



Los Angeles

by Miki Goral

"UCLA Librarians are at variance with the other campuses of the University, as represented by their delegates to the statewide steering committee, on several major issues."—*Position Paper from Librarians of UCLA to All Librarians of the University of California, October 9, 1967.*

This statement, in one form or another, sums up the history of the Los Angeles division of LAUC. Scouring the voluminous records of the past 25 years has only reinforced the adage that "the more things change, the more they stay the same." The issues that occupied much of the energy, creativity and efforts of the founding members of LAUC-LA are still around. While the \$11.00 reimbursement for lunch for all the Los Angeles delegates to the systemwide Assembly in 1973 would not cover even one meal today, support for professional activity is still a major concern. The role of the division vis-à-vis the Library Administration, how to balance the emphasis given to the four criteria upon which we are evaluated, librarian participation in the Academic Senate, how to maintain a top-ranked Library in a time of budgetary constraints, the role of paraprofessionals in the library, communication between the LAUC-LA Executive Council and the membership: all of these are themes that appear and re-appear over the years.

The UCLA Librarians Association was born on September 26, 1967, with the adoption of Bylaws and election of the first Executive Council. Its gestation stretches back to 1962, when, in the words of a report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation, Promotion, and Appointment Procedures:

Librarians at UCLA were designated as members of the University's academic staff, but this step toward true academic status has been incomplete because

personnel actions affecting librarians have continued to be handled through the Non-Academic Personnel Office. This office works within a standardized, job-oriented framework which has made it difficult adequately to recognize individual growth and achievement, and has limited advancement opportunities primarily to those who have been able to undertake larger administrative responsibilities. It has been understood that the granting of academic status to librarians implied their eventual transfer to the jurisdiction of the Academic Personnel Office, which holds a totally different concept of performance evaluation.... [It] depends upon review committees drawn from the academic community itself. These committees are flexibly able to evaluate colleagues in terms of their individual development, performance, and potential.

On May 11, 1967, a questionnaire sent to all librarians at UCLA asked whether they wanted to form an organization to address issues of concern. Of the 160 questionnaires sent out, 106 were returned, with 96 agreeing in principle that librarians should organize.

Although the documents found in the LAUC-LA archives do not themselves describe a specific impetus for changing the status quo, it is possible to speculate from the vantage point of a quarter-century later that the general societal changes engulfing campuses in the 1960s spurred on the movement begun in 1962. In late 1966, a Professional Subcommittee of the [Library's] Committee on Orientation and Communication was appointed to discuss the status of librarians in the University of California. It held two open meetings, sent out a questionnaire on "Professional Librarianship Within the Academic Community," compiled the results into a "checklist" and distributed it to all librarians.

At the same time, as noted in Part 1 of this book, the Hoos and Spiess Committees were ostensibly dealing with issues affecting librarians and other non-Senate academic personnel. However, the lack of proper attention to librarian concerns by these committees led an informal group of twelve librarians to meet and prepare a document on "Some Proposals on the Status of UCLA Librarians," which was sent to each librarian on campus on May 11, 1967. The items discussed included job security and tenure, promotion and grievance procedures, leaves of absence, access to research funds, opportunity for professional growth, formation of a permanent organization of professional librarians, pay scale and voice in University affairs. It is fortunate that Johanna E. Tallman, the first LAUC-LA President, included a recapitulation of the organization's beginnings in her Annual Report for 1967/68:

As a result of all this activity, the time seemed ripe to consider establishing such an association at UCLA. Approximately one hundred UCLA librarians met June 8. At this meeting a resolution was passed unanimously to form an association of UCLA librarians. Frances Kirschenbaum was elected temporary chairman and a Constitution Committee was appointed to draft a proposed constitution. This committee met eleven times between June and September.... [I]deas were thoroughly discussed, reworded, and finally integrated into an overall document.

As the fledgling organization sought to establish itself, it had the "cooperation and endorsement of University Librarian Robert Vosper," according to President Tallman's report. Yet on December 6, 1967, the Librarian's Office issued a memo on "Work Week for Library Staff Members," ending a 20-year policy which ensured that those who worked nights and weekends could put in 38 hours a week instead of 40. The justification for this sudden change was that librarians were under the Non-Academic Personnel Office and had to conform to staff rules. LAUC-LA's response was immediate. Emergency meetings were called and the Administration agreed to defer the new policy for six months and have an ad hoc committee make a thorough study of the problem and its solution. (Whether this was done is not known, but after 1970 the policy was no longer adhered to. When the University Federation of Librarians, University Council-American Federation of Teachers (UFL) negotiated its first contract with the University in 1984, the issue was not of a set work week, but of assuring librarians "reasonable flexibility...in the use of University time," so that they could participate in the activities expected of academic employees.)

The Executive Council met every two weeks (except in summer) until 1989, when the schedule was revised to once every three weeks, and then to once a month. In the early years, the number of "special" meetings convened to discuss specific topics was an indication of the vitality of the organization and willingness of people to be involved. LAUC-LA was called on to react to many issues as librarians stretched themselves to have more control over their working lives. Much of the work of the Association was conducted through its committees. In its first two years, there were eight ad hoc and five standing committees in addition to those handling elections and nominations. The ad hoc committee names illustrate the broad spectrum of issues that LAUC-LA tackled:

Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate the Directive of December 6 Regarding the Work Week for Library Staff Members

Ad Hoc Committee to Observe Evaluation, Promotion and Appointment Procedures (March 1968-November 1969)

Continuing Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation, Promotion and Appointment Procedures (January-July 1969)

