



Irvine

by Sylvester E. Klinicke and Judy Horn

The Library of the University of California, Irvine opened its doors in October 1965, just two years before the establishment of LAUC. Work in building the library began in 1963; on opening day it housed 100,000 volumes in its stacks. Built on 1,510 acres of rolling grasslands, of which 1,000 had been donated by the Irvine Company, the campus was located in the center of fast-growing Orange County, which then had a population of 1.1 million people. It opened with 1,589 students. Today, Orange County is home to over 2.4 million people and the student population of UCI has increased to about 16,000. The campus, as well as the surrounding area, has changed tremendously over the years. Once a center of farming and cattle grazing, it is now surrounded by homes and high-technology businesses. Since its inception, its goal has been to rank among the nation's top Universities.

The growth of the library has been commensurate with that of the campus. In 1981 it became a member of the Association of Research Libraries and celebrated the acquisition of its one-millionth volume. In its first 25 years it had only two University Librarians and two persons acting in that capacity. John Smith, the founding UL, served until his retirement in 1978. Calvin Boyer arrived in April 1980 and stepped down in October 1991. Beverly Toy, Associate University Librarian, served as Acting UL from January 1979 until the end of March 1980. John King, a faculty member, was Acting UL from October 1991 until the arrival of Joanne Euster, UCI's third University Librarian, in July 1992. Both Smith and Boyer supported LAUC-Irvine, especially for professional development. Smith encouraged systemwide recognition of LAUC from the beginning, and throughout the 1970s LAUC-I committees played significant administrative roles within the library.

In 1967 there was more interest among the librarians at Irvine in forming a local organization than a systemwide one. Early in the year librarians met and formed a division called the

Librarians of the University of California, Irvine, or the Librarians Association of the University of California, Irvine—more commonly and affectionately known as LUCI. The name continued to be used until May 1976, when the membership with regret and sadness dropped LUCI in favor of the more conventional LAUC-I, to conform to the other LAUC divisional names. To avoid confusion, LAUC-I is used throughout this history.

Governing articles were adopted July 11, 1967. When the invitation came to send representatives to the LAUC organizing meeting in San Francisco in June of that year, LUCI voted to send two delegates, Marjorie Reeves and Jane Kimball, but to withhold endorsement until further information was received as a result of the meeting. LAUC-I requested from Chancellor Daniel Aldrich formal recognition and permission to use the words "University of California, Irvine" in its name; the requests were granted in September 1968.

Apart from the structure of LAUC and LAUC-I, early topics of discussion were the Spiess and Hoos reports; Library Council's Working Paper #1, on restructuring librarians' salaries and classifications; and Working Paper #2, proposing changes in the job descriptions of librarians and library assistants. Members also suggested various hierarchical and collegial organization schemes, sabbaticals and possible faculty status for librarians.

The University Librarian attended a meeting of the Academic Senate's Privilege and Tenure, Academic Freedom Committee and spoke on behalf of the librarians' desire for a voice in campus affairs. Early in 1969, LAUC-I began a dialogue with the Academic Senate on faculty status and representation on the Senate. LAUC-I voted against forming a non-senate academic organization on the Davis model, affirming instead its goal of full faculty status for librarians. In April of the same year, the Academic Senate approved a proposal for librarians to serve on seven of its standing committees. The division also recommended that librarians join campus administrative committees; at the end of 1969 members were serving on ten such committees, in addition to the seven reporting to the Academic Senate.

ORGANIZATION AND BYLAWS

The organization of LAUC-I has constantly evolved, and its Bylaws have undergone four or five major revisions, in addition to numerous smaller changes. The first important change to the original governing articles took place in 1971 when the Association voted to establish five standing committees: Promotion and Review, Policies and Procedures, Staff Development, Budget and Planning, and Collection Development. The Budget and Planning Committee was to play an especially strong administrative role during the 1970s.

It was not until 1974 that the Bylaws were changed, in compliance with a similar change in the systemwide Bylaws, to provide membership in LAUC-I for the University Librarian and the Assistant and Associate ULs.

The 1975 Bylaws reveal six standing committees: on Mediation of Professional Differences, Publications, Physical Planning, Continuing Education, Budget and Planning, and Research and Development. The name of the Research and Development Committee was changed several times between 1977 and 1981.

In 1978, during a discussion of various proposed Bylaws changes, the most controversial question was whether non-committee members could attend committee meetings except by

invitation. About this time it was noted that the LAUC-I Bylaws did not match the systemwide Bylaws in several provisions, and steps were taken to remove the inconsistencies.

A major restructuring and change took place in 1981, with the arrival of Calvin Boyer. After being the primary developer of the library's budget as well as prioritizing new positions and projects, LAUC-I modified its role in the 1980s from administrative to advisory. The advisory role, and the division's place in the management structure of the library, were fully recognized in 1984 with the appointment of the LAUC-I chair to the Council of Department Heads, now the Management Steering Committee.

The 1981 structure, based on recommendations from the Task Force to Study the Role of LAUC-I Standing Committees, is still in effect today. It has four standing committees: on Professional Development, Academic Librarianship, Programs, and Library Planning and Service. Committee members are elected for 3-year staggered terms.

Leadership changes for LAUC-I have been fairly routine, with two exceptions. In 1978, George Raulin died half-way through his term as Chair. Vice Chair Eric MacDonald completed Raulin's term as well as serving his full term in 1978/79; Lynda Adams was appointed Vice Chair for the second half of 1977/78. The other non-routine change was a bit more difficult. Chris Ferguson, Chair-Elect for 1985/86, left UCI in May 1985, and LAUC-I was left without a Chair for the coming year. The Nominations and Elections Committee requested an indication of how LAUC-I should select its incoming Chair. The preferred choice of 21 voting librarians was that the present Chair should continue for an additional year; Ellen Broidy defeated the write-in candidate by a slim margin, and thus held the office in both 1984/85 and 1985/86.

Mention of budgetary matters occur early in LAUC-I documents. Annual dues were first discussed in April 1968, and set at \$2.50 each. The purpose was to help pay the expenses of local representatives to systemwide meetings and for postage. On hearing of this, University Librarian John Smith said that Library Administration would pay for the delegate to the systemwide meetings. The administration continued to support LAUC-I officer travel until the University's Office of the President assumed the responsibility in 1975.

Periodically, the divisional minutes include a call for all members to pay their dues, which were raised to \$5.00 in the early 1980s. They were used to sponsor programs and provide coffee for the meetings. After December 1984, when it was announced that the campus administration would provide \$9,000 for operational expenses for LAUC-I, they were no longer necessary. The funds from the campus administration have been used for photocopying, program expenses, and to pay the salary of a student assistant to take and prepare the LAUC-I minutes and generally provide assistance for the Chair and Secretary. The \$9,000 has been appropriated each year since 1984. In the early years there were unexpended funds, which the Association used for the purchase of laptop computers and software.

The LAUC-I Handbook was completed in 1988 and distributed to each librarian. It covers all aspects of LAUC-I and LAUC, including copies of the Bylaws, peer review documents for the librarian series, the list of divisional officers, major library conferences, salary scales, benefits, and material on the UC system. The purpose was to have an updatable Handbook that would bring together in one place documents used by librarians as well as serving as a manual to introduce new librarians to LAUC-I.

The minutes show that LAUC-I has been very active in sponsoring programs from its inception. The number and type of programs has varied over the years, ranging from Irvine librarians describing a program or event to elaborate seminars with nationally known speakers. As examples: in 1977 Steve Salmon met with LAUC-I to discuss *The University of California Libraries: A Plan for Development*; in the same year Millicent Abell, University Librarian at UCSD, and Eleanor Montague, UL at UCR, met with the members. In 1979/80 Anne Lipow described the BAKER program at UC-Berkeley, and Dean Roger Greer and Martha Hale from USC's School of Library Science talked about community analysis for academic libraries. A workshop on research methods was conducted by Gail Schlacter, AUL at Davis, in 1978; also during that year Jim Perry, a faculty member at the UCI Graduate School of Administration, presented a seminar on collective bargaining for librarians. Programs on various database packages and preservation, and a workshop led by the Dean of the Graduate School of Management on resolving conflicts and management, were held in 1985. In 1990 the Program Committee developed a major event of the 1990 National Library Week by securing four nationally known speakers on censorship and the arts. Speakers during National Library Week has become an annual event.

