could participate as full voting

members, in order to improve communication and cooperation between the General Library and the NGLs in collection development, reference services, automation development and catalogs. In January 1979 Library Administration agreed to appoint Non-General librarians to the Reference Services, Selection and Bibliographic Control Committees on a 1-year trial basis. This has continued for the most part, with Non-General librarians serving on several of the advisory committees as regular members. In 1980/81, the LAUC-B Bylaws were revised to give the Committee on Non-General Library Affairs responsibility for recommending NGL appointees for LAUC-B and ACUL committees. This has been done through an NGL member on the Nominating and Elections Committee.

Automation has been the critical dynamic driving the organizing effort of the affiliated librarians since 1977. Automation of the catalogs required both standardization in cataloging practices and closer working relationships with other campus and University libraries.

In 1977, discovering that LAUC-B was deferring to the General Library for a campus response to the Salmon Report, they formed their own Ad Hoc Committee on the Salmon Master Plan: Ron Heckart (Governmental Studies), Becky Mason of the Executive Library, Beverly Hickok and Gerald Giefer. The Committee developed a statement articulating the Non-General librarians' desire to be more explicitly recognized as a distinct group which needed to be gradually integrated into the overall University library system—automation, inclusion in and access to the systemwide catalog, interlibrary lending, systemwide reference directory, access to storage facilities—and given special support from systemwide resources for automation, cataloging, etc. The statement was sent to systemwide LAUC in June.

In September 1978, the Committee to Integrate Non-General Libraries into the Statewide Library Plan, chaired by Michael Kleiber submitted a report to Assistant Vice President Salmon entitled "Criteria for Inclusion of Non-General Libraries in the University-wide Automated Union Catalog." The following year the Institute of Transportation Studies Library began cataloging on OCLC and a retrospective conversion project, both subsidized by the University's Division of Library Automation (DLA).

In 1979/80 the Staff Development Committee, working with AUL for Public Services Elaine Sloan, sponsored a series of Public Services workshops. Some Non-General librarians wished to attend, but since the workshops were funded by the General Library and over-subscribed already, their request was rejected. LAUC-B asked that the NGLs be allowed to send a representative. In order to avoid the problem in the future, UL Rosenthal approved the appointment of an affiliated librarian to SDC. Marc Levin (Governmental Studies) became a member in April, on a 1-year trial basis. At the end of the year, he felt the experiment had generally been valuable and should be continued.

Non-General librarians also asked that support staff from their libraries be allowed to participate in advisory committees, but since this was not LAUC-B's purview, they were referred to Library Administration. In 1982, a staff rotation program developed by SDC (with Marc Levin still a member) did include NGL staff.

In 1981, the Committee on NGL Affairs discussed a statement on "Resource Sharing among Non-General Libraries," focusing on rotational opportunities and automation. Workshops were held on RLIN and OCLC, and requests sent to both the Chancellor and DLA for help with automation.

In 1982, the University Librarian was made the "central review person" for all library-related grant proposals emanating from the campus, including those from NGLs. Ron Heckart, Chair of the Committee on NGL Affairs, wrote to Provost Maslach protesting the fact that Non-General librarians were excluded from General Library planning, adding that there could be conflicts between what the UL and the affiliated librarians considered the most appropriate research projects. The immediate case in point was that both the General Library and the Asian American Studies Library had submitted Title II-C grant proposals, but only one could be accepted per institution, so the two were hastily combined, but rejected. Maslach agreed to adjudicate future disagreements.

In October of the same year another conflict arose between the Non-General librarians and the University Librarian, when UL Rosenthal denied NGL requests for MELVYL terminals and NRLF storage space. Chair Jim Larrabee (Law) wrote to Vice President Stephen Salmon to express NGL concerns about the potential conflict of interest involved, and the fact that the NGLs were not represented on Library Council and thus had no role in policy decisions on allocations of resources such as MELVYL connections and storage.