Ad Hoc Committee to Develop a Position Paper for the Association

Ad Hoc Committee on the Obligations of Librarians at UCLA

Ad Hoc Committee of the Executive Council on the Problems Faced by Librarians on Leaves of Absence or Exchanges [e.g. payment of parking fees]

Ad Hoc Committee to Recommend on the Credentials of the Candidate for the Position of Afro-American Bibliographer

Ad Hoc Committee of the Executive Council to Consider the Report of the
Ad Hoc Committee to Observe Evaluation, Promotion and Appointment
Procedures

Ad Hoc Committee to Draft Request to Faculty Center for Provisional
Membership Privileges for Beginning Grades in the Academic Librarian
Series (L-1 and L-2)

LAUC-LA's internal organization has evolved to meet the changing needs of the organization. Out of its original commitment to be a democratic organization, it created a structure to assure representation of all librarians on its Executive Council. The large number of professionals working in the UCLA libraries made it practical to have a representative structure. Accordingly, three divisions were created: Division I (Public Services), Division II (Technical Services), and Division III (Branch libraries). In addition there were two Member-at-Large positions to be filled by so-called "junior" librarians. In 1976, the divisional constituencies were revised because librarians in the branches outnumbered the other two divisions. In 1981 a Bylaw revision created five divisions and eliminated the Member-at-Large positions. The divisions are as equal in size as possible and a Committee on Membership and Reapportionment meets annually to determine if any changes are needed.

The Bylaws have undergone several major overhauls and many minor ones. In 1972 there was a major revision, and again in 1975, to bring them into conformity with the new status of LAUC in the University. In 1981, in addition to the division changes mentioned above, several significant revisions were made. The Committee on Appointments, Promotions, Tenure and Salaries changed its name to the Committee on Appointments, Promotions, Career Status, and Salary. While not explicitly stated, the implicit meaning of the action was that LAUC had finally come to terms with its own identity and was no longer pretending that its members belonged to the Academic Senate. A Committee on Programs was also established at this time. The next major revision followed the adoption of the contract between the UFL and the University. LAUC-LA restructured its committees to correspond more closely to those of the systemwide association.

In 1979 the Executive Council developed a Committee Interest Form for librarians to indicate on which groups they would be interested in serving. The form continues to ensure that everyone has an opportunity to serve, and identifies people who might be willing to run for office in the next election.

The first budget request, made by President Johanna Tallman in February 1968, was for \$200, to cover office expenses. Since the organization was not yet officially recognized by the University, donations to support activities such as attendance at systemwide meetings were solicited from members, and an account opened at Security Pacific Bank in March 1972. In 1976 the account was closed in favor of one at the UCLA Credit Union. In 1973 LAUC-LA gave \$50 to the Systemwide association. The following year a contribution of \$1.50 from each member was solicited, to be distributed as follows: 50 cents to Systemwide LAUC, 50 cents to LAUC-LA, and 50 cents to host the LAUC Assembly, which was held at Los Angeles that year. After LAUC's official recognition by the University the budget situation changed, since dues could no longer be collected. In 1976 LAUC-LA presented a budget request to the Chancellor, which

covered among other expenses round-trip airfares to the LAUC Assembly. Not until August 1980 did it have its own account number in the Library budget. In 1992 its annual budget was about \$6,000.

LAUC-LA'S ADVISORY ROLE

It was apparent from the earliest days that LAUC-LA took seriously its mandate to advise the Library Administration on matters relating to the operation of the Library and issues of professional concern. There was much discussion in 1973/74 about the role and status of the organization. University Librarian Page Ackerman met with the Executive Council several times, asking the association to identify specific areas in which it should be working in the Library, similar to its "essential role in handling peer review." In her 1973 Annual Report, President Phyllis Mirsky wrote that

one major issue facing the Association is the need for clarification of LAUC-LA's role vis-à-vis the Administration and a determination of areas of responsibility it might assume in the Administrative Network.

The UCLA Library Administration has over the last 25 years had a variety of administrative/organizational structures that bring together the Library's middle-managers. In February 1968 the suggestion was made to include the LAUC-LA President and Vice-President on department heads' mailings. From the beginning the association was represented at the Library Advisory Council, first by the President and later by Executive Council members on a rotating basis. When a reorganization in 1977 created the Library Executive Advisory Committee (LEAC) and the Administrative Information Meetings (AIMS), it continued to be represented at AIMS on a rotating basis by a member of the Executive Council. As these groups evolved into the Administrative Conference (AdCon), the LAUC-LA Chair (formerly President) was automatically a member by virtue of holding the office.

In August 1968 there was discussion about the appointment of an Assistant University Librarian for Personnel and Staff Development. LAUC-LA agreed that the person holding the position should have an M.L.S. A November 5, 1968 letter from President Jim Mink to UL Vosper declared:

The Executive Council further recommends, in fact, strongly urges, that the University Librarian, beginning early in 1969, adopt the custom of holding an annual meeting of the entire library staff to present a state-of-the-library message and answer and/or discuss questions from the floor.

In early 1970, President Norah Jones called a special meeting so that librarians could respond to a request from Personnel Librarian Anthony Greco for input on developing the sections of the University's Administrative Manual (later the Academic Personnel Manual) affecting librarians. LAUC-LA members have continued to be effective participants in analyzing and critiquing proposed revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual relevant to the librarian series.

For several years in the late 1970s and early 1980s, LAUC-LA responded to various iterations of the proposed Library Specialist Series, which attempted to create a classification of staff positions that it felt would seriously compromise the librarian series. LAUC-LA went on record as opposing all the proposals promulgated.