Annually since the 1980s there has been a peer review meeting each fall, to describe and discuss peer review activities for that year as well as any changes that may have taken place in the procedures. In early years this took the form of a panel of librarians describing different aspects of the review process, such as writing the factual résumé, writing peer letters, criteria for evaluating librarians, etc. It has become more standardized in recent years, sponsorship having moved from LAUC-I to the Library Personnel Office.

The division also sponsors brown-bag meetings at which members describe activities at major library conferences they have attended. The meetings, which are open to support staff, provide an opportunity for librarians to learn about events in the various library organizations and to stay informed on trends in the profession outside their areas of specialization.

When a number of new librarians were being hired in the early 1980s, LAUC-I began an annual social event honoring new librarians. After being quite successful for a number of years, it began in the later part of the decade to taper off. More recently, social events honoring arriving and departing librarians have been held during lunchtime at a nearby restaurant. The first of these was rather spontaneously arranged by Sally Tseng, and as they have grown in size and popularity she has remained pivotal in arranging them.

To help integrate new librarians into LAUC-I and the library, the Association began an orientation program for new librarians in 1987, in which one of the responsibilities of the Vice Chair was to meet with each new librarian and describe LAUC-I and the library organization. The program was expanded in 1989, when the division adopted a one-on-one mentor program for newly hired librarians. All new librarians not only received an overview and short history of LAUC, LAUC-I and the peer review process from the Vice Chair, but would also be assigned an individual mentor who would assist them during the orientation period.

RELATIONS WITH LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION

The relationship of LAUC-I and the library administration has varied over the years from a high level of cordiality to acrimonious hostility. There sometimes appeared to be an ongoing battle between the two bodies over the type and amount of participation appropriate for the Association, with the latter generally urging participative management. Despite this struggle LAUC-I has played a major role in the organization and decision-making processes of the library, especially through some years of the 1970s.

In 1969 several members joined Library Administration at Lake Arrowhead for the UCI Librarians Planning Conference. Following the meeting LAUC-I formed an ad hoc committee, chaired by Marilyn Freeman, to study the proceedings of the Arrowhead conference as well as the recently issued Berkeley Task Force Report, and to make recommendations for UCI. The report of the committee, known as the Freeman Committee Report, was of major significance and was to provide the framework not only for the organization of LAUC-I but for the interactions between it and the Library administration for many years to come.

The Freeman Committee Report was issued in draft form on December 16, 1969. It recommended sweeping changes in the assignments and responsibilities of librarians, the ratio of librarians to support staff, flexible work schedules, advancement through the ranks without administrative assignments, long range planning, communication between librarians and the educational planning apparatus of the University, hiring of a library personnel officer, participatory management, recognizing specializations of librarians, development of orientation and training programs, and the communication of policies and plans of library departments. Finally, it suggested that the Committee continue to exist and work out more specific recommendations in many areas.

Thus began nearly a year of hard work and heated debate, to implement many of the recommendations. Several of them were innovative: that every six months all librarians would change positions and departments; that supervision is not a professional activity; that the person you report to is not necessarily your supervisor but a colleague; that evaluation of librarians should include evidence from students, staff and faculty; that unit heads would be elected annually; and that librarians, as professionals, do not need supervision. (Also that Aries should not be evaluated by Pisces.)

Five discussion groups were formed to evaluate the practicality of implementing these recommendations. Responses ranged from parts being labeled ridiculous to impractical to desirable. A resolution was passed that librarians should have accountability of their own time, except for scheduled hours of public service—a principle that remains today.

The Freeman Report was a response to the Berkeley Task Force Report; but even more, it was testimony of the frustrations expressed at the Arrowhead Conference over the librarians' role in the management of the Library. In June 1970, LAUC-I voted in favor of the final Freeman Report, 29 to 4. Not all of the recommendations were accepted, but those that were signaled a change in the governance of the library and the role of LAUC-I.

In accepting the final report, the membership approved the establishment of the five standing committees mentioned above under the Bylaws revision of 1971. The Budget and Planning Committee was charged with the responsibility of reviewing the departmental budgets, and librarian evaluations when the merit increases exceeded the budget allocations. The Staff

Development Committee was to act as a standing search committee advising the Staff Development Officer (later the AUL for Personnel) on all matters of concern to that office. The Promotion and Review Committee was charged with establishing procedures for librarians' reviews as well as serving as the reviewing body. The roles of the Policies and Procedures and Collection Development Committees were self-explanatory. University Librarian John Smith declared that substantial changes in the governance of the library would be necessary if the recommendations were to be implemented, yet he endorsed the report, saying it was long overdue.

In 1972 the University Librarian proposed his own plan for a reorganization of the library. He established a Select Committee on Library Reorganization headed by Harry M. Rowe, Librarian for the County of Orange. The report of the select committee contained three proposed organization charts and recommended the appointment of a Head of Technical Processing (paralleling the already existing Head of Public Services), review of the Library Systems Analysis Office, abolition of the position of branch coordinator, orientation for all library employees on a continuing basis, physical rearrangement of the main work areas, management training, administrative stipends, and equal enforcement of rules on the granting of time away from work. Other than resulting in the appointment of a Head of Technical Processing, however, the proposals did not have much direct impact.

The involvement of LAUC-I in recommending on the allocation of the Library's budget was growing. Its Budget and Planning Committee was very active in reviewing budget requests, preparing the budget, considering priorities on a library-wide basis and reporting its findings to the University Librarian. All budget requests from the library departments were reviewed by the committee. It was especially active in 1978/79, reviewing additional requests for general assistance and supplies after the allocations had been reviewed and discussed. The committee's influence was at its peak during this period, since it was basically handling the budget for the Library. The Staff Development Committee was also serving as a search committee for all librarian positions, reviewing librarian travel requests, and preparing a questionnaire on professional memberships of LAUC-I members.

In 1972 problems developed on two fronts: responsibility for providing documentation for peer review and the University Librarian's proposal to promote the Staff Development Officer to an AUL position. Of particular concern to librarians who were advancing under a new peer review process was the question of appropriate review of qualifications before advancement to another level.

The key to both problems was lack of consultation with LAUC-I. The challenge over the appointment of an AUL, Personnel was both the high and the low point of the division's goal of participatory management. It was also the turning point in relations between the UL and LAUC-I; interactions from that point on were tinged with suspicion, especially on the part of many LAUC-I members.

Because the Staff Development Officer, Michael MacInnes, was systemwide LAUC President at the time, questions arose about a conflict of interest. Heated discussions and memos were exchanged between Library Administration and LAUC-I for some time, resulting in the circulation of two petitions. One rejected the UL's decision to move the Staff Development Officer into the Assistant University Librarian Series without doing the same for the Head of Public Services. In the midst of the controversy, MacInnes resigned his position as President of

LAUC. Finally, out of frustration, the University Librarian announced that the entire matter was under reconsideration, and solicited reasons for the opinions expressed in the petitions. Arrangements were made for all of the staff to meet with him in small groups. After almost all of them had aired their concerns in this manner, the UL withdrew his recommendation to promote the Staff Development Officer to the AUL position. The conclusion of the affair found LAUC-I members split into two camps, and attitudes developed during the controversy were to linger and affect other issues for some time to come.

This element of distrust was seen again in 1976 when the LAUC-I chair wrote to UL Smith to express the Association's concern that information concerning its role and accomplishment, as reflected in the minutes of an Administrative Committee meeting, was inaccurate. The University Librarian wrote back that "the goals of LUCI [LAUC-I] and administration are not at odds with one another, and it appears that I must repeat this again and again and still expect skepticism from some."

Smith attended an Executive Board meeting as a guest to help mend the rift. He admitted the relationship had been less than perfect, but he would try harder to see if some areas could be improved. A lengthy discussion ensued over the question whether librarians wishing to serve on LAUC-I and LAUC committees needed department head approval. The administration said they did; librarians felt that this took away from the independent status of the associations. The UL asserted that his administration was a strong believer in, and practitioner of, participative management.

