



## Davis

*by Katherine F. Mawdsley*

### The Pre-history

The Librarians Association of the University of California, Davis (LAUC-D) began early in 1967 under several nurturing influences. Academic librarians within the University, and throughout the nation, had become part of the multiple movements for greater recognition and "voice" for previously unheard groups, which were a defining feature of the social activism of the 1960s. The UC-Davis administration, with an inclusive cooperative tradition born of its role as the most active and extensive agricultural land-grant campus in the UC system, was inclined to be receptive to respectfully worded justifications for participation. The Davis campus had been designated a general campus of the University in 1959 and was in a period of expansion and growth, especially in the library-dependent fields of the humanities and social sciences. The campus had a young College of Engineering and was preparing to open law and medical schools. Aspirations, ambitions and belief in "progress" abounded; the campus had faith that there was room for everybody and enough to go around.

Activity to gain librarians' participation in advice or governance at Davis seems to have originated, not surprisingly in those days, from the University Librarian, J. Richard Blanchard. Blanchard was a member of the Spiess Committee, a systemwide Academic Senate committee charged in 1966 to consider proposals to widen Senate-like participation in University governance. Spiess Committee files include letters from him and other University Librarians asserting the academic nature of librarians' work and advocating some form of representation, at least for more senior or specialized librarians, in the Senate or some other governance group.

In late 1966 or early 1967, the University Librarian appointed an Advisory Committee on the Status of Librarians consisting of four librarians, Bert Pratt, Don Kunitz, Rosemond McFerran

and Loren Owings, to advise him on "questions of librarians' salaries, status and 'fringe benefits.'" The committee submitted a written report on March 9, 1967, in conjunction with a campus visit of the Special Administrative Committee on Academic Non-Senate Personnel (the Hoos Committee) on the same date. The report identifies concerns of librarians, based on a survey of the 48 librarians then at Davis, which ranked security of employment first and "voice in the affairs of the University" sixth.

In a further report to the University Librarian on May 10, 1967, the advisory committee recommended that UC librarians form a systemwide organization and affiliate with CURLS, the academic chapter of the California Library Association, as a UC round table, and outlined possible roles of such an organization. (The early records at Davis contain numerous references to CLA activities and possible cooperation, including several fruitless attempts to pay dues by payroll deduction.) It specifically recommended against affiliating with a union. The report was discussed first by library department heads in June 1967 and then at a "librarians' seminar" on June 16. A report of the meeting notes that 16 librarians were present. The University Librarian attended briefly, called formation of a professional librarians association "highly desirable," and departed. An ad hoc committee of four librarians—Kunitz, McFerran, Owings and Tom Birrell—was selected to prepare a statement of purpose for a local organization, based on the recommendations in the May report. This project seems to have been abandoned in favor of the different organizational pattern developed by LAUC systemwide. Kunitz and Owings were nominated to attend the first LAUC Steering Committee meeting at the American Library Association conference in San Francisco later that month.

### Early Organization and Recognition

Correspondence files include lengthy reports from the Davis representatives about the Steering Committee meetings and the October General Assembly in Fresno. Memos conveying reports or calling meetings to discuss necessary action were addressed to "Professional Librarians, UC Davis."

A notable change had occurred by November. A report begins: "The first meeting of the Davis Division, Librarians Association of the University of California, was held...on November 6, 1967." Appointment of a Bylaws committee and election of systemwide officers were among the agenda items. Thereafter meetings, always scheduled on University space and time, were held more or less frequently, as business demanded. Clyde Baker was elected the first divisional Chair.

By March 1968 the minutes began, "Minutes of the regular meeting of the Librarians' Association, University of California, Davis Division...." At that meeting members discussed priorities for systemwide study and action, all related to conditions of employment. The University Librarian reported on a proposal being considered by the Hoos Committee for an advisory super-group which would incorporate the Academic Senate and other academic employees. The failure of this proposal and the referral of the Spiess Committee recommendations to individual divisions for action was shortly to lead, at Davis, to formation of the Academic Staff Organization (ASO), a unique feature of campus governance which has had a continuing strong impact on the role of LAUC on the campus. ASO, renamed the Academic Federation in 1990, is described in detail in a later section of this chapter.

Campus recognition of the new association was one of the first issues considered after local and systemwide organization were complete. In July 1968 the Chancellor's Office responded to the Executive Board's request for local recognition, saying that it was awaiting a decision from the President before making a decision. By November 1968 the membership minutes record: "The Association has been authorized to use the name Librarians Association of the University of California, Davis." A motion was passed at the November meeting supporting the pending request for systemwide recognition.

The issue of local recognition was raised again in 1969, along with a request for a budget of \$200. The Academic Senate Library Committee supported the request in a resolution to the Chancellor approving "the efforts to form a professional organization" and restating the purposes from the divisional Bylaws. Vice Chancellor William Dukes replied to Chair Tom Birrell in October: "You already have, it would seem, the kind of recognition necessary for performing the primary goals you have outlined, and further recognition would be redundancy." The letter specifically cites support for time, use of campus facilities, and travel funds taken from the Library's existing allocations. This seems to have resolved the matter until recognition resurfaced as a systemwide issue in the early 1970s.

One issue of some concern to the campus administration in the local Bylaws was the exclusion from membership of the University Librarian and the Assistant and Associate University Librarians. The same provision appearing in the systemwide Bylaws also concerned the Office of the President. It had a direct impact at Davis, where the first chair, Clyde Baker, was appointed Assistant University Librarian during his term and had to resign. By early 1969 proposals to reverse the exclusion both locally and systemwide were recorded in the minutes. The Davis division early and consistently supported including the administrative titles in LAUC.

Vice Chancellor Dukes' letter had cited budgetary support for LAUC travel, and correspondence from the University Librarian noted the amount of \$200 for 1970. Clerical support and copying were tacitly underwritten. Calls for donations from members to fund program and social activity expenses and to provide support for systemwide expenses are recorded annually for the next several years, usually with earnest pleas for greater participation. Not until the passage of a major systemwide Bylaws revision in the mid-1970s did LAUC-D move to a firmer budgetary basis.

### The Liaison Committee

Another unique LAUC-D group, the Liaison Committee, dates from the first Bylaws. The minutes of December 15, 1967 report a discussion on the adoption of the first Bylaws, which included: "The Liaison Committee will assume the responsibility for discussion of professional standards, privilege, tenure, salaries and conditions of employment of professional librarians at [UCD]."

A prominent feature from the very beginning of LAUC-D, the Liaison Committee at times almost overshadowed the Executive Board because of its special relationship with the University Librarian. Using a concept "liberally adapted" from the Santa Barbara Division, it comprised an elected chair, the divisional chair and vice chair, and two members elected at large. Its defining charge was to be "the specific group within the organization to serve as the consultative body to the University Librarian on matters of mutual concern."

The University Librarian made the official designation in May 1969. The committee received several of its earliest charges directly from him. Reports on the charges were submitted to the UL, then went to the membership for consideration, a pattern quite different from later LAUC committees. There are references in committee minutes in 1971 to meetings with the University Librarian in his office, a highly unusual occurrence at Davis. The subjects reflected a general consultative agenda.

The Liaison Committee's charge in the Bylaws included the issues identified as most important to the membership in the first survey conducted at the time of the Hoos Committee visit in 1967: professional standards, privilege, tenure, salaries and conditions of employment. Its first four reports, issued between 1968 and 1971, formed the basis for the development of peer review for librarians at Davis, and are dealt with under that heading later in this chapter.

The 1972 Committee had an early charge to provide "interim guidelines on peer review" reflecting the new series structure. By late 1972 intensive study of issues related to development of the local peer review process moved to ad hoc committees. The Liaison Committee instead received a series of charges from the Executive Board on timely issues. Topics included improved communication, compiling a handbook for librarians, the elective/appointive composition of the General Library peer review body, a rotation plan for librarians, and the appropriate form and content of the librarians' statements of responsibility.

The Liaison Committee gradually lost its initial stature as the premier consultative group. University Librarians increasingly turned to the Executive Board as the principal channel for communication. The Liaison Committee became an all-purpose standing committee available for systemwide or local tasks as they emerged. In 1973, for example, it gathered information from members for the Special Committee on Librarians' Salaries. In 1978/79 the charge was to comment on a proposed revision of the Master Plan for Libraries. A Bylaws revision in 1977 removed the divisional chair from the committee; two elected and two appointed members were added.

LAUC-D's advisory role within the Davis library was further recognized in March 1971, when the chair was added to the department heads' council which met monthly and served as the principal advisory group. LAUC-D and the library administration seem to have been feeling their way on appropriate activity for the organization; in 1972 the Board responded to Mr. Blanchard that it had decided not to take on the functions of the former Staff Association, a social group.

The first specific occasion for contact with the campus administration occurred in 1973, when a new title series, Assistant Law Librarian, was announced for use on campus. LAUC-D Chair Jane Kimball addressed the Vice Chancellor and systemwide LAUC, questioning the authenticity of the division's advisory status when the new personnel title was created without consulting LAUC. The reply maintained that consultation with the Library administration had been deemed sufficient.