The LAUC-LA Committee on Library Policies grappled with the recurring problem of funding cutbacks in a 1982 Report of Budget Constraints. It formulated suggestions for the Administration on how to cope with the shrinking budget. Some of the issues covered were hours of service vs. quality of service, more communication with the staff, and decreasing staff size by vacancies and attrition rather than layoffs.

In August 1982, LAUC-LA responded to a request from University Librarian Russell Shank for input on the Library organization. Its suggestions included a number of ideas that have materialized, indicating either the effect of LAUC's advice or the similar approach and outlook of library management and the line librarians. For example, the association recommended a Personnel Officer for the Library (although opinion was mixed on whether the person should have an M.L.S.), a Collection Development Officer at the same level as the Assistant University Librarians for Public Services and Technical Services, and a Budget Officer with a strong accounting background. It wanted to assign outside fund-raising to someone on the staff, and felt a URL Librarian was not needed.

Again, in 1984, UL Shank "expressed interest in hearing how librarians feel about working in the UCLA library system." The Executive Council had lengthy debates on the question; some doubted their ability to achieve a real consensus of opinion, others sensed an opportunity to improve communication with the Administration. An open meeting of the membership was held in July, according to the 1983/84 Annual Report of the Chair, "to stimulate discussion about how librarians feel about being librarians at UCLA.... The results of the discussions were consolidated at the end of the meeting and were later synthesized by the Executive Council into a report for the University Librarian." One of the most important, though intangible, results of the July meeting was the public affirmation of the pride people had in being librarians at UCLA.

Since Gloria Werner became University Librarian in June 1990, she has met with the Executive Council a number of times and sought counsel on various issues affecting librarians. Some of the matters discussed relate to peer review, others to the direction the library must take as it faces the fiscal constraints of the 1990s.

Over the years LAUC-LA has been vigilant in tracking the appropriate classification of library positions. Several times it has questioned the posting of jobs in the Library Assistant instead of librarian series, and has raised the issue with administrators. In 1979 an intended library assistant position in the Chicano Studies Research Library was changed to a librarian posting. When the Graduate School of Library and Information Science planned to appoint a library assistant in charge of its Laboratory Collection, LAUC-LA questioned the decision and the classification was changed to the librarian series. A library assistant posting in the Data Archives of the Institute for Social Science Research was likewise changed to a librarian position.

Much of the work of LAUC-LA committees has consisted of responding to systemwide reports or requests for information. In 1980, for example, the association was asked to respond to a letter written by Ann Hinckley, UCLA's Head of Reference, to LAUC President Joyce Toscan. She raised the issue of whether librarians should be expected to fulfill Criteria 2-4 for

advancement, suggesting that Criterion 1 was sufficient. At the LAUC-LA Spring Meeting the membership discussed the letter and voted not to recommend any changes in the criteria.

Local issues were occasionally introduced, resulting in committee reports, discussion and incorporation into local procedures. In 1984 the Committee on Appointments, Promotions, Career Status, and Salary proposed that "union activity" be "considered valid University Service just as LAUC activity is considered University Service." The recommendation was accepted by the Executive Council and incorporated into the "Data Summary Guidelines."

In 1985 the consideration of several major issues by the Committee on Library Policies resulted in important statements on behalf of UCLA librarians. The first was a "Report on the Utilization of Volunteers in the UCLA Library System," which concluded, after a thorough investigation, that "UCLA should not utilize volunteers within the Library System." Its second report was on "Emeritus Status for Librarians," an issue raised by LAUC-R members recently retired or about to retire. Since emeritus status is not automatically conferred on retired librarians, the committee looked at the available options and recommended that "the Library Administration take a more active role in reviewing the careers of individuals retiring at the Rank of Librarian, the highest in the title series, and put forth for nomination to Emeritus status those who have demonstrated substantial and significant achievement on a continuing basis."

The Status of LAUC-LA

Following the 1975 enabling letter from President Hitch, establishing LAUC as an official organizational unit of the University, the position of LAUC-LA underwent some subtle changes. The Administrative Group (UL and AULs) invited the association to meet and discuss the new status and its implications. At about the same time Page Ackerman announced her retirement. The Executive Council immediately began investigating how to become involved in the search for a new University Librarian. Its request crossed in the mail with a letter from Executive Vice Chancellor William Gerberding asking for nominations of librarians to serve on the search committee. *The desire of LAUC-LA to be involved in a serious way in library operations was articulated early, as this excerpt from the minutes of the March 3, 1972 Council meeting illustrates:*

After some mention that a number of high level library personnel will be retiring in the next few years, and that it was quite likely that there would be reorganization and restructuring...a suggestion was made that a resolution from the Executive Council would be in order. The resolution to be submitted to Mr. Vosper, University Librarian, with copies to A. Greco, Assistant University Librarian (Personnel) and the *Library Newsletter*, read as follows: As the result of their deliberations on 3 March 1972, the Executive Council of the UCLA Librarians Association wishes to reiterate their position that the Association must participate in all stages of position planning and staff selection at the level of Librarian III and above.

The Library Administrative Officers requested a meeting with the Executive Council to discuss the resolution. They agreed to consider a procedure for ensuring better communication and

feedback between LAUC and the Administration when positions such as unit heads were to be posted and applicants from both inside and outside the UCLA library system were to be considered for the position. Designated LAUC-LA representatives have served on search committees for all subsequent AUL and UL positions.

The association was asked to comment on UCLA Chancellor Charles E. Young's performance when he was reviewed several years ago. The Chair, Vice-Chair and Past Chair have met with various Vice Chancellors to discuss issues of concern to the membership. When APM revisions relating to librarians have been proposed, the Vice-Chancellor for Faculty Relations has asked for LAUC-LA's comments before formulating his reply to the Office of the President.