Just before this, members had called for a review of the organization and administrative structure of the UCI Library. They proposed an ad hoc committee composed of three librarians and a staff member. The division voted on whether it wished to pursue the concept, and to whom the committee should report: LAUC-I, the University Librarian or the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The decision was overwhelmingly to endorse the proposal and to have the committee report to the University Librarian, thus making it an administrative committee.

Meanwhile James McGaugh, the new Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, had received a copy of the proposal. He ordered that the study be done immediately and arranged for part-time assistance for the committee. The latter would report to the Vice Chancellor, who would appoint the chair and the committee members and issue the charge. Fifteen librarians were willing to serve on the committee, but only four were required: three to be selected by the Executive Board, the fourth by the University Librarian from his Administrative Committee. The three names recommended by the Board came from a vote of the LAUC-I membership.

After the Library Study Committee, as it became known, had issued its report, the Vice Chancellor attended a divisional meeting, where he explained that his office did not consider the document final, but that more study and discussion were needed to bring the issue to closure. LAUC-I formed five task forces to review its various parts; three meetings were held to discuss the summaries of issues they had prepared.

The report itself, to say the least, was revolutionary in scope. It called for the establishment of three councils and coordinators; definition of the roles of various advisory bodies and mechanisms for input into the decision-making process; establishment of a communication apparatus; and definition of who makes and who implements policy, including goal setting and budget responsibilities. A section on staff development called for job flexibility, job rotation,

continuing education, involvement in innovative areas of librarianship, and overall professional growth.

Discussion of the report of the Library Study Committee was to occupy a great deal of LAUC-I's time throughout 1977. The various task forces developed and issued statements of concerns of librarians and staff. Reaching consensus on the various proposals for a new library organization chart was extremely difficult. LAUC-I had approved a system that placed the LAUC-I Committee on Budget and Planning in an administrative position. The chart that was finally approved by Carl Hartman, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, established a Council of Department Heads (CDH) with general policy-making authority, and an AUL position that would serve as coordinator for the operating units and remove some of the detail work load from the shoulders of the University Librarian.

The campus moved quickly to fill the AUL position. LAUC-I participated in the drafting of the position announcement. The procedures approved by the campus for implementing Section 83 of the Academic Personnel Manual included a segment on the composition of AUL search committees. The Committee was appointed by the University Librarian. The Council of Department Heads nominated two members, and one LAUC-I member (not on CDH) was selected from a slate of three names submitted by LAUC-I. A representative of the support staff and one from the faculty filled out the committee. The division was invited to meet each of the three candidates interviewed, and members submitted comments to the search committee. This set the pattern of LAUC-I involvement in all subsequent AUL search committees.

LAUC-I raised the need for a bibliographic instruction program and a bibliographic instruction coordinator position, and the first recommendation to campus administration for a library instruction class—"Bibliostrategy," later to become Humanities 75—came from the Association. In 1976 and 1977, there were discussions at several membership meetings on how the class should be taught, who should be responsible for teaching students, and what department in the library should administer the program. The Ad Hoc Committee on Library Instruction proposed to place a half-time coordinator under the jurisdiction of the Associate University Librarian. Members of the Reference Department felt the position should be part of that department. After heated debate, a compromise was reached in which a half-time coordinator position was created and based in the Reference Department.

In 1977 LAUC-I formed an Ad Hoc Committee to Develop Recommendations for Filling Academic Vacancies in the Library. Its report enumerated three key issues; redeployment of academic positions within the library, job or position rotation, and vacancies that occurred as a result of resignations or reduction in the working time of an academic employee. Job rotation was viewed as temporary redeployment which might or might not become a permanent reassignment. The committee recommended that a standing committee—preferably the newly formed Research and Education Committee—be given the charge of oversight of librarian positions in these three key areas.

This was implemented, and for the next three years the Research and Education Committee—and its successor, the Research, Education, and Personnel Advisory Committee, known variously as REPAB, REAPAB, or REAPAAB (the B was never explained), following minor changes in the committee's name—reviewed requests from librarians for transfers or reassignments to other positions, and made recommendations to the University Librarian. In the

year 1978/79, the committee reviewed and made recommendations on six such requests. It was also charged to review library policies and plans, requests for time off for classes, scholarly pursuits and research proposals, and to plan and sponsor workshops.

REAPAB received a proposal in 1978 from the librarians in Government Publications, to fill the vacant department head position on a rotating basis from the librarians in the department, rather than recruit for a new head. The committee approved the proposal; discussion at a membership meeting disclosed a preference for term appointments based on a flexible approach. But Assistant Vice Chancellor Hartman opted for permanent department head positions, and the flexibility proposal was never implemented.

As often happened during these years, LAUC-I initiated an idea and an administrative committee was formed to develop it. In 1976 the Physical Planning Committee met with Library Administration to discuss minor capital improvements and begin a study of library space problems. In early 1977 the committee was asked to prepare three documents: a report for the membership on the ongoing maintenance needs of the library's public areas; a procedure for installing directional plans and other indicators, with special attention to emergency exits and efficient access to them; and a report on the existing visual amenity in the Library's public areas, recommending appropriate enhancement of particular spaces. In 1978 an administrative committee, the Long Range Space Planning Committee, was established with Beverly Toy as chair. It was to go beyond the charges to the LAUC-I committee, working with a library consultant to develop a plan for space reorganization.

When John Smith retired in December 1978, Associate UL Beverly Toy became Acting University Librarian. A search committee for the UL position was established by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Chaired by a faculty member, the committee included three LAUC-I members and one from the support staff.

The arrival of Calvin Boyer as University Librarian in April 1980 began a new era for LAUC-I, in which it withdrew from involvement in administrative activities to become an advisory body. Shortly after his arrival, the Association sponsored an academic colloquium with the objective of acquainting Boyer with concerns and issues within the University of California library system, with particular emphasis on the UCI library.

The new University Librarian attended his first LAUC-I meeting on April 17, 1980. He said that keywords for the future in personnel matters would be "recognition" and "involvement." As a member of the division he continued to attend its meetings regularly.

On August 1 of that year the membership met to respond to the report of the Library Resource Planning and Allocation Advisory Committee, an administrative committee established by the University Librarian. The report was far-reaching, including in its scope the need for goals and objectives for the library, cross-departmental assignments, staff flexibility, a floating task force, ongoing review of library planning, establishment of coordinator positions for tasks that spanned library departments, the development of a Public Services Committee and the establishment of an Information Desk.

LAUC-I was concerned because the report was unclear on the division's role in recommending and implementing proposals for library planning and resource allocation; indeed many of its recommendations, if adopted, would effectively remove the Association from playing a major part in budget and personnel affairs. The Executive Board therefore met with the UL to discuss

the roles of its committees, especially the Budget and Planning and the Research, Education and Personnel Advisory Committees. Boyer said that he welcomed participation by LAUC-I committees if their charges addressed substantive issues.

A compromise was reached. The Budget and Planning Committee was abolished, since its functions were more appropriate to an administrative group; the budget would go to the Council of Department Heads and LAUC-I for approval. The divisional Chair would request that Library Administration make the budget available for discussion at membership meetings. Likewise, because of the University Librarian's view that decisions to fill positions should be his responsibility, the personnel functions were withdrawn from the charges to the Research, Education and Personnel Advisory Committee.

In May 1981 Boyer sent a memo to LAUC-I seeking advice on his proposal to create the position of AUL for Personnel. It was a strange *déjà vu* experience, and for a short time it seemed that history would repeat itself. The letter transmitting the proposal was addressed to Judy Horn, divisional Vice Chair, since the Chair at the time was none other than Michael MacInnes, Personnel Officer, who had been Chair of systemwide LAUC when the former UL tried to do the same thing.

The Executive Board discussed the proposal and drafted a response; the next membership meeting focused on this reply. It was a tense meeting, many members remembering the earlier abortive attempt and its legacy of distrust. UL Boyer told the members that the designation was not being made to reward, but to recognize the appropriate place of the position in the administrative structure. He asked LAUC-I to discuss the pros and cons of the proposal, and inform him of any harmful effects that might make him change his mind.