Vice President Salmon arranged a joint meeting in February 1983, bringing together Non-General librarians, their deans and directors, the University Librarian, the Library Systems Office head, the AULs for Public Services and Collections, the Head of NRLF and the Head of DLA. All regarded it as a significant positive step.

An Ad Hoc Agenda Committee (Joe Rosenthal, Jack Leister, Becky Mason) was formed to arrange quarterly "General/Non-General Library Meetings" for NGL Heads and key members of the General Library staff.

In 1983/84 the Non-General librarians met with Gloria Stockton on NRLF, with Barclay Ogden on disaster planning, with Joe Rosenthal, Rita Kane and Carl Bengston on GLADIS. Ogden spoke to an NGL program about the Library's preservation program, and to the NGL Spring Assembly on disaster planning. The following year, the General/NGL meeting focused on MELVYL terminal installations. Vice Chancellor Roderic Park spoke to the NGL Fall Assembly on the impact of campus academic planning on the NGLs, and the Spring Assembly heard Gary Lawrence, from the office of the Academic Vice President for Library Plans and Policies.

In 1985, NGLs became eligible for NRLF and were allocated ten MELVYL terminals. By 1986/87, with the General Library's introduction of GLADIS as the UCB online catalog, the Non-General librarians' chief concern became eventual inclusion in GLADIS and access to GLADIS terminals.

In 1988 two independent institutions, the Pacific Film Archive and the Women's Center, petitioned for designation as affiliated libraries. Vice Chancellor Park referred the matter to the University Librarian, who appointed two ad hoc committees, chaired respectively by AUL for Public Services Rita Kane and AUL for Technical Services Sue Rhee, with faculty, personnel and library representatives. Terry Dean represented NGLs on both committees. Both petitions were denied, but in the process of formulating criteria they could use to evaluate the petitions, the committees developed a set of "Criteria for the Establishment of Libraries on the Berkeley Campus as Affiliated Libraries."

These criteria were more elaborate and exacting than anything previously existing; in effect, they refined the definition of an affiliated library. They required a collection development policy, stable and adequate funding, cataloging to national standards, a circulation policy, the provision of access to the UCB community, reference service, staffing that includes at least one librarian, with recognition of the professional role and provision for adequate support for professional activity outside the primary job. Although they were not adopted as official policy, the University Librarian would presumably rely on them in the event the question arose again. In Fall 1989 Ron Heckart reported them to the Senate Library Committee, in his capacity as ex officio LAUC-B member, and the Committee endorsed the Criteria.

Relations with the General Library continued to improve. Members of the Library Administrative Group visited all library units in 1988/89, including the Affiliated Libraries. Meetings were held with UL Rosenthal and Janice Burrows, the new Director of Human Resources. Rosenthal also spoke for the second year in a row to an Affiliated Librarians Assembly, pledging increased cooperation in collection development, management, preservation, patterns of referral and a unified database. He urged adherence to AACR2 and MARC format standards, and welcomed the inclusion of the ALs in GLADIS and NRLF. The Library's new AUL for Collection Development, David Farrell, was the featured speaker at the Spring 1990 Affiliated Librarians Assembly.

The Affiliated Libraries Administrative Group met with Dorothy McPherson (DLA) and Bernie Hurley (Library Systems) in 1989 to discuss problems involved in adding AL records to the CALLS (California Academic Libraries List of Serials) database and to GLADIS. The Library agreed to cover costs of GLADIS terminals in the Affiliated Libraries and the costs of inputting AL records into GLADIS as soon as problems of data maintenance were solved, and two of the libraries, Institute of Industrial Relations and Chicano Studies, began loading records into GLADIS in the spring of 1990. On the storage front, Joan Howland reported to the Spring 1990 Assembly that Law, Water Resources, Governmental Studies and Asian-American Studies were all being permitted to store the following year.

The 1990/91 Committee on NGL Affairs, chaired by Ginny Irving (Law), conducted a series of brown-bag lunch programs dealing with the IMAGEQUERY system developed by the Architecture Slide Library, the Library's new "Primary Clientele" policies, a report from IIRL on loading records into GLADIS, the use of the campus network for e-mail, and campus parking.