PEER REVIEW

The transfer of librarian personnel matters from the Non-Academic to the Academic Personnel Office highlighted the need to develop a mechanism for peer review. Activists believed it was essential for LAUC-LA to make its proposals for personnel evaluation procedures before the Academic Personnel Office did, since the latter's might have unacceptable elements—such as having Senate faculty sit on librarians' review committees. In February 1968 Ed Kaye, chair of the Committee on Appointments, Promotions, Tenure and Salaries, met with University Librarian Vosper and AUL Page Ackerman on having librarians review recommendations for reclassification, and in March the Library Administration agreed to let an ad hoc committee "observe the 1968 round of reclassification actions."

The Ad Hoc Committee to Observe Evaluation, Promotion and Appointment Procedures (March 1968 to November 1969), chaired by Mildred Badger, prepared a report suggesting a 5-member committee to review all recommendations for promotion and all documentation relating to applicants for appointment. Discussion of the report revealed that some librarians still perceived themselves as staff rather than as academic. For example, some suggested that librarians could take classes to prepare for future promotion. Others felt that "criteria for appointment and promotion are still too exclusively job oriented and do not allow enough scope for recognition of individual professional and academic development." Because of these concerns, the Continuing Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation, Promotion and Appointment Procedures (January to July 1969), chaired by Ed Kaye, was appointed to work on a proposal for a permanent structure.

The committee held a number of open meetings to involve as many as possible in the design of a proposal which would be acceptable to librarians and would meet the requirements of the Academic Personnel Office. Many of the proposals from these meetings are still adhered to: people should not sit on the review committees of members of their own department; time limits (e.g., a calendar) should be set; appointees may initiate actions on their own behalf; candidates may request that certain persons not be on their review committees. After incorporating suggestions made at the various meetings, a Final Report, "Proposal for the Establishment of an Association Committee to Advise the University Librarian on the Appointment, Promotion, and Reclassification of Librarians at UCLA," was submitted to the membership and overwhelmingly approved in July 1969 by a vote of 120 to 13.

The basic structure of the peer review process described in the Final Report has withstood the test of time. Over the years, various refinements and adjustments have kept the process in

conformity with current APM provisions and new policies adopted by LAUC-LA, but the framework remains intact. The Committee-at-Large (now called the Committee on Peer Review), from which 3-person subcommittees are selected, is coordinated by the Vice-Chair of LAUC-LA, who transmits review files from the Administration to the confidential review committees. Each year the Committee-at-Large has reported on any difficulties encountered. This is still done under the rubric of Peer Review Committee Debriefing, and suggestions may be incorporated in the next year's procedures. (Footnote: the record number of reviews conducted in a short time period would undoubtedly be the 133 personnel actions completed in six days in June 1973.)

One section of the Final Report defined "Criteria for Appointments, Reclassifications, and Promotions" based upon the University-wide "Criteria for Appointment and Promotion" already in place for teaching faculty. The four criteria were: (1) Librarianship; (2) Professional Competence and Activity; (3) University and Community Service; and (4) Research and Other Creative Work. Some initial concern that Criterion 4 would catch librarians in a "publish or perish" trap has not materialized.

In 1975 the Library Personnel Office issued "Procedure for Personnel Actions on Appointees in the Librarian Series at UCLA." This has been incorporated into the annual Call for Recommendations for Academic Merit Increases, Promotions, and Career Status (the "Call"), which "provides instructions, guidelines, and summaries of policies regarding merit increase, promotion, and career status recommendations affecting appointees in the librarian series at UCLA." The Call also includes several appendices, some of which were originally LAUC-LA reports adopted by the membership. Also, although the Call is an Administration document, LAUC-LA is regularly asked for suggestions of additions and clarifications to be incorporated into the next year's edition. A major revision of the Call was done in 1978 and another in December 1980, when the "Statement of Professional Achievements" (SPA) was introduced. This document, written by the candidate under review, was designed to explicate the activities outlined under Criteria 2-4 in the Data Summary. The SPA is specifically not a self-evaluation, which has traditionally not been required of UCLA librarians; its intent is to provide each candidate with an opportunity to identify individual career goals and to assess accomplishments, achievements and potential in relation to them.

In the late 1970s the tradition of having an annual meeting to discuss the Call and the peer review process at UCLA was instituted. The Call meeting featured brief presentations by the University Librarian, a Review Initiator and the Peer Review Coordinator (the LAUC-LA Vice-Chair), designed to acquaint all librarians with the peer review process at UCLA. It was also an opportunity for the UL to state publicly the expectations for various personnel actions (e.g., merit increases, promotion or movement to Librarian V). In 1984 the first Peer Review Documentation Workshop was held, to help librarians prepare their review packets. It was more informal than the annual meeting on the Call, offering helpful hints on gathering and organizing material for the Data Summary and guidelines on what to include in the Statement of Professional Achievements.

In 1981 the Committee on Appointments, Promotions, Tenure and Salaries, chaired by Judy Kantor, prepared a major report, "Criteria Guidelines for Librarian Personnel Action." Following discussion at LAUC-LA's Spring 1981 Assembly, it was adopted and included as an Appendix to the Call the following year. In August 1987, the "Criteria Guidelines" were revised to make them more concise, eliminate redundancies, and give a sense of progression through the ranks.