The division's response addressed three factors: the desirability of the position, its responsibilities, and implementation of the proposal. It reminded the University Librarian of the need for open recruitment, and recommended that the appointment be made in an acting capacity while the responsibilities of the position were discussed further. Concern was expressed over the lack of overall planning which made full assessment of the position difficult. The proposal was implemented.

In April 1982 Boyer established the Goals and Objectives Steering Committee, chaired by Associate UL Beverly Toy, to draft statements on the library's mission and long-range objective. LAUC-I held brown bag meetings, as well as regular membership meetings, to discuss the proposals coming from the committee. Comments were made by LAUC on how the goals and objectives would be applied and implemented, the organization of the document and the need to flesh out its "bare bones." The mission statement and the goals and objectives were adopted by CDH as a working document, but, with the exception of a few parts, actual implementation never occurred.

At the end of 1983, UL Boyer again sought LAUC-I advice on the management structure of the library. He proposed changing the primary policy-recommending body from its current pattern of one Associate University Librarian plus the Council of Department Heads to AULs for the functional areas, Public Service and Technical Services. He also proposed to hire a Management Services Officer to oversee the budget and building maintenance and the development of a program for library renovation and space planning. The role of CDH would

remain the same. The proposal would not create any new positions since Beverly Toy had announced her retirement and another AUL position had been vacant for several years.

Questions raised by members included the similarity of the new proposal to the earlier structure which had not worked well, the role of AULs in the review process, whether the Council of Department Heads would become too large, and whether this was the best utilization of resources. After a lengthy and sometimes heated discussion, the members voted unanimously to support the concept of the restructure.

In 1984, LAUC-I requested and was granted membership on the Council of Department Heads, at the same time that the Management Services Officer was appointed a member. The advisory body has undergone various name and membership changes and is now the Management Steering Committee, but the division's membership through its chair—the first representative was Ellen Broidy—has continued to this day. The arrangement has changed the role of LAUC-I, since now, when the University Librarian brings issues for discussion to the Management Steering Committee, a separate request for advice does not go to LAUC-I. Its advice is sought and given through the management structure.

After the two Assistant UL positions were filled in 1985, there occurred another subtle shift in the relationship of LAUC and the Library administration. The University Librarian formed an Administrative Group, composed of himself and the Assistant University Librarians. Although the role of the Council of Department Heads was supposed to remain the same, the Administrative Group gradually assumed a more influential role, and became the major decision-making body in the Library.

One of the most difficult and sensitive issues that LAUC-I had to handle began in March 1989, when an article appeared in the local newspapers on the subject of discriminatory behavior by library staff toward its users and each other. LAUC-I's position was to deplore such action, and the Chair wrote a letter to the newspapers to express deep concern. Vice Chancellor Chang-Lin Tien was also invited to address the division on the quality of library services on the campus. Several workshops on the problems of librarian recruitment, retention and intercultural sensitivity were held for all librarians and staff. This led to the formation of the Cultural Diversity Steering Committee, along with the development of a position description for a multicultural librarian who would work with the campus and the community. LAUC-I took a proactive role in pushing for the formation of the committee and the implementation of its proposals.

Concerned about these reports, the Academic Senate established the Senate Special Committee to Review Affirmative Action Practices in the Library, chaired by faculty member Myron Simon; its report became known as the SCRAAPL or Simon Report. The committee was charged to review affirmative action in the library, and later expanded the charge to include management issues. It sent questionnaires on discrimination to 43 librarians, followed by lengthy interviews with the Library administration and the University Ombudsman, and with 33 librarians, who were promised that their statements would remain confidential. The report, which detailed both perceived and actual instances of racial and cultural insensitivity, concluded that there were problems with affirmative action and a need for change in the upper levels of management in the Library. It recommended that the University Librarian be reviewed at once.

The LAUC-I meeting held to review the SCRAAPL report was punctuated by heated barbs and deeply felt anger on several issues. A number of members did not agree with the findings

of the report, questioning the validity of some of its assertions. Some were also concerned that confidentiality had been breached because the identity of individuals could be inferred from statements in the report.

At the conclusion of the meeting LAUC-I recommended to Chancellor Jack Peltason that the University Librarian be reviewed and a programmatic review of the library take place. The Academic Senate concurred with the recommendation, further suggesting to the Chancellor that two reviews take place concurrently: one of the University Librarian and one of the Library. The Chancellor followed up with a letter informing the LAUC-I Chair that the Office of Academic Affairs would develop and implement procedures for a comprehensive review of the Library.

To implement the latter action an Internal Review Committee was established, composed of three librarians appointed by LAUC-I and three faculty who were members of the Academic Senate Committee on the Library; it was co-chaired by a member from each constituency. Working with the Office of Academic Affairs, the committee recommended the membership and procedures for an External Review Committee, and were responsible for compiling a packet of information about the organization, structure and activities of the Library as background information for the External Committee. The latter, patterned as much as possible on reviews of academic departments by external committees, comprised six members, all faculty or University Librarians, some from inside and others from outside the University of California. They met with various library constituencies in small groups during their 3-day visit. Questions asked were based on the charge to the External Committee, which was developed by the Internal Committee and covered four broad generic goals for the Library.

The long-awaited report of the External Review Committee was issued in April 1991. It covered the effectiveness of the UCI Library in meeting the research, instructional and information needs of its users; new technologies and automation; management structure; and affirmative action and cultural diversity. LAUC-I reviewed the document, which "found no evidence of racial discrimination in employment practices on a systematic basis in the handling of personnel matters." Overall, the committee found few major problems within the library; those it focused on involved the management structure, and included lack of communication, the need for greater clarity in defining the authority and responsibilities of the AULs, and the exceedingly slow review process.

In October 1990, the LAUC-I Chair was instructed by the membership to again question the Chancellor on the status of the review of the University Librarian, which LAUC-I and the Academic Senate had recommended be held concurrently with the External Review. The Chancellor's response was brief: the UL was included in the Executive Program of the University of California and the manner and schedule of performance was specified in the policies, therefore there would be no special review of the University Librarian, nor would he be reviewed under the procedures used to review deans, as LAUC-I had recommended.

Meanwhile, and independently of the external review activities, the Administrative Group had decided to hire an outside consulting firm to provide advice on the management structure of the Library. The NAPA Group, originally brought in to assist and advise the Administrative group in working together more effectively, found that it needed to expand its scope and talk with department heads and librarians about middle-management problems as well. The group began its work in mid-1990 and issued a report in January 1991, detailing management problems that

they uncovered. This report also cleared the library of any widespread racial discrimination policies.

In April 1991 Boyer announced that he would step down as University Librarian, effective September 1991. At that time three of the five AULs who had been there throughout the various reviews had left their positions, either through resignation or retirement. Professor John King was appointed Acting University Librarian by Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Bill Parker without consultation with the library community. Dr. King served in a part-time capacity from the middle of October 1991 until the arrival of Joanne Euster on July 1, 1992. Three librarians and a staff member were included on the search committee for the new University Librarian after much negotiation with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

PEER REVIEW AND THE APM

The Review Committee

LAUC-I has never gained full control of its peer review process. The review committee is appointed by the Vice Chancellor from names submitted by LAUC-I, and the review process is under the auspices of the Office of Academic Affairs. Also, in spite of several attempts, the division has not been successful in having the University Librarian designated as the final authority in appointments and reviews. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs and Planning makes the appointments and has final authority in all personnel actions.

In 1967/68 reviews of librarians were relatively simple. They were sent by the supervisor to the department head and forwarded to the Annual Review Committee, which was composed of the Assistant University Librarian, a Senate Library Committee member and the LAUC-I President. The recommendations were then reviewed by the University Librarian and forwarded to the Chancellor through the Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs for approval. Reviews took place annually; those of department heads required an ad hoc committee appointed by the UL.

