



The Pre-history

On a grey, foggy morning in San Francisco during a Convention of the American Library Association, more than 150 librarians braved the traffic and the daunting hour of 8:00 a.m. to organize an association of professional librarians within the University of California. The date—June 27, 1967—is often referred to as the birthdate of the Librarians Association of the University of California, invariably known to its members as LAUC.

The meeting unanimously passed a resolution that "an all-UC librarians organization be formed." A Statement of Purpose and scope for the organization was also approved. The first named as its objectives:

1. To create a forum where matters of concern to librarians in the University of California may be discussed and an appropriate course of action determined.
2. To set and enforce professional standards and the rights, privileges and obligations of librarians at the University of California.
3. To promote full utilization of the professional skills and abilities of librarians, to improve library service and collections, and to protect librarians at the University of California.
4. To propose to the University administration, at the earliest possible date, that this organization be recognized by the University of California as the official state-wide body within the University structure where librarians have the opportunity to participate in the deliberative and decision-making process of the University. This group would function for librarians in a fashion similar

to the manner in which the Academic Senate functions for officers of instruction.

The Statement of Purpose also outlined the methods by which librarians would be organized. On each campus a local association would be formed, as well as a local advisory or liaison committee "to open formal channels of communication between the local associations and their respective University Librarians, local Academic Senates, and appropriate Senate and University committees." Additionally, the systemwide organization was to "petition the University administration for direct representation of the state-wide organization on the Library Council" and also to establish lines of communication with "the Library Council, the Academic Senate, the University administration, and any other pertinent body or group" and the systemwide organization.

Why was this group formed at this time, with this statement of purpose? The impetus came partly from activities within the University of California, partly from changes affecting the role and status of librarians in the national academic environment, and partly from the general activist climate of the time.

A headline in the *San Francisco Chronicle* for June 27, 1967—HIPPIES IN DANGER—provides some insight into the general environment. It was a period of activism. The Vietnam War was raging, rioting and urban violence was taking place in Detroit, Boston, Newark and other cities. The "Free Speech Movement" had begun at Berkeley just three years earlier. On campuses across the country librarians had begun to agitate for academic and sometimes faculty status. Throughout the 1960s the national trend was toward providing university librarians with some measure of academic recognition; the University of Illinois took the lead in granting them faculty status. By the mid-1960s the Illinois pattern had been adopted with some modifications at a number of other institutions, including state universities in Iowa, Kansas and Colorado.

In the University of California, the basic personnel pattern for professional librarians had been established in 1946. At that time it was one of the most progressive in the country, but it had not kept pace with the changes taking place in the library profession or in its job market.

In the early 1960s the University opened three new campuses within two years—Irvine, 1964; San Diego and Santa Cruz, both 1965—and the libraries of the established campuses were expanding rapidly. The need for new librarians was critical, but a non-competitive salary scale and an archaic personnel scheme obstructed their recruitment.

The University librarians became acutely aware of the lack of competitiveness. Library Council—then composed of the nine University Librarians, the Deans of the University's two schools of librarianship, the Director and Assistant Director of the University's Institute of Library Research, the University Vice President for Academic Affairs and the chair of the systemwide Academic Senate Library Committee—began petitioning the University's Office of the President (UCOP) for an increase in librarians' salaries and for a change in the structure of the librarian series. A formal review of the latter was undertaken by the UC Personnel Office in 1961, with the assistance of Library Council's Subcommittee on Personnel. The result was a new classification scheme and a new salary scale. No documentation suggests that librarians were consulted in these actions; on the contrary, they appear to have had virtually no say on either of them.

The new classification plan went into effect in July 1962. Stated goals of the restructuring were to provide for local campus control of reclassification and promotions, to provide for the granting of merit increases of varying amounts to recognize individual performance, and "to emphasize the close tie between the librarian's responsibility and the teaching and research function of the University."

The plan expanded the librarian series from four classes to five. Librarian I was the entry level, intended as a haven for no more than three to four years. Librarian II was described as the full professional level for those without major management or administrative duties, and the career rank for the majority of librarians. Librarian III would be granted to those with administrative responsibility for a moderately large department or with responsibility for the development and management of specialized collections. Librarians IV and V were basically management positions.

A memo of February 6, 1962 from the UC Personnel Office, outlining this proposal, reads:

It is proposed that the system recognize three major areas of concern in the operations of the university's libraries:

1. The development of collections and service for undergraduate instruction and faculty and graduate research needs;
2. The administration of the organization established to develop the collections and give service; and
3. The application of appropriate technology to all operations. All three are important to high quality University library service.

Under the old salary scale, salary increases had been limited to a single range adjustment, 6% for the last fiscal year. Under the new plan they could vary from 2% to 7.5% per year, depending on class and step. The UC Personnel Office also allocated to the campuses a certain number of positions in each rank. Each Chancellor was authorized to allocate positions to classes, to appoint individuals to positions, to set initial salaries and to determine individual salary adjustments. Most of the Chancellors delegated the authority to the University Librarians.