University Librarian Blanchard announced his retirement in 1972, and the issue of librarian participation in the search for a successor was raised. Through negotiation with ASO, two librarians were appointed to the search committee. LAUC-D submitted a slate of names which was forwarded by ASO, and also prepared a statement of desired qualifications which was distributed to the full search committee by the campus administration.

## Early Systemwide Issues

Through this period, minutes reflect concern about the development of drafts of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) establishing the policies governing librarians. LAUC-D's comments in 1970 to library, campus and systemwide administration supported the LAUC Consensus statement, and identified as its top concerns the M.L.S. requirement for appointment, conferral of tenure, and reduction in overlap in the salary scale. A detailed response to the April 1971 APM draft contained sharp criticism of the draft's acceptance of the demanding criteria in the Consensus without including the corresponding improvements in status. Also noted was the lack of systemwide policies and criteria for appointment, promotion and security of employment.

In January 1972, the divisional response to the December 1971 APM revisions adopted a more conciliatory tone, commending the positive changes of the new version. In her cover letter to the University Librarian, Chair Eleanor Payne wrote that "what the Librarians Association seeks is in no way 'a pie in the sky' but an accommodation of points of view, with the end result beneficial to *both* the University and its individual librarians. It is in this spirit that we have approached the Sections in question, and it is this we ask of the Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs."

When the final form was transmitted in April 1972, Chair Payne wrote to the UL reflecting mixed views. On the positive side, "we take some comfort from the fact that whatever status we enjoy within the University community is now codified and we have been provided with a working document." The letter cites achievements on the issues of security of employment, the two-track system and the weight given to "professional competence and qualifications." Resolution of the salary conversion coincident with implementation of the policy was identified as the next imperative.

Much attention was devoted to salary issues in the early 1970s. Some of the strongest feeling recorded in the archives greeted the 1971 state budget provisions, which contained no range increase for academic employees. The division was equally outspoken in commenting on the development of new salary scales. It argued for annual salary increases and retention of half-step provisions—in retrospect, remnants of staff personnel status. It unfailingly supported the reports and recommendations of the administrative Special Committee to Study Librarians Salaries, chaired by its own AUL William McCoy; and it supported the concept, never realized, of a pay increase to resolve pay scale inequities in comparison with other University title series.

As early as April 1972 LAUC-D discussed the issue of salary differential for department heads, and proposed to pursue it at the systemwide level. The issue surfaced both in discussions of the two-track system in Section 82 of the APM and in the development of local peer review procedures. Davis has represented a LAUC minority in consistently supporting the concept of administrative stipends.

Although there have generally been a handful of union members at Davis, ours has consistently been among the divisions (and campuses, overall) least sympathetic to collective bargaining. In 1972 the division voted not to support the AFT on salary issues, but was willing to have the LAUC President observe AFT discussions with the University if invited. Davis responded to a 1974 systemwide committee considering LAUC's relations with voluntary organizations by opposing active affiliation. The report of the local committee on the issue analyzed the differences between employee and professional organizations, and was revised and

published in *College and Research Libraries* in 1975 under the title, "Professional Associations and Unions: Future Impacts of Today's Decisions."

Responses to systemwide committee reports on personnel issues were major topics for membership meetings in the mid-1970s. The salary restructure, criteria for promotion to the Librarian rank and access to personnel records were studied by local committees which made recommendations to the membership. LAUC-D generally supported the systemwide committee positions on all these issues.

Protracted attention was devoted to the reports recommending a Library Specialist series proposed between 1977 and 1981 by a subcommittee of the Library Council Personnel Committee. The recommendations to recognize certain actual personnel practices in both technical and public services, and to provide a longer, more responsible and more remunerative career ladder for paraprofessionals, conflicted sharply with divisional thinking about the need to reserve original cataloging and reference for librarians. A series of reports by ad hoc committees repeatedly objected to "blurring the distinctions" between librarians and paraprofessional staff. Objections to the degree of salary overlap between the range proposed for the highest levels of support staff and the librarian scale were also registered. The division consistently recommended creation of two new levels in the existing Library Assistant series as a preferable alternative. Davis's Linda Hoffmann (later Kennedy) was the LAUC representative to a systemwide administrative committee which proposed the Library Assistant V series, the final result of the drawn-out deliberations.

### The 1970s

Dissent over interpretation of policy surfaced locally in 1974, and the Executive Board responded by holding an open meeting referred to as a "gripe session." Concerns seem to reflect tension between older and new librarians on issues such as opportunities for committee service and performance expectations for advancement. How confrontational and "union-like" LAUC should be was also an issue. The Board responded by initiating "happy hour" socials at the faculty club to promote informal discussion and better communication. Chair Rosemond McFerran initiated an irregular newssheet, usually including a cartoon, to provide frequent updates on issues under consideration. Parodies of the new terminology of "Chair" were a recurrent attempt to inject humor.

Bernard Kreissman, appointed University Librarian in 1974, came from an institution with traditional collective bargaining, but had not worked with a professional advisory group like LAUC. Through the next several years situations arose in which both LAUC-D and the University Librarian had to decide what role the organization wanted and would be permitted.

In 1975 the first recruitment of an AUL since 1968 stimulated a LAUC-D request for participation in the selection process. There was no history of librarian participation in recruitment at Davis, though the matter had been raised at an Executive Board meeting as early as 1971. In response to the Board's request, the UL agreed to use it as an ad hoc committee to "speak to the candidates and provide some input." The practice was then formalized into a policy providing for a committee of four librarians nominated by LAUC and two staff to interview in future cases.

Similarly the next department head recruitment, in 1978, was the occasion for a recommendation that all candidates brought for interview meet with the other department heads and the staff of the department. This provision, along with a meeting with a joint committee representing LAUC-D and staff personnel, became policy in department head recruitments. In spite of isolated inquiries, no further moves for participation in librarian recruitment occurred for almost a decade, and search committees were not routine below the department head level. It was only with the arrival of a University Librarian who was accustomed to using representative search committees for all academic appointments that the practice became standard at Davis. LAUC-D now nominates a member of all academic search committees in the Library.

LAUC-D's budgetary affairs were placed on a firmer footing in late 1976, when a request specifying support for official travel, copying and other office expenses, and a small amount of General Assistance support to the Chair's department, was prepared and submitted. The request noted the first approval two years before of a systemwide LAUC budget. Travel expenses were requested from the Vice Chancellor's Office; Library Administration was designated as the source for the balance. The request was not received in time for funding in the 1976/77 fiscal year, but was renewed and approved for the following year. The proposal also recommended that the time spent by the Chair be recognized in the Statement of Responsibility; The Library administration found this provision unnecessary and did not approve it.

### The "Bio/Ag Issue"

LAUC-D rose to a new level of campus visibility and influence in 1978, when it developed and successfully advocated a position on library service for the biological and agricultural sciences different from those proposed by the affected faculty and the library administration. Controversy had arisen in late 1977 when the medical and veterinary science collections moved to permanent quarters beyond convenient walking distance. Biological sciences faculty who had become accustomed to the convenience and specialized services of the previous location were forced back to the general reference and complicated and crowded collections of the Shields (general) Library. In their protests to the Chancellor, they asked for a separate location to house journals, new monographs and reserve reading. The Library administration responded by pointing out the cost impact and service limitations of the requested location, but offering two alternatives. One was within Shields; the other would provide limited service in the space vacated by the medical collections, with limited staffing and hours, and neither catalog nor reference service. The faculty voted for the Shields option.

Both proposals had been prepared without consulting the librarians providing services, and when they learned of the proposals they expressed serious concern about the impact on service to students in the sciences and on the larger campus. A solid majority of librarians signed petitions for a special meeting of the division in August 1978, to hear from the University Librarian and discuss alternatives to the administrative proposal. Chair Linda Hoffmann led the ad hoc committee appointed to evaluate suggestions; it met intensively and presented its report in less than a month.

Calling for the recommendations to be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, the Senate Library Committee and the affected faculty, the report argued against creating a separate reference location, citing collection duplication and the inadequate staffing levels

proposed. Instead, it proposed a separate reference desk within Shields, sharing a rearranged collection. It supported rearranging the collection to bring the science classifications together, close to the unbound periodicals, and creating a consultation area for the latest issues of selected titles. Hoffmann's transmittal memo noted pointedly: "We therefore consider it very unfortunate that negotiations with the Bio/Ag faculty were allowed to reach such an advanced stage without the knowledge or participation of any librarian outside of AdCom [the collective designation for the UL and AULs]."

University Librarian Kreissman transmitted the report to departmental chairs and library representatives, adding: "The questions and alternative proposals raised in the LAUC-D report are worthy of careful consideration by the biological sciences faculty." At a meeting to discuss the recommendations the faculty accepted the reference location, but insisted on a separate administrative unit to provide specialized managerial oversight.