The growth of the Library required changes. By the summer of 1968 discussions were taking place on proposals to enlarge the Review Committee, to standardize the evaluation procedures and to consider peer review. The composition of the Review Committee was revised to exclude librarians in management positions except the Assistant University Librarian. Thus began the long history of the debate to exclude department heads at Irvine from serving as members of the Review Committee. The debate, punctuated with numerous votes, went on for nearly two decades.

In 1970 peer review for all librarians was implemented. In March 1971 the campus incorporated some provisions of Sections 82 and 51-4 of the Administrative Manual into its Promotion and Review Committee Procedures, and adopted extensive appeals and grievance procedures. The committee's name was changed to the Promotion and Review Committee.

The first year of the renamed committee was a very difficult one. In several cases it did not agree with the supervisor's recommendation. The University Librarian overturned almost all of the committee's recommendations with the claim that it had not documented its cases. He based his decisions on two alleged facts: the availability of money for the increases and the lack of documentation. LAUC-I replied that money was not the issue; the committee's evaluations were supposed to be made on the basis of performance. This was the first year for peer review, and

UL Smith felt that it was a learning experience. The discussion on responsibility for documentation led into a proposed administrative reorganization.

In early 1972, LAUC-I expressed concern that after reviews and comments on two revisions of Sections 82 and 51-4, there were few changes in the final documents. The Executive Board met with Chancellor Aldrich, stressing LAUC-I's concerns over security of employment, grievance procedures and improved salaries for librarians; the Chancellor was supportive of LAUC-I's position. Letters were sent to systemwide LAUC and Vice President for Academic Affairs Angus Taylor expressing LAUC-I's concerns, its rejection of 82 and 51-4, and its determination "to continue in our present situation" until improvements were made in the two sections.

In September 1972, when President Ted Gould asked for input on whether systemwide LAUC should participate in the Committee on Salaries being proposed by Vice President Taylor, LAUC-I voted 5 in favor and 19 against participation. The view was that since UC-AFT had been meeting regularly with the University on the same issue and LAUC had just completed a report on salaries in July 1972, more information was unnecessary.

At Irvine, with the advent of the two new Administrative Manual sections, the question was to whom the Chancellor should delegate authority on reviews. The structure and reporting relationship of the review committee was also under consideration. By the late fall of 1972, LAUC-I was deep in deliberations over the issues of appointment, performance evaluations, peer review, promotions, grievances and appeals. Doubts that had surfaced earlier about the continued existence of LAUC-I's Promotion and Review Committee were well founded. Its responsibilities were subsumed by the Chancellor's Advisory Committee.

In October 1972 the Promotion and Review Committee issued a report which was accepted in part by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and became the basic document from which the present Library Review Committee (LRC) evolved. In place of the Promotion and Review Committee which reported to LAUC-I, the new Library Review Committee became the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Advisory Committee. Peer review remained, but direct LAUC-I election was replaced by recommended names submitted to the Vice Chancellor, who then appointed the committee members.

A slate of six candidates for the new committee was presented to the membership, and the results of the vote forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. He appointed three librarians and one faculty member to the committee, which held its first meeting in May 1973. In 1976 LRC members were appointed for 3-year staggered terms running from October 1 to September 30. The following year, it was agreed that no more than one LRC member should be from the same department and that none would serve consecutive terms. This system, with a few variations, continues to this day.

For a decade the Assistant Vice Chancellor always appointed to the Library Review Committee the librarian who received the highest number of votes. But in 1984 he stunned the division by appointing instead the one with the second highest number. Speaking to a LAUC-I meeting held to discuss the issue, he explained that he had appointed the person with the most experience. "...This decision is without precedent, the situation is without precedent, the opportunities are without precedent, the dangers are without precedent, and I think there is unlikely to ever be a similar opportunity for LAUC." Librarians responded with such statements as: "The decision has compromised the process of LRC appointments"; "the decision is insulting

to LAUC-I"; and "it is disheartening that LAUC-I has been prevented from selecting its own representative."

Confidentiality

In the 1972 discussion of peer review, one of the hottest topics was confidentiality. The pros and cons of all aspects of the subject were discussed at numerous LAUC-I meetings. The division opted for open files except for the deliberations and recommendations of the Library Review Committee.

In March 1973 Assistant Vice Chancellor Hartman accepted an invitation to meet with LAUC-I to discuss the new Procedures for Recommendation and Review for Librarians. He said that a basic concept for any review was confidentiality, and with that statement the division lost its bid for open files. Responding to the librarians' objections, he asked that the new procedures be tried for two review cycles and then re-evaluated.

Procedures

At this time librarians' reviews were modeled closely on those of the faculty, the review files being confidential and the department heads responsible for providing summaries of the dossiers' contents. Confidential peer letters were heavily used to gather input for the dossiers—much to the objection of the librarians, who felt that much unnecessary time was spent in preparing the letters.

In 1974 a LAUC-I discussion group reviewed the procedures for peer review and presented its findings, thus beginning the gradual evolution to the system currently in use. At one point the department head showed a copy of the review letter to the candidate, who could not make a copy; finally in 1981 each reviewee received a copy of the letter. In 1977 "No Action" reviews, neutral reviews in which the initiator and the reviewee agree there is insufficient information to recommend advancement, were implemented. They give a librarian at a plateau point, such as Associate Librarian VI, time to put together a stronger case for promotion.

The division established an Ad Hoc Committee for Revision of Academic Procedures for the Librarian, with Cynthia Butler as chair, in June 1981. It was charged to review the procedures followed by LAUC-I for peer review, most of which had been in place with minor changes since 1972. It recommended making the University Librarian the final review authority, having the UL appoint LRC from a slate of names, eliminating the requirement of peer letters for a "normal" merit increase, having a copy of the review initiator's letter given to the person under review, establishing a strict time schedule for reviews, and stipulating that a letter be sent by the final authority to each person under review giving reasons for the final action.

The membership agreed that the UL should be the final authority, so that the review process would be integral to the Library, rather than controlled by the Office of Academic Affairs. The recommendation of abbreviated reviews for normal merit increase, with peer letters as an option, was rejected and not forwarded to campus administration.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Hartman attended a LAUC-I meeting to discuss the recommendations. He disagreed with two of them: making the University Librarian the final authority would change campus policy, and he would continue to appoint the members of LRC.

He approved the suggestion to supply a copy of the review initiator's letter, and asked that LAUC-I implement the proposal to make peer letters for normal merits optional.

With the revision of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) following the advent of collective bargaining, LAUC-I established a Committee to Examine Peer Review Procedures. Chaired by Joyce Loepprich, its task was to develop a "Consumer Guide" that would outline procedures for review, the schedule, membership and reporting relationship of LRC, application of the criteria, the role of the review initiator, the role of librarian under review, etc. Each part of the Guide, as it was prepared, was critiqued section by section, line by line, in membership meetings. This was the only way to achieve consensus, so varied were the opinions, and thus the work of the committee took a great deal of time to complete. In 1988 the final copy of a revised Policy and Procedures for Review of Librarians, incorporating all of the changes mandated by Tier Two of the bargaining agreement as well as several recommended by LAUC-I, was approved by the Vice Chancellor.

Between 1985 and 1989 there were some notable changes in the review process. Department heads became eligible to serve on the Library Review Committee, the faculty member was eliminated from the committee and an additional librarian was appointed, the AULs were brought into the review process to "enhance their roles as counselor, facilitator, and evaluator," and the Vice Chancellor agreed to the direct election of the membership of LRC by LAUC-I. These changes were all recommended by the division.

Two other decisions were imposed from the outside. The "short form"—to be used for all actions except potential promotion, career status, termination, or advancement to Associate Librarian Step VI or VII or Librarian Step IV or V—was introduced by the Associate Executive Vice Chancellor and implemented with the 1989 review cycle. It was designed to cut down on peer letters, which are not requested when this form is used. The other matter involved access to files. Though the librarians agreed that they should see the letter of evaluation prepared by the University Librarian for their file, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs disagreed, saying the letter was "administrative confidential," and so it remains today.