At the same time the "Data Summary Guidelines" were also revised to clarify the categories, accommodate changes in librarians' activities, and standardize the format. These two documents are distributed to all LAUC-LA members as part of the Call.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT & RESEARCH

Support for librarians' professional activities has been a recurring issue. The first funding discussions focused on attendance at systemwide LAUC Assemblies. In July 1973 Page Ackerman asked LAUC-LA to send her an "official request" for travel support and per diem for the systemwide meetings. She also noted that professional development opportunities should be "a matter of cooperation among the Administration, the Librarians Association, and the Library School Liaison Committee." In November 1973 one-half of the travel expenses were given to the delegates to attend the Assembly at Santa Cruz. In 1976 round-trip airfares were covered, establishing a practice that remains in effect.

The handling of funding for professional travel for some time reflected the inconsistent attitude of the Library Administration toward librarians. In 1973 a special Ad Hoc Committee on Travel Funds was set up by the Librarians Association and the Library Staff Association, to formulate a realistic proposal for the equitable disbursement of the limited travel funds available. Both librarians and library assistants were appointed to an administrative Staff Development Committee, which awarded travel money to all. The work of the committee, which tried to meet the differing needs of librarians and paraprofessional staff, was made more difficult because the available funds varied from year to year according to the budget situation.

In April 1974 the Ad Hoc Professional Development Committee reported that it had drawn up a preliminary list of subjects important to professional development, but that substantive matters could not be considered until decisions were made on the source of funding, the amount of funding, and the activities eligible for such support.

In September 1980 money for librarians' research became available through the University Research Grants for Librarians Program, augmented by the UCLA Faculty Development Program. The Committee on Academic Status was charged to prepare criteria and procedures for awarding the funds. Among its recommendations were the establishment of an ad hoc committee to make the awards and its conversion to a standing committee after two years. An Ad Hoc Committee on Research was formed to review proposals for the systemwide program. Locally, however, Faculty Development Program proposals were until 1984 reviewed by a committee consisting of the University Librarian, the Chair of LAUC and the chair of the Staff Development Committee.

With the advent of minimum Professional Development Funding guaranteed by the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) ratified in August 1984 by the UFL and the University, responsibility for distributing all professional development funding for librarians was transferred to the LAUC-LA Committee on Research and Professional Development in October, 1984. Since the contract gave each campus the authority to allocate the funds to research or other activities, extensive discussion on how this should be done ensued. The proportion of money reserved for research varied from year to year. As travel costs increased, LAUC-LA made the decision to put more of the professional development money into that category and forward research proposals for systemwide consideration. In 1986 the Research Committee developed a Mini-Grant program,

which would make \$500 awards to librarians wanting to undertake some preliminary research for a larger project or to work on a small project.

OTHER PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS

Academic Status

As librarians endeavored to establish themselves as academic staff within the University community, they were continually faced with obstacles both large and small. One of the earliest LAUC-LA committees concerned itself with ensuring "junior librarians" (those at L-1 and L-2 ranks) a reduced membership fee in the Faculty Center, comparable to that offered Assistant Professors. Although there was some support, Jim Mink's annual report of the President for the year 1968/69 reported that the Faculty Center declined to change its policy pending a reassessment of the total dues structure. The situation had not changed by 1976, when Ann Hinckley wrote to the UCLA Legal Counsel about the Faculty Center's discrimination against Assistant Librarians.

In 1974 a major issue was to what extent and under what circumstances librarians should show manuscripts to their supervisors before submitting them for publication. A report, "Standards of Publications for UCLA Librarians," was prepared jointly by the Library Policies Committee and the Committee on Appointments, Promotions, Salaries, and Tenure.

LAUC-LA and the Academic Senate

LAUC-LA has had a somewhat ambivalent relationship with the Academic Senate at UCLA. From the earliest period, even before the association was founded, there was some sentiment for librarians becoming members of the Senate. One of the papers in "Goals for UCLA Librarians" (1969) provides this tantalizing tidbit:

Some years ago the UCLA Senate voted to include professional librarians in the Academic Senate. This noble effort sank without a trace when it encountered the need for approval by the Berkeley [i.e., Universitywide] Academic Senate.

UL Vosper supported the objective, but overtures made after the Hoos and Spiess committee reports were not well received. LAUC-LA President Norah Jones also dealt with the issue in her 1969/70 Annual Report. In 1969 an administrative committee, appointed by Chancellor Charles Young to follow up on the Hoos and Spiess reports, had recommended

full Senate membership for librarians of the rank of V [the top rank of the librarian series, reserved for department heads] and above, and inclusion of others in a parallel non-Senate body which is envisioned as a loose federation of such work-oriented associations as the librarians have already formed. Since any decisions regarding changes in the composition of the Academic Senate are likely to be made no later than this spring [1971], it is essential that the

Association clarify its own views on the question of Senate membership without delay.

However, LAUC-LA was overly optimistic in thinking that any real change would take place. The recommendation for AULs and Librarian Vs to be accepted as Senate members was not even referred to the Ad Hoc Reorganization Committee of the Academic Senate in 1970.

In 1975 the Senate Committee on Library invited LAUC-LA to send observers to its meetings. At first the President appointed the representatives, but eventually the responsibility devolved to the Chair and Past Chair. In 1976 and 1979 attempts were made to have librarians appointed to other Senate committees, but to no avail. In 1991 the Executive Council, after analyzing which committees would be of particular interest to librarians, tried once more to initiate communication with the Academic Senate, but the latter still declined to permit librarians on any of its bodies other than the Committee on Library.