Planning and recruitment proceeded on the basis of these decisions. Several months later LAUC-D sent another memo to the chairs of the biological sciences departments, which gave reasons for opposing title arrangement of the 768 shelves of current biological sciences journals—especially since they were shelved in the same room as all other unbound titles. The arguments were persuasive, and a title arrangement was abandoned. The Library administration's willingness to have LAUC take a leadership role in this instance appeared to recognize the effectiveness of their recommendations during the earlier, more heated, debate.

A similar but far less controversial issue of library planning for academic programs arose in Fall 1979, when planning resumed for a long-deferred graduate school of administration. Again librarians most concerned about the likely impact on library service requested a meeting with the University Librarian to obtain information about the status of planning, then prepared a statement for LAUC's consideration. The report of the ad hoc committee appointed to consider the issue reviewed previous planning assumptions, which had vested responsibility in a small library attached to an institute housed in Shields, and recommended instead that the General Library be allocated funding for collections and two librarians to serve the program. The division and the Library administration accepted the report, but the campus administration did not allocate the additional support requested. The absence of an influential and well established constituency may have been a major reason for this result.

Although the rosters report a Program Committee since the earliest years of the organization, it was not until the late 1970s that divisional records first indicate activity beyond occasional social events or planning for LAUC Assemblies. LAUC-D Seminars—from four to seven afternoon programs per year—discussed individual topics of current interest, or centered around a common theme such as the history of books. The programs were planned to offer professional development opportunities for members and were often open to other Library staff as well. Program Committees were eager to expand their offerings by bringing speakers from a distance; but, since funding for honoraria and travel expenses was a continuing concern, almost all the presentations were by local residents or adventitious visitors. Budget limitations notwithstanding, the LAUC programs brought variety and interest to the professional calendar. The Program Committee also coordinated an annual fall reception at which new librarians were formally, and usually humorously, introduced to their new colleagues.

## The Early 1980s

Contacts between LAUC-D and Leon Mayhew, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, became more frequent and direct in 1980/81. Pertinent policies, such as the non-Senate academic layoff policy, came directly to LAUC-D for comment, rather than indirectly through ASO or the University Librarian. The Vice Chancellor accepted an invitation to speak to the first fall program in 1980, addressing from his professional sociological perspective the librarian personnel process and the controversial issues raised by Ann Hinckley's recent letter on review criteria. Affirming both the professional responsibility to act in the best interests of the client and the "cosmopolitan and leavening effect" of professional development, the Vice Chancellor noted what he called a "lock-step" advancement pattern among librarians at Davis and called for more differential recognition of merit.

Mayhew invited LAUC-D, among other campus representative organizations, to comment on the draft campus self-study report for reaccreditation; LAUC-D responded on the library issues it raised. In December 1980 he forwarded a proposal for change in local AUL review procedures initiated by the University Librarian. LAUC-D's response supported the recommendation of the ASO Personnel Committee, which agreed on the composition of the special ad hoc committee proposed but called for its report to pass through the Personnel Committee.

Chair Vernon Lust and Vice Chair Anthony Operhall met with the Vice Chancellor to discuss a proposal to waive recruitment and appoint a Library Assistant IV to an Assistant Librarian position. The division went on record favoring open recruitment, and a subsequent letter implies that the Vice Chancellor's decision supported the open recruitment. In late 1981 another interseries movement, to the Assistant Law Librarian rank, stimulated extensive correspondence between the Executive Board and the Vice Chancellor, though it is not mentioned at all in membership minutes. The Board again protested the lack of open recruitment for the position and also informed LAUC systemwide and the ASO Affirmative Action Committee of its concerns.

The action had been approved several months before LAUC-D learned of it, and Vice Chancellor Mayhew responded that the change in title, loosely referred to as a "reclassification," was similar to several movements to professorial ranks which had advanced minorities or women who might not otherwise have been successful in the climate of the times. Review under applicable ASO procedures was also cited as balancing concern about the waiver. The Executive Board was not satisfied with the response and pursued the matter in a brief series of confrontational letters. A final memorandum from the Vice Chancellor confirming his authority to waive the open recruitment policy ended the matter at the local level, and seems also to have concluded the period of close and cordial contact with the Vice Chancellor's office. LAUC President Judy Ganson's inquiry to Assistant Vice President Edward Blakely also received a reply confirming that there had been an authorized exception to policy.

Preparing and discussing responses to the large number of systemwide committees active at the time, and considering proposals for change in local personnel procedures, occupied LAUC-D throughout 1982/83. The Library administration notified the Board in March that the collective bargaining laboratory period required suspension of consultation on issues within the scope of bargaining. The LAUC-D Chair ceased to be a member of the general advisory group for the same reason. LAUC had proposed a forum with representatives of labor organizations and the University to provide information about collective bargaining, but canceled it because of the

restrictions. The legality of continuing membership and other meetings having been raised, LAUC-D met quarterly that year, a less frequent schedule than typical in those years. In July it learned that ASO had been instructed not to discuss matters pertaining to librarians because of the positive vote for an exclusive representative. References to the inability to discuss pending reports on personnel matters, or to update the Bylaws, are further indications of the constraint placed on local LAUC activity in the laboratory period.

### The Northern Regional Library Facility

But the major issue in 1984 was completely unrelated to labor relations. In early April, shipment of large numbers of serials backfiles to the Northern Regional Library Facility (NRLF) began. Planning to relocate collections to NRLF had taken place over several years, with notices to the faculty and discussion with appropriate committees, but the date of the first shipments and the choice of journals as the first element to move were not widely known. A group of bibliographers became concerned that the faculty were not aware of the gravity of the situation, and felt that LAUC-D should be on record as registering professional concern for the integrity of the collections.

They prepared a draft Statement of Concern, which became the sole topic for a previously scheduled membership meeting. The statement reviewed the critical library space shortages and deferred building plans which had left Davis with a deposit goal equal to one-quarter of its collections. The likely impacts on research and the urgent need for a new building or on-campus storage were emphasized. After extensive discussion the division voted to present the revised document to Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Robert Cello, for distribution to the faculty and administration. Cello met with a small delegation led by division Chair Patricia Inouye and acknowledged their efforts and the gravity of the issue. He declined to distribute the LAUC-D statement in favor of developing his own negotiating strategy, but a number of copies reached members of the faculty.

Faculty concern over the relocation had become intense, and the Academic Senate took up the issue at several meetings in the ensuing quarter. Vice Chancellor Cello declared a moratorium on shipments to NRLF, pending recommendations by the Senate Library Committee. From an administrative viewpoint the matter was very sensitive. Meeting the storage quota, no matter how unreasonable, was considered an essential condition for obtaining state approval of any library space for the campus, and a Project Planning Guide for expansion of the Shields Library was awaiting state approval. Any radical change in the proposal would eliminate the Davis project from consideration. Vice Chancellor Cello explained the issues both to the Academic Senate and to LAUC-D in several meetings. He suggested actions to reduce the impact of the quota while not appearing to abrogate it: obtaining a waiver of the non-duplication policy which threatened Davis deposits with discard; slowing down deposits to permit renewed faculty consultation; obtaining a guaranteed retrieval time. After vigorous discussion LAUC-D accepted the proposals to ameliorate the most damaging impacts of massive relocation while continuing to meet the mandate to store.

The Representative Assembly of the Academic Senate became the forum for further action on the issue. Division files contain long detailed letters exchanged by the Vice Chancellor and Senate Chair as they attempted to clarify critical issues. The local Senate's position was

strengthened by the approval by the systemwide Senate Assembly of two resolutions calling for greater faculty involvement in issues related to collections. Locally, the principal outcome was the establishment of a Senate committee "to formulate...policies and procedures [which] provide for and encourage the direct participation of faculty within their areas of academic expertise in the selections of books to be removed from their current locations." By the next academic year, the major mitigating actions identified by the Vice Chancellor were implemented. For the next several years relocation remained both a major and highly labor-intensive project for library staff and a sensitive point for the faculty who had been most involved in the struggle. Over time, however, concerns were alleviated by the highly efficient retrieval procedures and ready access to the collections.

### The Later 1980s

Partially as a result of the furor over storage, University Librarian Kreissman resigned in 1984, and a search for a successor began. In a process very similar to that used a decade earlier, LAUC-D appointed an ad hoc committee on qualifications to prepare a statement for the search committee and to review and suggest librarians to serve on it. It recommended the inclusion of four librarians and two library staff members. ASO again agreed to forward LAUC-D's nominations, and two librarians and one staff person were appointed. The interview process included a meeting between the candidates and the Executive Board; Board notes during the interview process reflect concern that LAUC not be confused with a union.