Career and Professionalism

LAUC-I has always been concerned about the role of the professional librarian and the application of the APM criteria to the review process. In its discussion of the Statement on the Criteria for Appointment and Promotion to the Rank of Librarian prepared by systemwide LAUC's Committee on Privileges, Salaries and Conditions of Employment, the division disagreed with LAUC by taking the position that the major step in a librarian's career should be promotion from Assistant to Associate Librarian rather than from Associate to Librarian.

As a result of these discussions LAUC-I appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on Criteria for Appointment in the Librarian Series. Its first report was rejected; the revision, issued in March 1976, documented past practices at Irvine and surveyed the other UC campuses on the criteria used in applying previous professional experience and education for credit in entry-level Assistant Librarian appointments. This logically thought-out scale and supporting documents fell under a "hail of bullets." The issue was dropped, only to surface again during 1988/89 in response to a Library Administration document on factors used in setting librarians' salaries.

Library Administration favored more flexibility, while LAUC-I, concerned with salary equity, leaned more toward a rigid standard. A compromise was finally worked out.

In 1977 LAUC-I established a Task Force on Professionalism. Implicit in its early discussions was the requirement of an M.L.S. degree, that working a strict 40-hour work week was not adequate job performance for professional librarians, and that librarians should continue their education and develop a broader theoretical knowledge.

Review Criteria

In 1978 the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Librarianship was formed and charged with developing guidelines of criteria for promotion and review. The basic premise of its 1979 report was: "It is not the job that makes the librarian, it is the librarian that makes the job." It declared that while Criteria 2-4 were important, professional commitment and quality of service must be demonstrated before the other criteria become relevant. Competence must include growth and one's career should show a progression of achievements. The first report was returned to the committee, which was reconstituted with Eric MacDonald as chair.

The letter from Ann Hinckley, Head of Reference at UCLA, to LAUC President Joyce Toscan in 1980, which expressed concern that increasing emphasis on criteria 2-4 was inconsistent with the goals of a service organization and proposed that the librarian series should be patterned after the lecturer series rather than the professorial series, generated a lively discussion among LAUC-I members. The Executive Board referred the letter to both the Library Review Committee and the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Librarianship. Both committees asserted, and the membership agreed, that the lecturer series was not an appropriate model. Focus should be on developing the librarian series. There was a general consensus that the APM was sound and that definitions and the "weight" of the various criteria were still evolving, though some felt that service and the primary job should come first and the APM review process was too cumbersome.

The discussion of the Hinckley letter provided a backdrop for the second report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Librarianship in 1981. The premises of the report were similar to those of the earlier one, emphasizing growth and balance in a librarian's career. At a LAUC-I membership meeting concern was expressed over equity between new appointees and persons already employed. With the understanding that three parts would be re-written, the report was adopted by a wide margin. The final document, "Criteria for Librarian Personnel Action," was issued in March 1981 by University Librarian Calvin Boyer, and remains in effect today. Its premises were reaffirmed in 1988/89 with the adoption of LAUC-I Position Paper #1, which, in addition to affirming that a librarian is reviewed first on performance in Criterion 1 and secondly on significant achievements in at least one of the other three criteria, gave participation in state and local library associations the same importance as national and international activities. In 1992 the Committee on Academic Librarianship began an editorial review of the document.

Criteria for advancement to Librarian Step V was a topic of considerable discussion during 1990/91. The Committee on Academic Librarianship prepared guidelines for this action, which included a basic assumption of outstanding performance in Criterion 1 and notable achievements in one or more of the other criteria since attaining Librarian Step IV, and adding the further criterion of a state, national or international reputation. Speaking to a membership meeting on the topic, Associate Executive Vice Chancellor Bill Parker said that Librarian Step V "should

be given to an individual whose career establishes a model that sets the highest of standards to which all professional librarians could aspire." He called it the "capstone" of a librarian's professional career.

Temporary Appointments

The issue of temporary appointments has also been an important one for LAUC-I. In 1977 Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Carl Hartman wrote to the University Librarian about the need for a policy on less than full-time appointments in the librarian series, since Section 82 of the APM did not address the problem. His view was that "a proposal that an existing appointment in the librarian series be changed from full-time to part-time or vice versa should be regarded as a proposal for a new appointment and should be reviewed as such...." The division asked for a more flexible policy, in which requests for no more than a 20% reduction in one's career appointment be considered exempt. The Library Review Committee responded by proposing a two-tier approach of long-term requests and short-term requests. The latter proposal prevailed.

In the discussions on the report of the LAUC Ad Hoc Committee on Temporary Appointments, it was revealed that UCI had been using temporary librarians to a greater extent than most of the other campuses. This fact undoubtedly influenced the position taken by LAUC-I that temporary librarians should not be required to perform in Criteria 2-4 nor be reviewed for merit increase. This was contrary to the LAUC view that temporary librarians should be treated as full professionals.

AULs and Stipends

The division played a role in the development of procedures to implement Section 83 of the APM for Assistant and Associate University Librarians. In 1977 a LAUC-I ad hoc committee issued a document recommending procedures for the appointment and review of these officers. The review committees were to be composed of a career appointee in the librarian series, an AUL from another UC campus, a faculty member and a person in the management series. The committee would be appointed by the Vice Chancellor after consultation with the Library Review Committee members, who would also review the dossier and the recommendation. Membership on search committees for Assistant and Associate UL positions, to be appointed by the University Librarian, was also defined: it was to consist of two members of the Council of Department Heads, one librarian from a slate of three names submitted by LAUC-I, one support staff member and one faculty member.

In the numerous discussion held by systemwide LAUC on the contentious topic, LAUC-I has been steadfast in opposing permanent administrative stipends, voting instead in favor of temporary stipends. The division had thought the issue dead, but it was revealed rather as being dormant when Library Council revived it in 1990. Members voted on the proposed 3-tiered schedule of stipends based on the number of FTE supervised, and rejected both the concept and the specific proposal. The vote was 2 in favor, 12 opposed, and 5 abstentions. The 2-track system and the past history of administrative stipends was reviewed for the membership, and debate was lively.

RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Travel for Professional Development

Research and professional development have always been important to Librarians at UCI. The first travel policy was adopted in 1968. During the early 1970s professional development for librarians was very limited; Library Administration, citing fiscal restraints, would fund only one librarian to attend ALA conferences.

In 1976 an Ad Hoc Committee on Travel was appointed to determine categories of librarians' travel, to provide a clear definition of administrative travel and to establish criteria for reimbursement of expenses for professional development travel. Its report, adopted in 1977, contained definitions and reimbursement criteria for administrative travel, training programs, institutes, workshops and conferences, and recommended a budget. It noted that \$8,679 was spent on travel in 1974/75, and in 1975/76 the amount was \$12,180. This was a major improvement over the late 1960s and early 1970s.

There was a major discussion in 1979 over a proposal to fund sending a representative to major library meetings when the University Librarian did not attend. The proposal was changed to provide greater funding for librarians who were presenting papers, were resource persons in round-table or similar discussions, or held office in an organization. Such individuals would have their travel and registration expenses fully paid, and would receive per diem allowances for the days in which they were "acting in an official capacity." LAUC-I voted to fund all other librarians with payment for one-half of the travel and registration.

In 1979/80 the division's travel budget was again restricted. In 1978/79 LAUC-I spent over \$8,000; in 1979/80, its allocation was only \$6,000. In spite of this the policy of funding registration, half air fare, and per diem for the days in which a librarian was attending in an "official" capacity, remained in effect.

Before 1981, the LAUC-I Budget and Planning Committee authorized funds for librarians' travel and professional development. With the shift in emphasis from an administrative to an advisory role, the division voted in a 1981 meeting to have all travel requests come before REAPAB or its successor committee for review. Recommendations would be forwarded to the University Librarian who would have full responsibility for funding. New forms and new definitions for various types of travel were approved.

At this meeting, "considerable angst" was expressed over the necessity to make adjustments to a travel policy that had been developed at a time when more money was available for the Library budget. The latter was so tight this year that, for the first time, a basic allocation was designated for the ALA and MLA conferences based on the location of the meetings (ALA, at San Francisco, \$120; MLA, \$400). It was decided that if additional money was forthcoming, it would be allocated first to non-conference-related requests for workshops and seminars, and secondly to ALA and MLA requests for per diem allowance according to established policy.