Vice Chancellor John Heibron was the featured speaker at the Spring AL Assembly on April 12, 1991. Added to a list of topics he had been asked to address was an uproar among Affiliated Librarians and their campus constituencies. The cause was a March 28 letter written by UL Joe Rosenthal to the Vice Chancellor, recommending much closer coordination of campus libraries in order to improve access and utilize resources more efficiently in the face of drastically reduced resources. Specifically, he proposed a goal of including all campus libraries in GLADIS and MELVYL, and integrating collection development, preservation activity, access policies, space planning and deployment of personnel in the Affiliated Libraries with that of the Library. To bring this about, he proposed placing all Affiliated Libraries under the University Librarian, effective July 1, 1991.

Since he had already announced his retirement, some wondered how serious Rosenthal was. In any event, there was a burst of outraged opposition from affiliated librarians as well as from faculty, administrators and others who rushed to defend the independence of their libraries and the high quality of specialized service they felt would be lost. Many felt the letter represented a kind of imperial arrogance on the part of the Library administration, since there had been no consultation with any of the Affiliated Libraries beforehand. There was even an article in the *Daily Californian*.

Ron Heckart, who was both an Affiliated Librarian and Chair of LAUC-B, wrote UL Rosenthal on behalf of the division, responding carefully to the various aspects of his proposal. While LAUC-B shared Rosenthal's concern about the fiscal problems, and agreed that closer coordination could be salutary in particular instances, the matter was complex and would have to be approached on a case-by-case basis, after establishing campus priorities for the respective values of the kinds of specialized collections and services represented by the affiliated libraries. The University Librarian thanked the division for its thoughtful comments, and welcomed its suggestions for ways to achieve improvements. The proposal was abandoned.

In February 1992, the Executive Committee commented to Provost Carol Christ on the Report of the Committee to Review the Ethnic Studies Libraries, chaired by Associate Professor Alex M. Saragosa. It supported the committee's recommendation that the three Ethnic Studies libraries remain under the Ethnic Studies Department, independent of the central Library system, but urged the importance of improved cooperation and coordination with the Library in collection development, acquisitions and bibliographic control, and that every effort be made to include their bibliographic records in the GLADIS and MELVYL catalogs.

In March 1992, LAUC-B Chair Becky Lhermitte wrote to Dean Albert Fishlow, expressing the division's "dismay and regret" over the decision to close the International Studies Library. She urged that he or Associate Librarian Colette Myles work closely with the Library to insure that, as the collection was dismantled, unique materials, especially serials, be transferred to the Library.

EPILOGUE

On the whole, librarians at Berkeley have been content with their gains over the last 25 years, and specifically with LAUC, peer review and the level of professional rewards and perquisites. Most discontent seems to derive from the perception of inept or unsympathetic management behavior, or from individuals feeling unfairly treated in either advancement decisions or opportunities for professional growth.

Measured against the original goals of those who established LAUC, the achievements might appear to have fallen short. Perhaps the most genuine gains were the restructuring of the rank and salary scheme, which allowed the average librarian without major administrative responsibility to reach a much higher salary level than before, and the 1975 upward shift in the salary structure, which has left UC librarians near the top of the ARL libraries in both beginning and average salaries ever since.

Librarians certainly have not achieved the degree of autonomy in governance that is the normal expectation of Senate faculty. The only decisions which it could be claimed are delegated to a LAUC-B body are in the allocation of funds for travel and research; and even that delegation

is ambiguous, since the University Librarian must authorize the actual expenditure of the monies. In every other instance, especially in appointment, promotion and advancement decisions, LAUC groups or other library advisory committees never do more than recommend, or provide input; decision-making is clearly reserved to the Library or campus administration. In spite of the strong concern in the formative period of the 1960s for such protections as tenure and a grievance process ending in binding outside arbitration, neither of these goals was ever achieved either through the division or through collective bargaining.