The resumption of increased direct discussions with the Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, ensued in mid-1984. The engagement on the storage issue may have been a factor, but the completion of bargaining for the first Memorandum of Understanding and the contacts stimulated by the Tier Two compact were also important. In October 1984 Vice Chancellor Cello wrote suggesting regular meetings and asking to receive agendas, minutes and communications. The pattern continued for several years, through Cello's tenure, but was interrupted with the arrival of his successor. In 1989/90 the Executive Board addressed Vice Chancellor Carol Cartwright on concerns about the time required for the local review process. The following year communication increased, again initiated by LAUC-D. Chair Linda Kennedy wrote urging a visible role for the Library in several major administrative searches being planned; in response, at least one Library representative was appointed to each search committee. The Board again raised the issue of receiving policies for comment directly rather than through the Academic Federation or the University Librarian; the instance cited was the proposal for administrative stipends for librarians. Campus administration, including Academic Affairs, was in reorganization through this period, and the divisional Chair and Vice Chair were invited to meet with the new Provost shortly after his appointment. Although the initiative has not led to regular meetings, a basis for continuing communication has again been established.

Approval of the Memorandum of Understanding stimulated a burst of activity directed to meeting the shared governance expectations of the Compact. Establishment of the first LAUC-D travel oversight committee came quickly, as described in the section on professional development later in this chapter. Consideration of changes in the APM focused principally on the stipulation that librarians constitute a majority of the peer review committee, since the ASO Personnel Committee did not meet this requirement. At first Davis opposed that provision, but was willing

to accept it with the footnote which became known locally as the "Davis exception"—the proviso that non-librarians could serve on review committees. Subsequently the issue of whether LAUC-D or ASO should have primary responsibility for advising on librarians' salary actions became the subject of contention and much discussion, as reviewed below. Consideration of APM provisions for deferred review and temporary appointments was careful but uneventful.

The Code of Conduct and other professional standards documents, however, were persistently problematic. Minutes from late 1984 report members' confusion over why the Code was necessary, and why it needed to be developed so quickly. Davis was among divisions voting for a more general document than the first iteration, and specifically disapproving the list of types of misconduct. When the next draft substituted the ALA Statement of Ethics, Davis supported it in principle and went on record opposing the inclusion of the suggested list of rights, since they no longer balanced a list of violations of the code.

By 1986 the documents had again been redrafted, and Davis was most concerned about a lack of coherence among the sections; Assembly delegates were instructed to urge that the document be returned to committee for further work. Davis also disapproved the proposed Bylaw establishing systemwide and local professional standards committees, on the basis that it should not include procedures.

In 1985/86 the Liaison Committee had Professional Standards added to its name and charge, and became the Davis body dealing with professional standards issues. Successive versions of the documents occupied the committee for the next two years. Throughout the discussion, Davis librarians struggled to determine why the documents were needed and looked in vain for issues not covered by existing policy. When in late 1987 the University's Office of the President questioned whether the Code and Bill of Rights were needed, Davis gratefully replied in the negative, recommending instead that other policies, such as APM 140, be revised as necessary. With the termination of the professional standards discussions, the local committee's name changed again to Professional Issues Committee, and it resumed accepting specific charges from the Executive Board.

A number of other issues are reflected in the archives of the period. A small cohort of librarians new to Davis suggested and implemented a new librarians' support group, which met for several months in 1984/85 to discuss the personnel system, opportunities for campus participation and similar acculturation matters. It requested official recognition from LAUC-D, but decided to disband when the Executive Board conditioned approval on including all new appointees, including department heads, in the group.

From mid-1984 onward, membership meetings regularly included reports from the University Librarian, first William McCoy as Acting University Librarian and then Marilyn Sharrow, on major developments at the University, campus and library levels. Planning for a major expansion of the Shields Library began in late 1985, suggesting a possible role for LAUC-D in the process. Extensive consultation through the departmental structure was implemented, and LAUC-D as an organization did not become involved.

1987/88 was unique as the only year in which a librarian from outside the General Library, Judy Janes of the Law Library, held the position of Chair. Movement of the Chair, and its attendant responsibilities for document distribution, led to the discovery that there was no longer a LAUC-D budget. For a number of years the budget had provided support for clerical time to assist the chief officer, as well as photocopying and similar expenses. A former Chair reported

that the staffing provision had disappeared through disuse; the budget was apparently discontinued without anyone noticing. A renewed justification was prepared and approved by Academic Affairs for 1988/89 in the amount of \$3,250. The allocation was reestablished for subsequent years, though the most recent budget has been reduced to \$2,500, with \$1,000 allocated for clerical support.

In 1988/89 and 1989/90 the Executive Board took an active role in reviewing proposed revisions to internal library policy statements. Like many such compendia, the manual of statements had become outdated but not officially withdrawn. When revision was announced in early 1989 Chair Vernon Lust wrote requesting definitive advice about which sections remained in force, and asking to review revisions. In this activity the Board seems to have seen a protective or monitoring role for itself on behalf of librarians and the institution. New and revised policy statements are now forwarded to LAUC-D for review on a routine basis.

### The 1990s

The issue of upward administrative evaluation arose in 1989/90 when a member appeared before the Executive Board to express concerns about a perceived diminution of communication and collegiality. The possibility of librarians reviewing AULs outside the formal review process was suggested as one way to address the situation. The Professional Issues Committee, to which the item was referred, reported in March 1990 that a literature review revealed enough background material for a full study. It raised a number of questions about possible procedure and purpose, noting that "it is hard to imagine the evaluation not becoming, in some form or another, a part of the formal review process." The committee encompassed department heads in its concept of the study, and stressed the necessity of including some of those who would be reviewed in a group appointed to develop a proposal. A membership meeting to discuss the concept was recommended and held.

Late in 1989/90 the Chair appointed an ad hoc committee to develop a proposal for upward evaluation. Working with the Professional Issues Committee over the next year, it produced a detailed questionnaire surveying member opinion on the issues of the destination and use of results, the extent of confidentiality, and the mandatory or optional nature of participation. The complexity of the survey prevented a clear consensus, but a majority of those responding favored some kind of upward feedback.

The combined committee continued its labors. The final report, completed in April 1992, outlined a rationale and implementation strategy for a confidential "organizational development tool," which was mandatory for supervisors but voluntary for subordinates. A proposed form was also submitted. Feedback would go only to the subjects, all librarian supervisors through the AUL level. While acknowledging that no recommendation relating to support staff could be binding, the report urged that senior supervisors from this group be given an opportunity to participate as well. The report, which emphasized the constructive intent of the process, was resoundingly approved by the membership.

LAUC-D and the Library administration found several areas of strong mutual concern for discussion in 1990/91. The campus was engaged in a self-study for reaccreditation, and University Librarian Sharrow asked the division to advise on how librarians could "keep abreast of the changes, formulate initiatives for mastering these challenges, and make contributions in

fulfillment of their professional role in meeting the information needs of the communities they serve" in the decade ahead. The ad hoc committee report prepared in response focused on the changes electronic access in many guises was making in the academic community, and the importance for librarians in all specialties of acquiring and using the tools and skills necessary to remain active participants in the community. The report was included in the documentation for the Library's self-study.

With the recognition of growing budgetary difficulties and the announcement of the first early retirement program, the University Librarian regularly reported developments to divisional meetings. As part of a concerted effort to increase discussion at these meetings, agendas from 1990 on frequently included background information or suggested issues. For a budget discussion in 1991, the outline reviewed support for professional development activities, and the adequacy of guidance in local review process policy for recognizing the impact of greater job responsibilities and reduced support. It concluded with a question which accurately reflects a major concern of the Executive Board: "How can we most effectively use LAUC-D to enhance communication and contribute to creative problem solving?" The division returned to budgetary issues in the next year, and supplemented departmental discussion of priorities and activities targeted for reduction with general discussion. Staffing issues and ways to manage potential reassignments were also outlined and discussed.

LAUC-D disagreed with the Library administration on one aspect of another local issue: revision of the AUL review process. The point in question was whether AULs would continue to be reviewed by the Academic Federation Personnel Committee, after prior consideration by a separately constituted confidential committee. Library administration, using as precedent the procedures for certain other managerial titles, recommended that the Personnel Committee not be part of the process. LAUC-D, after extended discussion, voted to support continuation of the Personnel Committee's involvement.

As LAUC's first quarter-century drew to a close, systemwide issues important in divisional discussion included a number of APM revisions. LAUC-D supported the reduction in confidentiality proposed in APM 158, and sponsored an Assembly resolution in response to the Pister report recommending completely open letters in librarian reviews. After detailed discussion of earlier drafts the division supported, with clarifying comments, the reports of the committees on Library Plans and Policies and Diversity. And finally, maintaining the only position on which LAUC-D has consistently for almost two decades opposed the majority opinion within LAUC, it once again supported the concept of administrative stipends, though not the Library Council proposal which was its latest embodiment.