Collective Bargaining

Before the official recognition of LAUC by the University in 1975, librarians at UCLA were informing themselves on collective bargaining and investigating how LAUC related to it. At the March 23, 1972 General Meeting of the UCLA Librarians Association, one agenda item was "Collective Bargaining for Academic Librarians." On October 4 of the same year there was a special meeting to discuss a proposed Committee on Salaries, and the position of LAUC vis-à-vis the University Council-American Federation of Teachers (UC-AFT) on the salary question. At issue was whether LAUC should support UC-AFT in its effort to obtain a larger inequity salary adjustment than was granted by the University. The members finally decided that a formal liaison between UC-AFT and LAUC could do more harm than good at that time. In early 1973 there was some talk of LAUC becoming a "voluntary organization" as an alternative to establishing stronger ties to the University; but the following year the Los Angeles delegates to the systemwide Assembly were instructed by the membership to vote against a proposed standing committee of representatives from voluntary organizations such as UC-AFT or the California State Employees Association (CSEA).

After the 1984 Memorandum of Understanding, the association saw a resurgence of interest and activity. UCLA librarians were deeply involved in the systemwide ad hoc committees on APM revisions and a Librarian Code of Conduct, appointed as a direct result of MOU provisions. LAUC-LA and the UFL have often addressed the same issue from their respective points of view, which in many instances have been complementary.

LAUC-LA and its Members

As with any organization, LAUC-LA has faced periods of declining interest among its membership. Various attempts to encourage wider participation have been introduced over the years. In October, 1983, LAUC-LA Divisions held caucuses to discuss the future direction of LAUC. This came as a result of the imminent beginning of contract negotiations between the UFL and the University. Four main areas of concern emerged from these meetings:

1. Revitalizing LAUC-LA through a restructure of the Divisions, holding quarterly instead of twice-yearly meetings, and using more ad hoc committees instead of standing committees;
2. Promoting and encouraging professional development activities;
3. Increasing LAUC-LA's advisory role vis-à-vis the Library Administration on relevant issues;
4. Improving communication through the library newsletter, HELP LAUC screen on ORION, inviting new librarians to LAUC-LA Executive Council meetings.

The annual meeting schedule was not changed, nor were there more ad hoc committees, but the other concerns were addressed. In fact, the issue of improving communication re-surfaced in 1991, at which time a LAUC-LA e-mail distribution system was set up so that all minutes, reports, election information, etc., could be sent to each member. This ensured that everyone would receive the information and, secondarily, resulted in a significant conservation of paper. With the recognition that many new appointees to the librarian series were unfamiliar with LAUC's role and history, an ad hoc committee was charged in 1987 with developing a LAUC brochure. It defined academic status at the University of California, gave a brief history of LAUC and its organization, and described the peer review process and documents governing librarians' employment at the University of California, and encouraged librarians to become involved.

At the 1990 Spring Membership Meeting, one agenda item bore a provocative title: "Is LAUC Dead?" It drew a large attendance, and launched a series of discussions over the next two years which resulted in a new phase of interest in LAUC. The genesis of the discussion was the report of the previous year's Nominating Committee, which had had an extremely difficult time finding candidates to run for LAUC-LA Chair. An Ad Hoc Committee on LAUC Participation identified problem areas, and found echos of many of the sentiments expressed six years earlier in the division caucuses. Another extremely successful event was a structured, brainstorming session organized by the LAUC-LA Program Committee in February 1992. Out of all this came a report by the Committee on LAUC-LA Participation, which was discussed at the 1992 Spring Membership Meeting. The intense introspection was a good investment: more people were willing to accept nomination for LAUC office.

LAUC-LA and the Outside World

LAUC-LA and the UCLA Library Staff Association have had a symbiotic relationship over the years. From the earliest days, the two organizations exchanged representatives at their respective board meetings. The issues on their agendas were often similar and concerned the work environment and conditions of employment. After 1984, when separate collective bargaining agreements covering most librarians and staff were approved, it was necessary to change this relationship. The Library Staff Association confined its activities to social and educational programs and could no longer deal with working conditions. At the same time, following the ratification of the first Memorandum of Understanding between the UFL and the University, LAUC's advisory role became more prominent and the issues it faced were more appropriately dealt with only by librarians.

In the late 1970s, the idea arose that UCLA librarians should interact more with our colleagues across town at the University of Southern California. Accordingly, on August 18, 1978, about thirty LAUC-LA members traveled to USC for outdoor games and a barbecue dinner. UCLA reciprocated on May 11, 1979, with a dinner event held in UCLA's Sunset Recreation Center. The number of USC librarians who accepted our invitation was far fewer than the number of UCLA librarians who had gone to USC. There have been no further attempts at cross-town socializing.

CONCLUSION

LAUC-LA has had a productive first quarter-century. Over 125 librarians have served as officers and members of the Executive Council. Countless others have served on numerous ad hoc and standing committees. UCLA librarians have played a positive, constructive role in shaping their working environment and establishing themselves as involved members of the academic community. Participation in LAUC, at both the local and systemwide levels, has given individual line librarians the opportunity to develop leadership skills and grapple with broad professional and University issues without holding a managerial position. The next 25 years will undoubtedly present new challenges for the association, but if its past is any indication, LAUC-LA, as a mature organization, is up to the task.