Librarians certainly have been afforded ample channels for a "voice" in decision-making. While some of this has been through LAUC-B, most has simply been a result of changes in management style on the part of the University Librarian or others in management positions. Indeed, it is likely that such changes in organizational culture would have occurred naturally in response to thinking in higher education, business and librarianship during this period, even without LAUC. Because the openness to input from individuals was always a function of administrative policy, the effectiveness of such input has depended directly on the attitudes of the administrators involved---on their interest in soliciting comment, and their willingness to be influenced or persuaded by it.

Librarians and administrators have spent an enormous amount of time and energy over the last 25 years developing and applying procedures to insure that only librarians of superior ability and achievement are appointed, retained and advanced. These procedures were derived from those for Senate faculty in the UC system, and were applied to librarians because of the decision of the University (and our profession) that librarians should be classed as academic employees. Given this context, it is difficult to see how any other course was possible. Yet one might well question whether the average ability and achievement of librarians at Berkeley is demonstrably superior to that found at any other academic libraries. It could be that there are so many other factors accounting for the willingness of superior individuals to take positions at Berkeley, or for those librarians who are on the staff to excel professionally, that the meager instruments of meticulous review and the "carrot-and-stick" elements of the advancement process have at best a marginal impact. Some appreciation of this may underlie the general sentiment among librarians and administrators alike that our performance review process requires too much time.

As for professional perquisites, librarians in the UC system never achieved full faculty status, membership in the Academic Senate, tenure, sabbaticals, salaries equivalent to those of the faculty, or recognition of the Library as a teaching department permitted to offer a course for credit. All of these goals have been achieved by our colleagues in the California State University system, as well as by many others elsewhere in the country. On the other hand, librarians at Berkeley no longer seem to consider any of those original aspirations to be very important, or even desirable. What they appear to value in practice are flexibility in the use of their time, office support in both staff and equipment, and financial support for professional activity. Even the money which is available to support research projects often goes begging, apparently because few librarians feel able or willing to detach themselves from their ongoing involvements long enough to carry them out.

The most meaningful achievement of LAUC at Berkeley has probably been the status it has provided librarians within the campus and UC administrative structures, as an official advisory body representing librarians. While LAUC-Berkeley is still working to develop more effective relationships with campus administration, the Academic Senate and academic departments, it has

made some progress over the years in gaining a regular place on campus and systemwide committees---in being accepted as having a legitimate role in some areas of academic policy-making.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE & CAPA MEMBERSHIP

1968

Chair: Myra Kolitsch
 Vice Chair: Eleanor Engstrand
 Secretary: Beatrice Lukens
 Executive C'tee: Marjorie Burr, George Davis, Jean Hudson, Catherine Moreno, Judith Morton, Thomas Reynolds (NGL), Margaret Studhalter, Eldred Smith (LAUC President)

1969

Chair: George Davis
 Vice Chair: Frank Velek
 Secretary: Ann Gilbert
 Executive C'tee: Sheila Dowd, Eldred Smith, Myra Kolitsch, Geraldine Clayton, John Emerson, Judith McDonough (Department & institute libraries)

1970

Chair: John Emerson
 Vice Chair: Sheila Dowd
 Secretary: Ann Gilbert
 Executive C'tee: Eleanor Engstrand, Vincent Duckles, Frank Velek, Geraldine Clayton, Philip Hoehn, Gwendolyn Lloyd (NGL), Laurel Burley (NGL)
 CAPA: Kimiyo Hom (Chair), Rudolf Lednicky, Sondra Shair, Naomi Held, Margaret Studhalter (from Feb.)

1971

Chair: Eleanor Engstrand
 Vice Chair: Louise Eastland
 Secretary: Barbara Tandy (to Sep.); Louise Eastland
 Executive C'tee: Linda Beaupré (Cain), Lois Farrell, James Gault, Simone Klugman, Virginia Pratt, Laurel Burley (NGL)
 CAPA: Kimiyo Hom (Chair), Rudy Lednicky, Sondra Shair, Naomi Held, Margaret Studhalter (to Sep.)