## THE ACADEMIC STAFF ORGANIZATION

The Academic Staff Organization (ASO), renamed the Academic Federation in 1990, has been a unique complicating and enriching factor for LAUC-D and for UC-Davis librarians. Librarians have played an important role in the formation of the group and throughout its history, serving frequently as Chair, on the Executive Council and on all committees. In the last decade it has not been unusual for about a quarter of the elective and appointive positions within the organization to be filled by librarians. The relationship of LAUC-D and ASO, for the most part strongly mutually supportive, has at several points become the subject for study and reconsideration by LAUC, usually because of the respective roles of the two groups in librarian peer review.

ASO was formed "to establish and secure for the non-senate academic appointees, recognition and voice, rights and privileges in University affairs and to advise and assist the administration in making the University of California, Davis, of maximum usefulness to the people of the state."

LAUC-D was contacted by the organizing committee in late 1968, and the Executive Board agreed to maintain contact with the nascent group. Davis librarians were members of the organizing committee and the first Bylaws committee.

In early 1969 about 600 full-time employees at Davis met the definition of academic employee in the Administrative Manual (predecessor of the Academic Personnel Manual) but were not members of the Academic Senate; the estimate two decades later is 650. The organizing committee asked these people to vote on the proposal to form an organization; with a 70% response, only five negative votes were recorded. Bylaws were promptly written and adopted, and ASO was recognized by the campus as one of three constituent organizations representing employees. The others were the Senate and the University Staff Assembly, representing classified personnel.

ASO's status as the recognized representative body for academic non-senate appointees, including librarians, has been regarded as both an asset and a constraint for LAUC-D. The policy of including representatives of the three organizations on important administrative bodies, including search committees, has provided a more consistent opportunity for voice than on many other campuses. In the 1980s ASO began to appoint non-voting representatives to an increasing number of Academic Senate committees, and librarians have thus been appointed to such pertinent groups as the Graduate Council and the Academic Planning Council. But because ASO is the official organization representing all academic non-senate personnel, there was no question that it, rather than LAUC-D, would be the avenue through which other academic personnel could achieve greater contact with the Senate. The value Davis librarians have placed on ASO was well expressed in their response in late 1981 to the systemwide report on Personnel Planning for the 1980s; the division recommended ASO-type organizations for the other campuses.

LAUC-D has sometimes chafed at having to work through ASO on matters specifically germane to libraries. To cite a prominent example, librarians were appointed to the search committees for University Librarian in both 1973 and 1985 only as a result of their nomination by ASO, which acceded to LAUC-D's request to recommend only librarians. Executive Board minutes show recurrent concern that ASO, but not LAUC-D, has been asked by campus administration for comment on a pending policy revision. Librarians' active roles on most ASO

committees have usually ensured that LAUC-D learns of the issues and has an opportunity to comment, but the lack of formal status has been a source of concern.

In 1975 systemwide LAUC's recognition by the University stimulated a proposal that a committee study the relationship of the two organizations. The effort, never easy, languished; a subsequent set of minutes shows that the discussion was divided into the separate issues of voice on campus and the review process. A final report in 1979 made no specific recommendations, affirmed the current situation, and was filed. Another effort, more focused on peer review, arose in the late 1980s when the APM was revised to emphasize LAUC's role in peer review. Described in more detail in the following section, its outcome was remarkably similar: a ballot in June 1989, on preserving the relationship to ASO as a link to the Davis academic community vs. LAUC's special responsibility for peer review, was inconclusive. The division voted to drop further discussion of the issue. Since then the traditional supportive relationship has prevailed, and librarians have continued to see the Academic Federation as an accessible avenue for university service and constructive interaction with campus colleagues.

### PEER REVIEW

Both process and criteria for peer review and performance evaluation have been central and recurrent concerns of LAUC-D, but it was not always so. In the 1967 survey by the advisory committee which preceded LAUC's formation, over 40% of the librarians expressed a preference for administrative review rather than one involving peer participation. Documentation is sketchy from the years before 1968, but additional review appears to have occurred only for promotions to higher administrative levels, and to have been conducted outside the Library by a faculty committee advisory to the Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs. A procedures document from 1968 describes an annual review barely distinguishable from that used for classified staff. A form required ratings on numerous components, including "professional competence," "professional characteristics," and "relations with fellow staff." Committee assignments and professional activities were reported but not rated.

Peer review first occurs in LAUC-D discussions in February 1969 in the context of the role of the Academic Staff Organization. For a topic which has been so pervasive in librarians' concerns, its first expression at Davis is startlingly innocent: "How do people feel about being reviewed by their Peers? How many members of this group would be willing to sit on a committee to pass judgment on their peers?" The Liaison Committee was charged to study the procedures and techniques of peer review "and to report at the next general meeting." The result was a one-page discussion report outlining the pros and cons of both peer and administrative review, with a further statement on the importance of an appeals committee for such processes. There were no recommendations.

More extensive consideration of peer review followed quickly. In September 1969 the University Librarian referred the report of the Berkeley Task Force on Academic Library Personnel to the Liaison Committee, asking them to prepare a similar document for Davis. The committee's report generally agreed with Berkeley's on the issues of series structure, terms and conditions of employment and salary; but it recommended immediate implementation of a number of features without waiting for the restructure of series titles, among them advancement without the requirement of administrative responsibility, and review of recommendations for

promotion by a confidential peer committee. Known as the Pratt Report, its principles for local peer review have recognizably persisted through extensive reconsideration and procedural change.

The report was approved by LAUC-D in February 1970; in March the University Librarian wrote to the division agreeing to "proceed with plans for the implementation of an in-house review of the Library's academic personnel," beginning with actions effective in 1971. The first internal peer review used three confidential committees appointed by the University Librarian from a slate of names recommended by LAUC-D. Each committee considered promotions to a higher rank, and consisted of librarians at the higher rank or above.

From the outset LAUC-D's role in the peer review process has been complicated by the campus recognition of the Academic Staff Organization as the Chancellor's designated advisory group on personnel actions for academic non-Senate personnel. In 1970, when the ASO was in process of formation, committees composed of representatives from each of the major academic non-Senate groups advised the Vice Chancellor on their respective series. In February of that year LAUC-D discussed a proposal that peer review of librarian promotions be conducted under ASO's jurisdiction by committees consisting of representatives from the Academic Senate, ASO and a library or library school; the Chair wrote to the Vice Chancellor with this recommendation. The concept seems to have died. Instead ASO's proposal in March 1970 that it be given jurisdiction for the review procedures for the non-teaching series of which it was composed, with provision for participation by the Academic Senate where desirable, was accepted. A single committee with representatives from all the major non-teaching series was established, with confidential advisory committees for promotions and special actions for each series. The confidential committee for librarians consisted of librarians and faculty.

In 1973 or earlier, LAUC held a special program meeting on ASO's review procedures, with a non-librarian from the ASO committee providing information. Although a LAUC committee was studying the issues at this time, in-house procedures still provided for internal review only of actions for promotion. ASO, by contrast, saw all recommendations, and was advised by a confidential committee of three librarians and three faculty members. Concern was recorded that the ASO committee did not see the comments of the University Librarian's advisory committees.

"Evaluation for Merit Increase and Promotion: Criteria, Guidelines, and Procedures," the report of an ad hoc committee referred to as "Prom Crit," was presented to division members in July 1973, and adopted in October after extensive discussion. Responding to a charge to compare and integrate existing divisional reports, the revised APM and current local procedures, the report recommended creation of an Academic Personnel Action Review Board, elected by LAUC-D, to review all librarian personnel actions. Documentation to be included in the review packet included the job description, the supervisor's evaluation, a self-evaluation and a form reporting professional activity. The supervisor's evaluation rated ten factors, from demonstrated job knowledge to dependability and attitude. Both narrative and rating terms were required for each. The report is both procedural and philosophical, especially in its discussion of "other professional activity." It declaims, *"The requirement of professional activity other than one's desk job is now a fact."* (Emphasis in the original.) The report also discusses professional development time and administrative stipends, issues on which LAUC-D had introduced a resolution to the systemwide Assembly in April 1973.

With administrative approval, Prom Crit's recommendations were used for performance review in 1973. A second ad hoc committee, called Evaluation Evaluation, worked in 1974 to

develop a number of refinements. The evaluation form was revised to provide fewer categories but more ratings, and the self-evaluation, which was very controversial, was made optional. Provision was added for librarians to take exception to language in the review without triggering a full non-concurrence procedure.

The Review Board's first annual report in 1974 established a pattern which continues largely unchanged: a statistical summary of actions considered, procedural recommendations, comments on particular problems such as documentation. The procedural recommendations have been in large measure responsible for the modifications of the review process through the years.

There were repeated attempts, noted as early as October 1974, to reduce the duplication of effort between the two campus review processes, and to give ASO the benefits of the Review Board's comments. In particular, early Boards complained that a narrative "cover letter" was written in the Administrative Office from the supervisor's narrative and used as the primary document seen by the ASO committee. These efforts bore fruit. In 1977 membership minutes noted that ASO had seen the Review Board and ad hoc committee reports for two years. The Board's 1978 report notes that the separate "recommending letter" was no longer required.