Following the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in 1984, LAUC-I received \$10,000 for librarians in the bargaining unit. University Librarian Boyer indicated that he would not only allot a like sum to non-unit librarians, but he would not permit the level of professional development allocations to fall below those of previous years, i.e., below \$30,000-\$40,000.

Boyer was able to make similar commitments at a slowly reduced level until the Library began to suffer severe budgetary cuts in 1989/90. At that time professional development travel reimbursements became a very hot topic at several membership meetings. In 1989/90 the division spent over \$22,000 on professional development travel; the following year it was told that only \$15,000 would be available, a reduction of 30%.

The problem was not easily resolved. The abrupt departure from the more flexible years of full registration, half of the travel expense, and per diem for the days one was presenting a paper or performing the duties of an officer, were difficult to accept. The questions of fairness and equity became muddled by the constraints under which the committee was working. A compromise was finally reached. A cap was placed on the amount of money received by each librarian during the year; if any funds were unexpended at the end of the year, librarians would be reimbursed for expenses assumed to the extent it was possible.

Research

In 1980 LAUC-I began working on a definition of, and guidelines for, librarian research. When research funds were allocated from the Office of the President that year, Irvine received \$2,350.00 and funded four research proposals. When the funds were discontinued by UCOP, University Librarian Boyer said that he would continue to fund research at the same level. After the MOU was signed, the campus administration provided librarians with \$10,000 per year for the purpose. Although one or more librarians have submitted research proposals each year since then, the allocation has seldom been fully utilized.

A major reason why librarians have not been taking advantage of the funds is the lack of time to do the research, which in turn is due to the pressures of the primary job responsibilities. In 1981/82 the division held several discussions on time off for professional activities. In January 1982 the Committee on Academic Librarianship conducted a survey asking librarians which professional activities they considered the most important: e.g., preparation and presentation of workshops, preparation and presentation of conference papers, academic course work, office and committee memberships in professional organizations. The committee then recommended that a maximum of eight hours per week be granted librarians for professional development and research activities. A precedent had been set in 1979 when REAPAB had recommended eight hours of released time per week for a research project, with reports submitted regularly and periodically. Detailed procedures were worked out for the implementation of the proposed released time hours, but only the concept of the eight hours of released time was accepted by LAUC-I. The concept was never formally implemented, but the eight hours became an accepted standard when time off was requested for research or professional development projects.

RELATIONS WITH THE ACADEMIC SENATE AND THE CAMPUS

As mentioned above, LAUC-I early achieved membership on Academic Senate and campus administrative committees. Gradually the number of Senate committees on which LAUC-I members served increased from the original seven to fourteen. In 1975, after LAUC was formally recognized by the University, the LAUC-I Chair wrote the Chair of the Irvine Academic Senate to request representation of the association on its Executive Committee. The

request was approved, and since that time the LAUC-I Chair has been a member of the Senate's Executive Committee, with the Vice Chair attending meetings of its Assembly.

The appointment of LAUC-I members to Senate committees is for a 3-year period. Each year the representatives are asked to prepare reports on the activities of their committee, which are presented to the LAUC-I membership. By 1988/89 these reports were revealing the value to the Library of their service. Through attendance at the committee meetings, members of the division are aware of most programmatic changes, concerns of the faculty and the direction of the University. LAUC-I is on the communication loop for the campus, a loop which has provided them with opportunities to be proactive rather than reactive.

In 1990 a librarian newly appointed to an Academic Senate committee asked whether or not LAUC-I representatives had official standing and voting status. The answers, from both librarians and faculty, revealed a range of opinion. Some faculty considered the representatives to be voting members, others did not. Responding to a letter from the LAUC-I Chair, the Chair of the Academic Senate affirmed that representatives of the association were not considered voting members because systemwide Academic Senate Bylaws specifically did not permit them to be. The ruling has not however diminished the level of activity of librarians on the committees.

The participation of LAUC-I members on Academic Senate committees and campus administrative committees has also served to increase the stature of librarians on the Irvine campus. In 1980, when the campus administration was beginning to develop a housing program for faculty, the LAUC-I Chair sent a memo to the Chair of the Academic Senate about the inclusion of librarians in the program. The response was favorable. Although librarians are not equated with faculty, they are now eligible for on-campus housing, and several LAUC-I members have taken advantage of this opportunity.

CONCLUSION

The influence and role of LAUC-I has seen many peaks and vales. Its fortunes have depended on an intricate set of factors: the administrative style of the University Librarian, the management organization of the Library, the interest and leadership of its own members, the provisions of the APM and the MOU, and the level of communication of its activities. All librarians at Irvine have at some time served on divisional committees; many have been active in systemwide LAUC committees. Irvine has contributed three Presidents to LAUC: Michael MacInnes, Beverly Toy and Judy Horn. Participation in the local association has given members the opportunity to develop creativity, leadership, management and organizational skills, and has provided the opportunity to influence in a meaningful way the direction of the UCI Library.

The importance of LAUC and LAUC-I to the Irvine librarians has been demonstrated by two votes of its membership. In the first, taken during discussions on the LAUC Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Relationship of LAUC and Voluntary Employee Organizations, the division voted unanimously to keep LAUC separate from other employee organizations. The second took place during collective bargaining discussions, when the majority voted in favor of retaining LAUC as a professional and advisory group.

The impact of LAUC-I has been, first and foremost, the positive role its members have played in assuring that librarians have been actively involved in the development of both campus and Library policies. It is hard to envision what the University and the campus would be like without

a systemwide and a campus librarians' association, but it is easy to conclude that they would have been much different. A strong, separate librarian series has been developed, recognized for its uniqueness, along with an equally strong peer review system.

LAUC and LAUC-I have met many challenges over the last 25 years; some have been resolved, others have resurfaced years later for further resolution. During these years, the division has discussed and advised on innumerable topics, ranging from the mundane to the extremely significant. All have been important in building this history. In the years to come there promises to be a wide range of other issues, some of them as yet unknown and undreamed of, which LAUC-I will discuss, on which it will offer advice, and which will provide the opportunity to build further upon the very solid foundation it has constructed in the course of its first twenty-five years.

EXECUTIVE BOARD & REVIEW COMMITTEE

1968

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------------|
| President: | Jane A. Kimball |
| Vice President: | JoAnn Brock |
| Secretary: | Janet Eggleston |
| LAUC Assembly Rep.: | Marjorie Reeves |
| Exec. Board Member-at-large: | Elizabeth Karshner |

1969

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| President: | Pieter Dekkers |
| Vice President: | Don Hixon |
| Secretary/Treasurer: | Karen Meinecke |
| LAUC Assembly Rep./Member-at-large: | Janet Eggleston |

1970

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| President: | Janet Eggleston |
| Vice President/President Elect: | Margaret Kent |
| Secretary/Treasurer: | Helen Reister |
| LAUC Assembly Rep./Member-at-large: | Pieter Dekkers |

1971

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| President: | Margaret Kent; Leslie Patrick Coyle |
| Vice President/President Elect: | Leslie Patrick Coyle; Maryll Lenky; Bob Bates |
| Secretary/Treasurer: | Cynthia Butler |
| LAUC Assembly Rep./Members-at-large: | Bob Bates, George Raulin; Diana Lane |

Promotion and Review Committee: Leslie Patrick Coyle (Chair), Anne Frank, Don Hixon, Margaret Renton (all 1973)

1972

President: Leslie Patrick Coyle
Vice President/President Elect: Jim Rollins
Secretary/Treasurer: Linda Kennedy
LAUC Assembly Rep./Members-at-large: Don Hixon, Helen Reister
Promotion and Review Committee: Don Hixon (1973), Janet Eggleston (1974), Karen Meinecke (1972), Evelyn Houston (1972), Michael MacInnes (ex officio)

1973

President: Jim Rollins (to Oct.); Bev Toy
Vice President/President Elect: Bev Toy; Linda Kennedy
Secretary/Treasurer: Jacqueline Doyle
LAUC Assembly Rep./Members-at-large: Linda Kennedy, Michael MacInnes
Library Review Committee: David G. Everett (Chair) (1973), Roberta Hansen (1973), Dora Jones (1975)