OFFICERS

September 26, 1967 - April 19, 1968

President:	Johanna E. Tallman
Vice-President:	James Mink
Secretary:	Norman Dudley
Division 1 Rep.:	Jim Davis
Division 2 Rep.:	Charlotte Spence
Division 3 Rep.:	Helen Alexander
Member-at-Large:	Henrietta Freeman
Member-at-Large:	Janet Ziegler
Past President:	Frances Kirschenbaum

April 19, 1968 - April 30, 1969

President:	James Mink
Vice-President:	Norah Jones
Secretary:	Ralph Johnson
Division 1 Rep.:	Jim Davis
Division 2 Rep.:	Gia Aivasian
Division 3 Rep.:	Donald Luck (to Dec. 31); Carlos Hagen
Member-at-Large:	Michael Berger
Member-at-Large:	Marcia Endore
Past President:	Johanna E. Tallman

May 1, 1969 - April 30, 1970

President:	Norah Jones
Vice-President:	Robert Collison
Secretary:	Bruce Pelz
Division 1 Rep.:	Jan Goldberg
Division 2 Rep.:	Elizabeth Herman
Division 3 Rep.:	Wendell Yeatts, Norman Handelsman
Member-at-Large:	Ann Mitchell
Member-at-Large:	Dino Sanchez
Past President:	James Mink

May 1, 1970 - April 30, 1971

President:	Robert Collison
Vice-President:	Donald Coombs
Secretary:	Elizabeth Eisenbach
Division 1 Rep.:	Janice Koyama

Division 2 Rep.:	Frances (Kirschenbaum) Zeitlin
Division 3 Rep.:	Betsey Beamish
Member-at-Large:	Helen Palmer
Member-at-Large:	Bruce Pelz
Past President:	Norah Jones

May 1, 1971 - December 31, 1971

President:	Donald Coombs (to Sep.); Bruce Pelz
Vice-President:	Bruce Pelz (to Sep.)
Secretary:	Janice Koyama
Division 1 Rep.:	Alvis Price
Division 2 Rep.:	Arline Zuckerman
Division 3 Rep.:	Lelde Gilman
Member-at-Large:	Barbara Silvernail
Member-at-Large:	Oscar Sims
Past President:	Robert Collison

1972

President:	Bruce Pelz
Vice-President:	Helen Alexander (to Nov. 30)
Secretary:	Dorothy Wells
Division 1 Rep.:	Rosita Lo Russo
Division 2 Rep.:	Bob Eckert
Division 3 Rep.:	Fauna Finger
Member-at-Large:	Gia Aivasian
Member-at-Large:	Miki Goral
Past President:	[vacant]

1973

President:	Phyllis Mirsky
Vice-President:	Bob Eckert
Secretary:	Nancy Brault, Roberta Medford
Division 1 Rep.:	Shirley Riggs (to Sep.)
Division 1 Rep.:	Jan Goldberg (Sep.-Dec.)
Division 2 Rep.:	Ruth Trager
Division 3 Rep.:	Dan Richards
Rep.-at-Large:	Mark Shier
Rep.-at-Large:	Sandra Taylor
Past President:	Bruce Pelz

1974

President:	Bob Eckert
Vice-President:	Elizabeth Herman
Secretary:	Olga Ignon
Division 1 Rep.:	Dorothy Wells
Division 2 Rep.:	Ana Duarte
Division 3 Rep.:	Anne Thomas (to Sep.)
Division 3 Rep.:	Pieter Dekkers (Oct.-Dec.)
Rep.-at-Large:	Don Lee
Rep.-at-Large:	Rosita (Lo Russo) Mal
Past President:	Phyllis Mirsky

1975

President:	Elizabeth Herman
Vice-President:	Alvis Price
Secretary:	Dorothy McGarry
Division 1 Rep.:	Miki Goral
Division 2 Rep.:	Giselle von Grunebaum
Division 3 Rep.:	San Oak Kim
Member-at-Large:	Jo Anne Boorkman
Member-at-Large:	Betty Takemoto
Past President:	Bob Eckert

1976

President:	Alvis Price
Vice-President:	Margaret McKinley
Secretary:	Ruth Trager
Division 1 Rep.:	Dorothy Wells
Division 2 Rep.:	Oscar Sims
Division 3 Rep.:	Bob Bellanti
Rep.-at-Large:	Eudora Loh
Rep.-at-Large:	Carole Wilson
Past President:	Elizabeth Herman

1977

President:	Margaret McKinley
Vice-President:	Dan Richards
Secretary:	Norman Handelsman
Division 1 Rep.:	Joyce Ludmer
Division 2 Rep.:	Amira (Lefkowitz) Green

Division 3 Rep.:	Gail Yokote
Member-at-Large:	Gary Lance
Member-at-Large:	Mary Talley
Past President:	Alvis Price

January 1, 1978 - August 31, 1978

President:	Dan Richards
Vice-President:	Jean Aroeste
Secretary:	Bob Bellanti
Division 1 Rep.:	Andrea Roberts
Division 2 Rep.:	Ana Duarte
Division 3 Rep.:	Don Lee
Rep.-at-Large:	Deborah Costa
Rep.-at-Large:	Marion Peters
Past President:	Margaret McKinley

September 1, 1978 - August 31, 1979

President:	Jean Aroeste (to Dec.); Alison Bunting
Vice-President:	Alison Bunting (to Dec.)
Secretary:	Jim Davis
Division 1 Rep.:	Jill Caldwell
Division 2 Rep.:	Michael Randall
Division 3 Rep.:	Kathryn Walsh
Rep.-at-Large:	Gabrielle Ouellette
Rep.-at-Large:	Camille Wanat
Past President:	Dan Richards

September 1, 1979 - August 31, 1980

President:	Alison Bunting
Vice-President:	Nancy Pruett
Secretary:	Camille Wanat/Leslie Green
Division 1 Rep.:	Audree Malkin
Division 2 Rep.:	Leon Gabrielian
Division 3 Rep.:	Betsey Beamish
Rep.-at-Large:	Sandra Card
Rep.-at-Large:	Roberta Elyea
Past President:	

September 1, 1980 - August 31, 1981

President:	Nancy Pruett (to Mar.); Dorothy McGarry
Vice-President:	Dorothy McGarry (to Mar.)
Secretary:	Helen Palmer
Division 1 Rep.:	Mona McCormick
Division 2 Rep.:	Giselle von Grunebaum
Division 3 Rep.:	Pat Walter
Member-at-Large:	Norma Pasillas
Member-at-Large:	Pat Wright
Past President:	Alison Bunting