1972

Chair: Sheila Dowd
Vice Chair: Marjorie Burr
Secretary: Carlene Brown
Executive C'tee: Virginia Pratt, Elizabeth Cziffra, Marilyn Peri (Lewis) (NGL), Thomas Alexander, Margaret Studhalter, Linda Beaupré (Cain), Jack Leister (NGL)
CAPA: Rudolf Lednický (Chair), Kimiyo Hom, Sondra Shair, Ann Gilbert, Arthur Waugh (Oct. 1971-Sep. 1972)

1973

Chair: Elizabeth Cziffra (to May); Thomas Alexander
Vice Chair: Thomas Alexander; Laurel Burley (NGL)
Secretary: Veronica Wakeman
Executive C'tee: Sol Behar, Helvi Bessenyei, JoAnn Brock, James Burch, Raymond Tang, Gerald Giefer (NGL)
CAPA: Ann Gilbert (Chair), Kimiyo Hom, Louise Eastland, George Davis, Arthur Waugh (October 1972-September 1973)

1974

Chair: Bill Whitson
Vice Chair: Peggy Stern
Secretary: Alison Howard
Executive C'tee: Laurel Burley (NGL), Liz Kislitzin, Rudolf Lednický, Annegret Ogden, Ann Patterson (NGL), Carol Snyder, Margaret Studhalter
CAPA: Ann Gilbert (Chair), George Davis, Louise Eastland, James Gault, Beverly Hickok (NGL), Kent Schrieffer (NGL), Arthur Waugh (Oct. 1973-Sep. 1974)

1975

Chair: Bill Whitson
Vice Chair: Geraldine Scalzo
Secretary: Simone Klugman
Executive C'tee: Alison Howard, Elizabeth Kislitzin, Suzanne Gallup (Calpestri), Dorothy Gregor, Kenneth Logan, Dorothy Simpson (NGL), Gregg Atkins (NGL)
CAPA: Kent Schrieffer (Chair, NGL), Thomas Alexander, George Davis, Louise Eastland, James Gault, Beverly Hickok (NGL), Elizabeth Todd (Oct. 1974-Sep. 1975)

1976

Chair: Geraldine Scalzo
 Vice Chair: Richard Cooper
 Secretary: Lee Petrsek
 Executive C'tee: Grace Dote (NGL), Kenneth Logan, Dorothy Gregor, Suzanne Gallup (Calpestri), Julia Cooke (NGL), Ann Gilbert, Alan Dyson (LAUC President)
 CAPA: James Gault (Chair), Beverly Hickok (NGL), Thomas Alexander, Elizabeth Todd, Jack Leister (NGL), Susan Martin, Virginia Pratt (Oct. 1975-Sep. 1976)

1977 (January-August)

Chair: Richard Cooper
 Vice Chair: Arthur Waugh
 Secretary: Joan Aliprand
 Executive C'tee: Ann Gilbert, Lee Petrsek, Julia Cooke (NGL), Lila Chandra, Louise Eastland, Philip Hoehn, Kent Schriefer (NGL)
 CAPA: Thomas Alexander (Chair), Elizabeth Todd, Jack Leister (NGL), Susan Martin, Virginia Pratt, Barbara Kornstein, Robert Starrs (NGL, Oct. 1976-Sep. 1977)

1977/78

Chair: Arthur Waugh
 Vice Chair: Linda Beaupré (Cain)
 Secretary: Ronald Heckart
 Executive C'tee: Lila Chandra, Louise Eastland, Peter Evans, Gerald (Jerry) Giefer (NGL), Philip Hoehn, Janet Rudd, Kent Schriefer (NGL), Charles Martell (LAUC Secretary)
 CAPA: Jack Leister (Chair)(NGL), Susan Martin, Virginia Pratt, Barbara Kornstein, Robert Starrs (NGL), Russell Gardiner, James Kantor (Oct. 1977-Sep. 1978)