In November 1977 the LAUC/ASO Study Committee appointed in 1975 proposed a radically different evaluation form, to reduce redundancy and be more comparable with dossiers of other ASO series. LAUC-D adopted the recommendation to eliminate categories and ratings and to divide the narrative into two sections, one dealing with assigned responsibilities and the other with professional contributions. The form is still in use.

The next round of procedural changes, stimulated by recurrent concern for the time required for peer review, was initiated by the Library administration in late summer 1978. The University Librarian, after responding to a number of LAUC-D recommendations on professional development and criteria for advancement, proposed some "Supplementary Recommendations" on limiting the length of evaluations, making written evaluations in non-action years optional, and defining the Review Board's quorum as three, to eliminate the participation of two alternate members. LAUC-D considered the suggestions in January, accepted all three, and extrapolated on the spirit of the proposal by adopting a motion that the Review Board cease to see recommendations for uncontested one-step increases. This radical change was discussed again and confirmed by another vote two months later. The Review Board was also directed to discontinue assigning priorities to actions.

Responding to these and a number of other concurrent developments, LAUC-D charged an ad hoc committee in late 1980 to consider whether changes to current process and criteria were desirable. Specifically identified in the committee's charge was the time required by the process, as well as a number of specific issues raised by the ASO committee. Reporting in March 1982, the ad hoc committee recommended that LAUC-D abolish the Review Board and attempt to nominate librarians to serve on the ASO Personnel Committee. The Review Board was given an opportunity to respond to the report, and several tension-filled meetings and a mail ballot ensued. The outcome was retention of the Review Board for exceptional actions only, with the option to see representative others without comment, abolition of internal ad hoc committees, and Review Board review of appointments at the Assistant Librarian level only. Also developed by the ad hoc committee, and approved, was the first divisional policy on deferral, which permitted deferrals for up to three years as a neutral action when there was insufficient documentation for advancement.

Review Boards in subsequent years were generally unhappy with the constriction of their activity, finding that it hampered their comparative and monitoring role. A gradual restoration occurred through the next half-dozen years, beginning with seeing some one-step actions for purposes of comparison, then seeing all, then having the option to comment. Concern with clarifying details and correcting procedural irregularities became important to the Board in mid-decade. In 1984 the Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs wrote to convey Personnel Committee concern that the Review Board was using undocumented information in its comments; the next year's Review Board report noted that the practice had ceased.

LAUC's enhanced role under the Compact and the revision of the APM in 1986 again provoked consideration of the respective roles of LAUC and ASO in the review process. Correspondence from Chair Hans Rocke to the Vice Chancellor and LAUC President Bellanti in 1985 supported ASO's role and requests an explicit "Davis exception" in the revised sections of the Manual. Reflecting a different view and a "distrust" of the ASO Personnel Committee, the Review Board issued a special report in July 1986, which recommended that all LAUC members at Davis be governed by the same criteria and procedures, using the Review Board, in contrast to the existing situation where LAUC-D advised only on General Library librarians. A minority report deplored the expression of distrust and recommended retaining ASO's role, perhaps through merging the committees.

An ad hoc Committee to Explore Peer Review was appointed to investigate options for consolidated ASO/LAUC-D review. The committee's report, considered by the membership in June 1988, identified three options. A straw poll of division members was inconclusive; the concept that LAUC should be solely responsible for peer review gained a narrow plurality. A subsequent committee to develop this option produced a compromise document from a divided committee. After another inconclusive mail ballot, the division united in passing a motion to take no further action on the issue. The "two-tier" review system continues.

Meanwhile, joint divisional-administrative committees had worked effectively to update the General Library's procedures documents after the advent of collective bargaining, and again in 1988. A LAUC-D Peer Review Documents committee was created in the latter year to handle updating the documents on a regular basis. A major change in procedure occurred at the insistence of the Vice Chancellor's Office in 1988: to conform to practice for other academic series on campus, the University Librarian's statement and Review Board's report were made confidential documents. LAUC's attempts to change this decision by citing past practice or prevailing practice on other campuses were unavailing through mid-1992.

Beginning in the 1970s the division, responding to LAUC position papers and other specific circumstances, had approved a number of appendices containing interpretations of criteria for major actions. In 1990 the Peer Review Documents committee, responding to concerns expressed over several years that the Library's increasingly lengthy and complex policy statement "embellished" and set more rigorous criteria than the APM, wrote an extensive review and restructure which reestablished the language of the APM as the basic document for librarians' review. The detailed and painstakingly documented procedures were strongly endorsed by the membership.

## PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Professional development, with its corollary rights and responsibilities, has been a recurrent concern at UC-Davis, often in conjunction with discussion of criteria for performance review or revision of policy statements on support for travel, course attendance or research. In 1968, in response to the charge to review the proposed salary structure contained in the Personnel Subcommittee's Working Paper #2, the Liaison Committee expressed general support for the paper, a desire for recognition of work in professional associations, and a preference for some systemwide uniformity in evaluation procedures. Of greatest concern were the proposals to recognize advanced study or contributions to the literature without providing for reduced schedules to meet such demands. Both the committee and the University Librarian in his reply in April 1968 doubted that these criteria would apply to all librarians. A policy statement outlining procedures for applying for released time for "research related to librarianship and bibliography" was in effect in July 1971. It provided for an ad hoc LAUC-D committee to "advise [the University Librarian] in doubtful cases."

Activities frequently characterized as professional development emerged as central issues again in 1971, when the Liaison Committee's major charge was to advise on criteria for merit increase and promotion. The committee, chaired by Noel Peattie, "obtained permission" from the UL to interview six librarians on their opinions and experience with promotion, merit salary increase and evaluation. The greatest emphasis within the committee and in subsequent membership discussion was on issues of research and publication: from whom they were expected, what this requirement meant for librarians, and how time was to be allotted. A major recommendation of the "Peattie Report," issued in Autumn 1971, was that the General Library adopt the policy of professional development for all librarians and encourage their participation. The 1973 Prom Crit report reinforced the importance of professional development activity, recommending that it be a written goal for every librarian.

In the mid-1970s a series of committee studies documented concern for support to meet mandated professional activity, and attempts to reapportion constrained financial resources. Time and fee support for attendance at University courses had been a brief charge to the Liaison Committee in 1976. The committee reported a survey showing that the Davis policy, which limited support to courses which were useful to the present assignment and would result in improved library service, was more restrictive than those of other campuses. After a meeting with the University Librarian for an exchange of views, the committee recommended that reasons be given for a denial and that LAUC consider whether a committee might have a role in the process. No changes in practice occurred, and a committee was not appointed.

Three committees dealt with travel funding between 1976 and 1979. Funds were allocated administratively at Davis, with consultation on the language of the policy dealing with criteria and procedures for application. The 1976 Liaison Committee reviewed the policy and made preliminary recommendations that reimbursement be prorated and that a LAUC-D committee be established to review requests; it recommended the issue be given more detailed consideration. The two ad hoc committees to which the preliminary recommendations were referred studied policies at other campuses and at Davis, and the records of approved and denied travel for the two most recent years. Refinements of current policy statements and forms, rather than radical restructure, were recommended and accepted. A 1979 administrative policy of limiting

reimbursement to 70%, with a maximum for major conferences, was endorsed as promoting equitable allocation among requesting librarians. The committee also recommended that support be allocated based on the level of participation. It did not recommend routine LAUC-D review of travel requests, but noted that the Liaison Committee had appeals as one of its responsibilities and could hear any complaint on a denial of travel support. It is notable that throughout this period, the same reimbursement criteria applied to professional travel by members of the Library administration.

"The individual librarian's role in professional development and the Library's role in assisting its librarians" constituted the Liaison Committee's charge in 1977. The committee worked from an interim policy statement issued by the Library Administration in February of that year, which dealt with concerns about the use of time by distinguishing between professional development and professional service. The former, for which librarians were authorized to request up to 10% of their working hours, included courses and workshops, research and writing, and professional reading. Professional service, which had no time guideline, included all committee service, conference attendance and community service using professional skills. The report, along with the divisional discussion that followed, concentrated on accounting rather than philosophy, and especially on reconciling responsibilities as shown on the job description and reporting time; it was approved. Over the years the concept of "pd time," without the accounting and paperwork, became ingrained in divisional practice; but the distinction between "development" and "service," always obscure, was ignored.

Differing views about the importance of professional development activity for librarians had been a subsurface current in the discussions throughout the development and refinement of the policies and procedures. These conflicting opinions surfaced in full philosophical intensity in the discussions of the Hinckley letter in 1980. Divisional consideration began with a meeting at which 24 members, an unusually high number, spoke. An invitation for written comment produced 13 memoranda signed by 19 librarians. Opinions ranged from opposing mandatory professional activity to vigorously reaffirming current APM criteria. Lacking any consensus and recognizing the risk of further polarizing views, the division voted to appoint two committees to articulate the opposing positions for a vote to report to systemwide LAUC.