September 1, 1981 - August 31, 1982

President:	Dorothy McGarry
Vice-President:	Bob Bellanti
Secretary:	Suzanne Shellaby
Division 1 Rep.:	Cecelia Polan
Division 2 Rep.:	Mary Greco
Division 3 Rep.:	Betty Takahashi
Division 4 Rep.:	Gordon Theil
Division 5 Rep.:	Karen Andrews
Past President:	[vacant]

September 1, 1982 - August 31, 1983

President:	Bob Bellanti
Vice-President:	Amira Lefkowitz (to Feb.); Eudora Loh
Secretary:	Marion Peters
Division 1 Rep.:	Diane Bisom
Division 2 Rep.:	Dunning Wilson
Division 3 Rep.:	Teresa Portilla
Division 4 Rep.:	Victoria Steele (to Jan.); Jenifer Abramson
Division 5 Rep.:	Peter Brueggeman
Past President:	Dorothy McGarry

September 1, 1983 - August 31, 1984

President:	Eudora Loh
Vice-President:	Lelde Gilman
Secretary:	Teresa Portilla
Division 1 Rep.:	Josephine Crawford
Division 2 Rep.:	Joseph Lauer
Division 3 Rep.:	Janet Ziegler

Division 4 Rep.: Kate Pecarovich
Division 5 Rep.: Diane Johnson
Past President: Bob Bellanti

September 1, 1984 - August 31, 1985

President: Lelde Gilman
Vice-President: Constance Nyhan
Secretary: Elaine Graham
Division 1 Rep.: Mary Carter
Division 2 Rep.: Leon Ferder
Division 3 Rep.: Patti Caravello (exc. Jan.-Aug.); Amy Tsiang
Division 4 Rep.: Karen Sternheim
Division 5 Rep.: Sara Shatford
Past President: Eudora Loh

September 1, 1985 - August 31, 1986

President: Constance Nyhan
Vice-President: Joyce Ludmer
Secretary: Deborah Costa
Division 1 Rep.: Helen Palmer
Division 2 Rep.: Lauri Sebo
Division 3 Rep.: Mona McCormick
Division 4 Rep.: Jan Goldsmith
Division 5 Rep.: Kay Deeney
Past President: Lelde Gilman

September 1, 1986 - August 31, 1987

President: Joyce Ludmer
Vice-President: Elaine Graham
Secretary: Lauri Sebo
Division 1 Rep.: Brian Schottlaender
Division 2 Rep.: Miki Goral
Division 3 Rep.: Roberta Medford
Division 4 Rep.: Roberta Walters
Division 5 Rep.: Louise Spear
Past President: Constance Nyhan

September 1, 1987 - August 31, 1988

President:	Elaine Graham
Vice-President:	Karen Sternheim
Secretary:	Ed Shreeves
Division 1 Rep.:	Ida Muellner
Division 2 Rep.:	Gail Nelson
Division 3 Rep.:	Lise Snyder
Division 4 Rep.:	Teresa Jacobsen
Division 5 Rep.:	Irene Lovas
Past President:	Joyce Ludmer

September 1, 1988 - August 31, 1989

Chair:	Karen Sternheim (to Apr.); Brian Schottlaender (Apr.-June); George Gibbs (Acting)
Vice-Chair:	Brian Schottlaender (to Apr.)
Secretary:	Beryl Glitz
Division 1 Rep.:	Cindy Shelton
Division 2 Rep.:	John Lawrence (to Feb.); Hannah Walker
Division 3 Rep.:	Chere Negaard
Division 4 Rep.:	Ronda Breitbard
Division 5 Rep.:	Victor Cardell
Past President:	Elaine Graham (to Feb.); Joyce Ludmer

September 1, 1989 - August 31, 1990

Chair:	George Gibbs (to Mar. 15); Miki Goral
Vice-Chair:	Miki Goral (to Mar. 15)
Secretary:	Anita Colby
Division 1 Rep.:	Jeff Morehead
Division 2 Rep.:	Melissa Beck
Division 3 Rep.:	Diane Zwemer
Division 4 Rep.:	Janet Carter
Division 5 Rep.:	Michael Noga
Past President:	Karen Sternheim

September 1, 1990 - August 31, 1991

Chair:	Miki Goral
Vice-Chair:	Esther Grassian
Secretary:	Cathy Brown
Division 1 Rep.:	David Hirsch
Division 2 Rep.:	Barbara Phillips

Division 3 Rep.:	Phil Bantin (to Apr.)
Division 4 Rep.:	Brian Warling
Division 5 Rep.:	Marion Peters
Past President:	Karen Sternheim

September 1, 1991 - August 31, 1992

Chair:	Esther Grassian
Vice-Chair:	Beryl Glitz
Secretary:	Rita Costello
Division 1 Rep.:	Michael Olson
Division 2 Rep.:	Brigitte Kueppers
Division 3 Rep.:	Peter Hadley
Division 4 Rep.:	Suzanne Shellaby
Division 5 Rep.:	Rhonda Lawrence
Past President:	Miki Goral

September 1, 1992 - August 31, 1993

Chair:	Beryl Glitz
Vice-Chair:	Karen Andrews
Secretary:	Melissa Beck
Division 1 Rep.:	Ann Bein
Division 2 Rep.:	Diane Childs
Division 3 Rep.:	Deborah Costa
Division 4 Rep.:	Amy Butros
Division 5 Rep.:	Maureen Russell
Past President:	Esther Grassian