1978/79

Chair: Rudolf Lednický (to Nov. 1978); Gail Nichols
 Vice Chair: Gail Nichols
 Secretary: Mary Heath
 Executive C'tee: Janet Rudd, Peter Evans, Gerald Giefer (NGL), Catherine Moreno, Susana Hinojosa, William Roberts, Catherine Cortelyou (NGL)
 CAPA: Barbara Kornstein (Chair), Robert Starrs (NGL), Russell Gardiner, James Kantor, Julia (Judy) Cooke (NGL), Catherine Gordon, Simone Klugman

1979/80

Chair: Gail Nichols
 Vice Chair: Charles Martell
 Secretary: Ellen Meltzer
 Executive C'tee: Susana Hinojosa, Catherine Moreno, William Roberts, Thomas Alexander, Virginia Pratt, Catherine Cortelyou (NGL), Alice Youmans (NGL), Jack Leister (LAUC Vice President/President-Elect)
 CAPA: James Kantor (Chair), Russell Gardiner, Julia Cooke (NGL), Catherine Gordon, Simone Klugman, Ingrid Peiffer (NGL), Geraldine Scalzo

1980/81

Chair: Charles Martell
 Vice Chair: Barbara Kornstein
 Secretary: Peter Evans
 Executive C'tee: Thomas Alexander, Ronald Heckart (NGL), James Kantor, Kenneth Logan, Jean Peck, Virginia Pratt, Alice Youmans (NGL), Jack Leister (LAUC President)
 CAPA: Catherine Gordon (Chair), Julia Cooke (NGL), Simone Klugman, Ingrid Pfeiffer (NGL), Geraldine Scalzo, JoAnn Brock, Carlene Brown

1981/82

Chair: Barbara Kornstein
 Vice Chair: Donald Williams
 Secretary: Philip Hoehn
 Executive C'tee: Ronald Heckart (NGL), James Larrabee (NGL), Jean Peck, James Kantor, Kenneth Logan, Elizabeth Myers, Camille Wanat, Ellen Meltzer (LAUC Newsletter Editor)
 CAPA: Geraldine Scalzo (Chair), JoAnn Brock, Carlene Brown, Gerald Giefer (NGL), Dorothy Koenig, Ingrid Pfeiffer (NGL), William Whitson

1982/83

Chair: Donald Williams
 Vice Chair: James Gault
 Secretary: Terry Dean (Langer)
 Executive C'tee: James Larrabee (NGL), Camille Wanat, Elizabeth Myers, Ginette Polak (NGL), Victoria Hanawalt, Simone Klugman, Patricia Vanderberg
 CAPA: Dorothy Koenig (Chair), JoAnn Brock, Carlene Brown, Gerald Giefer (NGL), Norma Kobzina, William Whitson, Ronald Heckart (NGL)

1983/84

Chair: James Gault
Vice Chair: Ivan Arguelles
Secretary: Cristina Fowler (Campbell)
Executive C'tee: Victoria Hanawalt, Simone Klugman, Patricia Vanderberg, Faye Williamson, Patricia Maughan, Ginette Polak (NGL), Nanette Sand (NGL), Donald Williams (PC)
CAPA: Dorothy Koenig (Chair), Gerald Giefer (NGL), Norma Kobzina, William Whitson, Ronald Heckart (NGL), Gary Handman, Jean Peck

1984/85

Chair: Ivan Arguelles
Vice Chair: Patricia Davison (Kreitz)
Secretary: Deborah Sommer
Executive C'tee: Patricia Maughan, Catherine Moreno, Alison Howard, Milton Ternberg, Charlene Kubota, Nanette Sand (NGL), Barbara Radkey (NGL), James Gault (PC)
CAPA: Ronald Heckart (Chair, NGL), Gary Handman, Norma Kobzina, Jean Peck, Susana Hinojosa, Judith Levy, Rebecca Lhermitte (NGL)

1985/86

Chair: Patricia Kreitz
Vice Chair: Norma Kobzina
Secretary: Grace Dote
Executive C'tee: Alison Howard, Catherine Moreno, Milton Ternberg, Thomas Alexander, Ellen Meltzer, Catherine Cortelyou (NGL), Alice Youmans (NGL), Ivan Arguelles (PC), Gary Handman (CAPA)
CAPA: Gary Handman (Chair), Jean Peck, Susana Hinojosa, Rebecca Lhermitte (NGL), Judith Levy, Raymond Tang, Ginette Polak (NGL)