Thus began the brief phenomenon known as the "war of the roses." Two rounds of reports, as well as a statement of the current standards at Davis, were prepared and debated. Citing concern about the degree of emphasis on professional activity, one report urged that it be de-emphasized and the APM modified to clarify its optional status. At the other extreme was a ringing endorsement of the benefits for library service and the individual of professional activity, which was seen as integral to academic status.

The statements prepared were among the documents referred to the ad hoc Committee to Review Librarian Evaluation Procedures, which was charged in December 1980 to "determine whether or not amendment or alteration of existing procedures and criteria are warranted or desirable and to recommend the means of implementing such amendments or alterations...." The committee's first report in 1982 urged "reasonable flexibility," but reaffirmed the concept of growth and achievement in advancing through the series. General consideration of professional development disappeared from divisional records through the ensuing years.

Allocating travel monies remained an administrative function at Davis until the compact prescribed LAUC involvement, although LAUC committees had initiated revisions in the policy

for several years. Charged with recommending procedures for LAUC-D participation, the Liaison Committee in 1984/85 proposed creation of a standing Professional Activities Committee to review librarians' requests for funding. Each member would be entitled to a base allocation for activities which met established criteria. Unexpended funds would be allocated on the basis of actual expenditures and funding priorities at the end of the year. This process, approved by the Division and the Administration, continues to be used. The committee has several times asked Library Administration for supplementary funding to permit reimbursing unrepresented librarians at the same percentage as represented colleagues; such funding has been granted.

## RESEARCH

LAUC-D began participating in the original centrally-funded research program with strong interest and several successful grant proposals. When funding was decentralized, the division promptly petitioned the Vice Chancellor to continue providing monies. The campus has allocated \$5,000 annually since 1982, with provision for rolling over the funds when there were insufficient meritorious applications. An initial proposal to screen applications through the ASO Research Committee was not pursued. Following systemwide guidelines, a divisional Research Committee calls for and reviews proposals, forwarding likely candidates for systemwide consideration. In about 1986 the committee recommended the use of mini-grants: preliminary funding to investigate the feasibility of a full-scale project, with minimal application requirements. Now limited to a maximum of \$200, the mini-grants have proved popular with the members.

Research funding at Davis has been kept completely separate from travel funds. The possibility of combining research and professional activity funding was discussed by the two committees responsible for allocating funds in early 1988; the Research Committee strongly opposed the move, fearing that travel requests would overwhelm research proposals. Their recommendation was sustained, and research funding continues as a separate allocation.

## A CONCLUDING PERSPECTIVE

History doesn't just stop; and 25 years, while a significant anniversary in the life of an organization, does not necessarily constitute a period with a sense of closure or completeness. But chapters must end; and to provide a concluding perspective, members of LAUC-D were invited to meet to consider the past and future of LAUC and the Davis division. Two meetings resulted, one primarily of librarians who had been at Davis less than ten years, the other of "founding members."

The two groups agreed that LAUC's fundamental achievement has been the recognition of librarians as members of the academic enterprise in the University of California, with responsibility for advice on library operations, participation in peer review, and perquisites of time for professional activity and travel funds. Participation through LAUC in Library Council and its committees, and in Senate committees on campuses other than Davis, have been additional avenues for advice on the role and function of the libraries in the University.

LAUC-D members further agreed on LAUC's immensely beneficial role in building among the University's librarians a sense of unity and ability to work together. The network established,

beginning in the early 1970s through LAUC committees, was used in developing the task forces of the Salmon Plan later in that decade, and continues to bear fruit in the multi-campus groups working on MELVYL databases and cooperative resource-sharing projects.

These are systemwide rather than divisional emphases, though each represents the culmination of a number of individual projects which required work at both systemwide and divisional levels. Asked whether their choice reflects a belief that LAUC's activity has been more important at the systemwide than at the local level, the Davis librarians agreed that it has. To balance the record, the division's role in revising plans for library services for biological sciences in 1978 was recalled as a local highlight, and as the best example of the continuing importance of an independent advisory role. The value of divisional activity in bringing Davis librarians together to consider issues outside the departmental structure was cited. LAUC-D has often provided a first opportunity for librarians to gain committee experience, a foundation for future service with the Academic Federation, systemwide LAUC or other professional organizations. One member with a long perspective recalled that Davis had taken practical and pragmatic stands on many systemwide issues, positions which frequently became part of the final consensus.

Looking forward, LAUC-D members had no definite agenda for further advancement. The recent systemwide report on resource sharing was cited as a positive step in an area which requires still greater attention and progress in difficult times. Seeking greater involvement in the educational mission of the University was identified as a possible useful effort, since a recent faculty publication on undergraduate education lacked any reference to libraries or information literacy. That LAUC should continue to identify, study and advise the University on issues pertinent to library service was an implicit assumption of all the Davis librarians who discussed the issue. Its role is a fundamental part of what it means to be a librarian at the University of California.

#### REPORTS OF AD HOC COMMITTEES

Ad hoc Committee on Promotion Criteria (Katherine Garosi, Chair). *Evaluation for Merit Increase and Promotion: Criteria, Guidelines, and Procedures*. 1973.

Ad hoc Committee on Selection of University Librarian. *Report*. 1974.

Evaluation Evaluation Committee (Roberta Stevenson, Chair). *Report*. 1974.

Ad hoc Committee to Comment on the Provisions of Proposed Section 83 of the APM: Associate University Librarian and Assistant University Librarian (Eleanor Payne, Chair). *Report*. 1975.

Ad hoc Committee Called to Comment on CLASS (Sharon Baker, Chair). *Report*. 1975.

Ad hoc Committee to Draft the LAUC-D Response to the Report of the Personnel Committee on the Investigation of the Library Assistant Series (Linda Hoffmann, Chair). *Report*. 1977.

Ad hoc Committee to Propose a Structure for the Review of Librarians Requests for Library Support for Travel, Courses and Personal Research (Dora Biblarz, Chair). *Report*. 1977-1978.

Ad hoc Committee on Travel, Research and Instruction for Professor Services (TRIPS) (Patricia Inouye, Chair). *Report*. 1978.

Ad hoc Committee on Biological and Agricultural Sciences Proposal (Linda Hoffmann, Chair). *Report*. 1978.

Ad hoc Committee to Prepare a Statement on Guidelines for Accelerated Merit Increases (Sharon Baker, Chair). *Report*.

Ad hoc Committee to Review the LAUC-LA Proposals Relating to Peer Review of Appointments, Retreat Rights for Assistant/ Associate University Librarians and Interseries Movement (William McCoy, Chair). *Report*. 1979.

Ad hoc Committee to Review the Library Council Personnel Committee Report on the Restructure of the Library Assistant Series (Sharon Baker, Chair). *Report*. 1980.

Ad hoc Committee for Discussion of the Criteria for Evaluation of Librarians (Committee I: Noel Peattie, Convener; Committee II: Jon Haughton, Chair). *Report*. 1980.

Ad hoc Committee to Investigate Demotions and Terminations (David Anderson, Chair). *Report*. 1980.

Deferred Review Committee (Edward Jests, Chair). *Report*. 1980.

Ad hoc Committee on Library Service to the Graduate School of Administration. (Katherine Mawdsley, Chair) *Report*. 1980.

Ad hoc Committee to Review Librarian Evaluation Procedures (Sharon Baker, Chair 1980-1982; Rosemond McFerran, Chair 1982-1983) *Report*. 1980-1983.

Ad hoc Committee on Temporary Appointments in the Librarian Series (Patricia Inouye, Chair). *Report*. 1980-1981.

Ad hoc Committee to Review the Library Council Personnel Committee "Restructure of the Library Assistant Series: Second Report" (Sharon Baker, Chair). *Report*. 1981.

Ad hoc Committee to Investigate the Role of APARB in the Appointment Process (Terri Malmgren, Chair). *Report*. 1981-1982.

Ad hoc Committee on University Librarian Qualifications (Noel Peattie, Chair). *Report*. 1984-1985.

- Ad hoc Advisory Committee for the AUL Position (Tehinder Sibia, Chair). *Report*. 1985.
- Ad hoc Committee to Explore Peer Review (Judy Janes, Chair). *Report*. 1986-1987.
- Ad hoc Committee to Update Library Policy Statement C-9 (Patricia Inouye, Chair). *Report*. 1988.
- Ad hoc Committee on U.C. Davis Mission Statement. *Report*. 1989
- Ad hoc Committee to Explore the LAUC Only Peer Review Option (David Lundquist, Chair). *Report*. 1989.
- Ad hoc Committee on Library Self Study--Librarianship Futures (Thomas McFadden, Chair). *Report*. 1990.
- Ad hoc Committee on Administrative Evaluations (Johanna Ross, Chair). *Report*. 1991. (Final report issued by Professional Activities Committee, 1992.)