1974

President: Bev Toy
Vice President/President Elect: Monica Beck
Secretary/Treasurer: Don Hixon
LAUC Assembly Rep./Members-at-large: Diana Lane and Joyce Loepprich
Library Review Committee: Helen Reister (1975), Anne Frank (1976), Diana Lane (1976), David G. Everett (consultant, 1974)

1975

President: Bev Toy
Vice President/President Elect: Marion Buzzard
Secretary/Treasurer: Margaret "Monie" Farber
LAUC Members-at-large: Diana Lane, Anita Lee
Library Review Committee: Helen Reister (1978), Diana Lane (1976), Anne Frank (1976)

1976

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| President: | Marion Buzzard |
| Vice President/President Elect: | F. Ray Long |
| Secretary/Treasurer: | Joyce Loepprich |
| LAUC Members-at-large: | Michael MacInnes, Margaret Renton |
| Library Review Committee: | Diana Lane (Chair) (1976), Anne Frank (1976), Helen Reister (1978) |

1977

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Chair: | F. Ray Long |
| Vice Chair/Chair Elect: | George Raulin |
| Secretary/Treasurer: | Jackie Palchek |
| LAUC Members-at-large: | Fred Forbes, Michael MacInnes |
| Library Review Committee: | Helen Reister (1978), Roberta Phelps (1979), Diana Lane (1980) |

1977/78

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Chair: | George Raulin (Sept. 1977-Feb. 1978), Eric MacDonald |
| Vice Chair/Chair Elect: | Eric MacDonald; Lynda Adams |
| Secretary/Treasurer: | April McLean (Love) |
| Members-at-large: | Lynda Adams, Herb Ahn |
| Past Chair: | F. Ray Long |
| Library Review Committee: | Helen Reister (1978), Roberta Phelps (1979), Diana Lane (1980) |

1978/79

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Chair: | Eric MacDonald |
| Vice Chair/Chair Elect: | Doris New |
| Secretary/Treasurer: | Sara Eichhorn |
| Members-at-large: | Michael MacInnes, April McLean (Love) |
| Past Chair: | [vacant] |
| Library Review Committee: | Roberta Phelps (1979), Diana Lane (1980), Margaret Renton (1981) |

1979/80

| | |
|-------------------------|------------------|
| Chair: | Doris New |
| Vice Chair/Chair Elect: | Michael MacInnes |
| Secretary/Treasurer: | Judith Bube |

Members-at-large: Anne Frank, Irene Wechselberg
Past Chair: Eric MacDonald
Library Review Committee: Diana Lane (1980), Margaret Renton (1981),
Don Hixon (1982)

1980/81

Chair: Michael MacInnes
Vice Chair/Chair Elect: Judy Horn
Secretary/Treasurer: Ruth Roden
Members-at-large: April McLean (Love), Lynda Adams
Past Chair: Doris New
Library Review Committee: Margaret Renton (1981), Don Hixon (1982),
Joyce Loepprich (1983)

1981/82

Chair: Judy Horn
Vice Chair/Chair Elect: Lynda Adams
Secretary/Treasurer: Eddie Yeghiayan
Members-at-large: Sylvester E. Klinicke, Rochelle Bock
Past Chair: Michael MacInnes
Library Review Committee: Don Hixon (1982), Joyce Loepprich (1983),
Sara Eichhorn (1984)

1982/83

Chair: Lynda Adams
Vice Chair/Chair Elect: Sylvester E. Klinicke
Secretary/Treasurer: Chris Ferguson
Members-at-large: Ellen Broidy, Eddie Yeghiayan
Past Chair: Judy Horn
Library Review Committee: Joyce Loepprich (1983), Sara Eichhorn (1984),
Fred Forbes (1985)

1983/84

Chair: Sylvester E. Klinicke
Vice Chair/Chair Elect: Ellen Broidy
Secretary/Treasurer: Rochelle Clary
Members-at-large: Anne Frank, Chris Ferguson
Past Chair: Lynda Adams
Library Review Committee: Sara Eichhorn (1984), Fred Forbes (1985),
Judith Bube (1986)

1984/85

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Chair: | Ellen Broidy |
| Vice Chair/Chair Elect: | Chris Ferguson |
| Secretary/Treasurer: | Michael Fineman |
| Members-at-large: | Joan Ariel, Julia Gelfand |
| Past Chair: | Sylvester E. Klinicke |
| Library Review Committee: | Fred Forbes (1985), Judith Bube (1986), Eric MacDonald (1987) |

1985/86

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Chair: | Ellen Broidy |
| Vice Chair/Chair Elect: | Fred Forbes |
| Secretary/Treasurer: | Mary Van Orsdol |
| Members-at-large: | Steve Clancy, John Pitcher |
| Past Chair: | [vacant] |
| Library Review Committee: | Judith Bube (1986), Eric MacDonald (1987), Sylvester E. Klinicke (1988) |

1986/87

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Chair: | Fred Forbes |
| Vice Chair/Chair Elect: | Julia Gelfand |
| Secretary/Treasurer: | John Pitcher |
| Members-at-large: | Eddie Yeghiayan, Judy Horn |
| Past Chair: | Ellen Broidy |
| Library Review Committee: | Eric MacDonald (1987), Sylvester E. Klinicke (1988), Herbert Ahn (1989) |

1987/88

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Chair: | Julia Gelfand |
| Vice Chair/Chair Elect: | D. Kathryn Weintraub |
| Secretary/Treasurer: | Marion Buzzard |
| Members-at-large: | David Lewallen, John Pitcher |
| Past Chair: | Fred Forbes |
| Library Review Committee: | Sylvester E. Klinicke (1988), Herbert Ahn (1989), Collette C. Ford (1990), April Love (1990) |

1988/89

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Chair: | D. Kathryn Weintraub |
| Vice Chair/Chair Elect: | Susan Russell |
| Secretary/Treasurer: | Eric MacDonald |
| Members-at-large: | Mary Van Orsdol, David Lewallen |
| Past Chair: | Julia Gelfand |
| Library Review Committee: | Herbert Ahn (1989), Collette C. Ford (1990), April Love (1990), Sharon Pugsley (1991) |

1989/90

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Chair: | Susan Russell |
| Chair/Chair Elect: | Eric MacDonald |
| Secretary/Treasurer: | Sylvester E. Klinicke |
| Members-at-large: | Dana D'Andraia, Rochelle Clary |
| Past Chair: | D. Kathryn Weintraub |
| Library Review Committee: | Collette C. Ford (1990), April Love (1990), Sharon Pugsley (1991), Yvonne Wilson (1992); Don Hixon (1991) |

1990/91

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Chair: | Eric MacDonald |
| Vice Chair/Chair Elect: | James E. Crooks |
| Secretary/Treasurer: | Colby Riggs |
| Members-at-large: | Judith Bube, Collette C. Ford |
| Past Chair: | Susan Russell |
| Library Review Committee: | Don Hixon (Chair to Apr. 1991) (1991), Yvonne Wilson (Chair from Apr. 1991) (1992), Linda Murphy (1993), Anne Frank (1993) |

1991/92

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Chair: | James E. Crooks |
| Vice Chair/Chair Elect: | Barbara Jenkins (to Dec. 1991); Carol Womack |
| Secretary/Treasurer: | Kathryn Kjaer |
| Members-at-large: | Locke Morrissey, Pauline Manaka |
| Past Chair: | Eric MacDonald |
| Library Review Committee: | Yvonne Wilson (Chair) (1992), Anne Frank (1993), Linda Murphy (1993), D. Kathryn Weintraub (1994) (to Jan. 1992); April Love (1994) |

1992/93

Chair:

Carol Womack

Vice-Chair/Chair Elect:

Locke Morrissey

Secretary/Treasurer:

Gary Rossi

Members-at-large:

Barbara Lucas, John Sisson

Past Chair:

James E. Crooks

Library Review Committee:

Linda Murphy (Chair) (1993), Anne Frank (Co-Chair) (1993), April Love (1994), Kevin Fredette (1995)