1986/87

Chair: Norma Kobzina
Vice Chair: Patricia Maughan
Secretary: Phoebe Janes
Executive C'tee: Thomas Alexander, Ellen Meltzer, Myrtis Collins, Gary Handman, James Spohrer, Alice Youmans (NGL), Terry Dean (Langer) (NGL), Patricia Kreitz (PC), Rebecca Lhermitte (CAPA), Camille Wanat (LAUC President)
CAPA: Rebecca Lhermitte (Chair) (NGL), Susana Hinojosa, Judith Levy, Raymond Tang, Ginette Polak (NGL), Elizabeth Kislitzin, Catherine Moreno

1987/88

- Chair: Patricia Maughan
 Vice Chair: Ellen Meltzer
 Secretary: Ann Jensen
 Executive C'tee: Myrtis Collins, James Spohrer, Gary Handman, Ruth Tucker, Dorothy Koenig, Terry Dean (Langer) (NGL), Colette Myles (NGL), Norma Kobzina (PC), Ginette Polak (CAPA)
 CAPA: Ginette Polak (Chair) (NGL), Raymond Tang, Elizabeth Kislitzin, Catherine Moreno, Alison Howard, William Roberts, Nanette Sand (NGL)

1988/89

- Chair: Ellen Meltzer
 Vice Chair: Peter Evans
 Secretary: Rebecca Lhermitte
 Executive C'tee: Patricia Maughan (PC), Dorothy Koenig (to mid-year), Ruth Tucker (mid-year), Barbara Glendenning, Jeff Katz, Allan Urbanic, Colette Myles (AL), Ann Jensen (AL), William Roberts (CAPA)
 CAPA: William Roberts (Chair), Catherine Gordon, Alison Howard, Catherine Moreno, Nanette Sand (NGL), Barbara Kornstein, Wei-Chi Poon (NGL)

1989/90

- Chair: Peter Evans
 Vice Chair: Ronald Heckart
 Secretary: Diane Brown
 Executive C'tee: Barbara Glendenning, Jeffrey Katz, Allan Urbanic, Yuki Ishimatsu, Armanda Mason (Barone), Ann Jensen (Aff.), Ginny Irving (Aff.), Ellen Meltzer (past Chair), Alison Howard (CAPA)
 CAPA: Alison Howard (Chair), William Roberts, Rebecca Lhermitte (AL), Wei-Chi Poon (AL), Barbara Kornstein, Roy Ortopan, Kenneth Logan

1990/91

- Chair: Ronald Heckart
 Vice Chair: Rebecca Lhermitte
 Secretary: Wendy Diamond
 Executive C'tee: Armanda Boni, Yuki Ishimatsu, Ginny Irving (AL), Carl Bengston, Daniel Pitti, Andrea Sevetson, Joy Svihra (AL), Peter Evans (PC), Barbara Kornstein (CAPA), Ellen Meltzer (LAUC Vice President/Pres.-Elect)
 CAPA: Barbara Kornstein (Chair), Wei-Chi Poon (AL), Kenneth Logan, Roy Ortopan, Elizabeth Sibley, Deborah Sommer, Alice Youmans (AL)

1991/92

Chair: Rebecca Lhermitte

Vice Chair: Gary Handman

Secretary: Ginny Irving

Executive C'tee: Daniel Pitti, Andrea Sevetson, Joy Svihra (AL), Wendy Diamond, Patricia Stewart, Kathleen VandenHeuvel (AL), Ronald Heckart (PC), Deborah Sommer (CAPA), Ellen Meltzer (LAUC President)

CAPA: Deborah Sommer (Chair), Carlene Brown, Kenneth Logan, Elizabeth Sibley, Alice Youmans (AL), Lily Castillo-Speed (AL), Milton Ternberg