## OFFICERS & COMMITTEES

1968

Chair:	Vernon Lust
Vice-Chair:	David Lundquist
Secretary:	Sylvia Gonzalez
Liaison Committee Chair:	Loren Owings
Delegates:	Bert Pratt, Lucille Jans

1969

Chair:	Vernon Lust; Tom Birrell
Vice-Chair:	Nancy Clark
Secretary:	Katie Blizzard
Liaison Committee Chair:	Bert Pratt
Program Committee Chair:	Mary Farrens
Delegates:	Al Lewis, Ted Gould

## 1970

Chair:	Tom Birrell
Vice-Chair:	Ted Gould
Secretary:	Margaret McKinley
Liaison Committee Chair:	Jane Kimball
Program Committee Chair:	Katie Blizzard
Delegates:	Vernon Lust, Eleanor Payne

## 1971

Chair:	Ted Gould
Vice-Chair:	Eleanor Payne
Secretary:	Bert Pratt
Liaison Committee Chair:	Noel Peattie
Program Committee Chair:	Betty Robinson
Delegates:	Jane Kimball, Vernon Lust

## 1972

Chair:	Eleanor Payne
Vice-Chair:	Jane Kimball
Secretary:	Rosemond McFerran
Liaison Committee Chair:	Winifred Kistler
Program Committee Chair:	Jane Johnson
Delegates:	Sun-Ji Cannon, Elizabeth Ingalls

## 1973

Chair:	Jane Kimball
Vice-Chair:	Rosemond McFerran
Secretary:	Johanna Ross
Liaison Committee Chair:	Roberta Stevenson
Program Committee Chair:	Dora Biblarz
Review Board Chair:	Ted Gould
Delegates:	Katherine Garosi (Mawdsley), Bert Pratt

## 1974

Chair:	Rosemond McFerran
Vice-Chair:	Prudence Clark
Secretary:	David Anderson
Liaison Committee Chair:	Sharon Baker
Program Committee Chair:	Mary Helen Moreno

Review Board Chair:  
Delegates:

Roberta Stevenson  
Dora Biblarz, Prudence Clark

1975

Chair:  
Vice-Chair:  
Secretary:  
Liaison Committee Chair:  
Program Committee Chair:  
Review Board Chair:  
Delegates:

Sharon Baker  
Katherine Garosi  
Linda Hoffmann  
Connie Wilson  
Jon Haughton  
Vernon Lust  
Dora Biblarz, Katherine Garosi

1976

Chair:  
Vice-Chair:  
Secretary:  
Liaison Committee Chair:  
Program Committee Chair:  
Review Board Chair:  
Delegates:

Katherine Garosi  
Johanna Ross  
Connie Wilson  
Margaret Capron  
Kate Cifra  
Sterling Leisz  
Hans Rocke, Johanna Ross

1977

Chair:  
Vice-Chair:  
Secretary:  
Liaison Committee Chair:  
Program Committee Chair:  
Review Board Chair:  
Delegates:

Johanna Ross  
Dora Biblarz  
Sharon Baker  
Patricia Inouye  
Kathleen Cifra  
Rosemond McFerran  
Vernon Lust, Dora Biblarz

1977/78

Chair:  
Vice-Chair:  
Secretary:  
Liaison Committee Chair:  
Program Committee Chair:  
Review Board Chair:  
Delegate:

Dora Biblarz  
Linda Hoffmann  
Diana Gray  
Winifred Kistler  
Reve Rocke  
Rosemond McFerran  
Linda Grix

## 1978/79

Chair:	Linda Hoffmann
Vice-Chair:	Roberta Stevenson
Secretary:	Margaret Capron
Liaison Committee Chair:	Reve Rocke
Program Committee Chair:	Hans Rocke
Review Board Chair:	Kathleen Cifra
Delegates:	Patricia Inouye, Roberta Stevenson

## 1979/80

Chair:	Roberta Stevenson
Vice-Chair:	Vernon Lust
Secretary:	Jon Haughton
Liaison Committee Chair:	Diana Gray
Program Committee Chair:	Marjan Meralá
Review Board Chair:	Marion Whalon
Delegates:	Margaret Capron, Vernon Lust

## 1980/81

Chair:	Vernon Lust
Vice-Chair:	Anthony Operhall
Secretary:	Terri Malmgren
Liaison Committee Chair:	Scott Kennedy
Program Committee Chair:	David Anderson
Review Board Chair:	Reve Rocke
Delegate:	Theodore Gould

## 1981/82

Chair:	Anthony Operhall
Vice-Chair:	Greg Preston
Secretary:	Linda Bickham
Liaison Committee Chair:	Ken Firestein
Program Committee Chair:	Dan Elliott
Review Board Chair:	Diana Gray
Delegate:	Linda Hoffmann

## 1982/83

Chair:	Greg Preston
Vice-Chair:	Patricia Inouye
Secretary:	Sandra Vella
Liaison Committee Chair:	Vincent Caccese
Program Committee Chair:	Winifred Kistler
Review Board Chair:	Judith Moomaw
Delegate:	Peter Vigil

## 1983/84

Chair:	Patricia Inouye
Vice-Chair:	Em Claire Knowles
Secretary:	David Anderson
Liaison Committee Chair:	Virginia Short
Program Committee Chair:	Winifred Kistler
Review Board Chair:	Vernon Lust
Research Committee Chair:	Irene Hoffmann
Delegate:	Vincent Caccese

## 1984/85

Chair:	Em Claire Knowles
Vice-Chair:	Hans Rocke
Secretary:	Gennie Bostock
Liaison Committee Chair:	Susan Casement
Program Committee Chair:	Robert Bell
Review Board Chair:	Greg Preston
Research Committee Chair:	Hans Rocke
Delegate:	Mary Eldredge

## 1985/86

Chair:	Hans Rocke
Vice-Chair:	Terri Malmgren
Secretary:	Karleen Darr
Liaison Committee Chair:	Marlene Tebo
Program Committee Chair:	Opritsa Popa
Review Board Chair:	Johanna Ross
Research Committee Chair:	Ken Firestein
Professional Activities Committee Chair:	Katherine Chambers
Delegate:	Gennie Bostock
Past Chair:	Em Claire Knowles

## 1986/87

Chair:	Terri Malmgren
Vice-Chair:	Judy Janes
Secretary:	Katherine Chambers
Liaison Committee Chair:	Jo Anne Boorkman
Program Committee Chair:	Virginia Short
Review Board Chair:	Vincent Caccese
Research Committee Chair:	Debbie Metzger
Professional Activities Committee Chair:	Buzz Haughton
Delegate:	Ken Firestein

## 1987/88

Chair:	Judy Janes
Vice-Chair:	Vernon Lust
Secretary:	Buzz Haughton
Liaison Committee Chair:	Linda Hoffmann
Program Committee Chair:	Dan Elliott
Review Board Chair:	Patricia Inouye
Research Committee Chair:	Juri Stratford
Professional Activities Committee Chair:	Karen Blank
Delegate:	Glee Willis
Past Chair:	Terri Malmgren

## 1988/89

Chair:	Vernon Lust
Vice-Chair:	Mary Eldredge
Secretary:	Margaret Capron
Liaison Committee Chair:	Katherine Chambers
Program Committee Chair:	Jean Stratford
Review Board Chair:	Hans Rocke
Research Committee Chair:	Sandra Lamprecht
Professional Activities Committee Chair:	Michael Winter
Peer-Review-Documents Review Committee Chair:	Sharon Baker
Delegate:	Kathy Lin
Past Chair:	Judy Janes

## 1989/90

Chair:	Mary Eldredge
Vice-Chair:	Linda Kennedy
Secretary:	John Ward

Program Committee Chair:  
Review Board Chair:  
Research Committee Chair:  
Professional Activities Committee Chair:  
Peer-Review-Documents Review Committee Chair:  
Professional Issues Committee Chair:  
Delegate:  
Past Chair:

David Anderson  
Opritsa Popa  
Virginia Short  
Michael Winter  
Sharon Baker  
Buzz Haughton  
Margaret Capron  
Mary Eldredge

1990/91

Chair:  
Vice-Chair:  
Secretary:  
Program Committee Chair:  
Review Board Chair:  
Research Committee Chair:  
Professional Activities Committee Chair:  
Professional Issues Committee Chair:  
Delegate:  
Past Chair:

Linda Kennedy  
David Anderson  
Marguerite Horn  
David Anderson  
Vernon Lust  
Sandra Vella  
Sandra Lamprecht  
Carolyn Kopper  
Axel Borg  
Mary Eldredge

1991/92

Chair:  
Vice-Chair:  
Secretary:  
Program Committee Chair:  
Review Board Chair:  
Research Committee Chair:  
Professional Activities Committee Chair:  
Professional Issues Committee Chair:  
Delegate:  
Past Chair:

Susan Casement  
Thomas McFadden  
Elaine Franco  
Rebecca Davis  
Katherine Chambers  
Michael Winter  
Marcia Meister  
Ted Hostetler  
Sandra Vella  
Linda Kennedy