Although the restructuring was not discussed with the librarians involved, the University Librarians voiced concern. Some, such as Berkeley's Donald Coney, pointed out inequities that would result if the system was implemented. In spite of these protests the new structure went into effect in July 1962.

In addition to low salary scales and a non-responsive personnel structure, librarians in the University of California were becoming increasingly aware of their lack of academic status and security of employment. In July 1962 University President Clark Kerr issued a directive that moved librarians, who had previously been classified as staff, from nonacademic to academic status. Again, there was no consultation with the librarians. The directive, published in the June 18, 1962 issue of the *University Bulletin*, declared:

Effective July 1, 1962, professional librarians will be classified as academic employees, and will come under the jurisdiction of the Academic Personnel Offices.

It was amended on July 2, 1962 to read:

At the systemwide level they will come under the jurisdiction of the Academic Personnel Unit in my office.... The change from nonacademic to academic status will not affect existing fringe benefits and working conditions.

Although the change in status was implemented with the new structure, it was to be several years before sections designated for the librarian series were to appear in the Administrative Manual (now the Academic Personnel Manual), which contains systemwide policies and procedures for academic employees. Also, the pace of the changeover of jurisdiction from staff personnel offices to academic affairs units varied greatly from campus to campus; in some cases it was a number of years before all personnel matters for librarians were handled in the Offices of Academic Affairs.

The lack of status for librarians became increasingly evident during 1966, when three significant events took place. They become known as the Ishimatsu Case, the Hoos committee and the Spiess committee.

The Ishimatsu case took its name from a librarian on the San Francisco campus, Chizuko Ishimatsu, who was terminated from her position despite positive evaluations of her work. The decision was appealed to President Kerr and the Regents of the University, and finally reached the California District Court of Appeal, where the dismissal was upheld. It became abundantly clear that librarians within the University of California did not have security of employment.

The objective of both the Spiess and Hoos committees was to study the situation of non-Senate academics. The first—formally the Special Committee on Non-Senate Academic Ranks—was established in June 1966 by the UC Academic Senate. Chaired by Professor F.N. Spiess of Scripps Institute of Oceanography, it was composed primarily of faculty, but included UC-Davis University Librarian J.R. Blanchard. It issued its report in May 1967 and revised it a year later. The other was an administrative committee appointed by the Office of the President. Chaired by Professor Sidney Hoos, most of its members were administrative staff from UCOP. William Wenz, UCB Library Personnel Officer, represented the libraries.

The committees held some joint meetings. They were studying the same topic but with different objectives: the Hoos committee primarily to revise the Administrative Manual, the Spiess committee to gain a clearer picture of the general conditions of employment for non-senate academics. The Hoos report, issued in April 1968, was entitled "Committee Report on the University's Minimum Commitment to the Academic Professional Appointee."

At last the views of librarians were heard. On each campus they met with and provided information to both committees. Each report made recommendations on the voice of non-senate academics in the University, the need for an appeals procedure, the provision of security of employment, leaves of absence, and criteria for appointment and advancement. Some of these set the stage for later documents from the Office of the President.

The Hoos and the Spiess committees set off an intense surge of interaction among librarians. Librarians met frequently with their University Librarians in efforts to define their role. Three of the campuses—Berkeley, Davis and Los Angeles—conducted surveys to determine the librarians' views on their status. On every campus the University Librarian played a major role in asserting the academic nature of librarians' work, and accordingly advocating flexible criteria for appointment and advancement. They also advocated a greater voice for librarians in University affairs.

On several campuses visits from the committees resulted in the formation of informal groups to discuss the status of librarians. Following the Hoos visits to UCLA, a group of librarians met informally and issued a statement in May 1967 entitled "Some proposals on the Status of UCLA Librarians." In it we read:

We have pride in our profession and wish to be recognized as professionals. We feel that it is inherent in the nature of professionalism to have more of a voice in our own careers and in matters of library policy than has hitherto been the case.... We feel that our goals cannot be reached without the formation of an association of professional librarians. We envision such an association as consisting of all librarians in classifications I-V, as being completely independent of any other existing organization, as being concerned with the professional interests and problems of the librarians of UCLA and with library policies and as representing the librarians in their communication with the Library Administration, the University Administration, the academic community, and the libraries and professional library staffs of other campuses of the University of California.

There was yet another group of players: the American Federation of Teachers, Library Chapter, Berkeley Campus (AFL-CIO)—later the University Federation of Librarians (UFL)—which was organized in 1962 by faculty members and librarians. Through its newsletter, *CU Voice*, it kept librarians informed about the Ishimatsu case, salary levels at other academic institutions, academic status, sabbaticals and other relevant issues. Via an editorial appearing in the October 1965 issue, it took the lead in advocating the formation of a group of librarians by declaring:

Many librarians think the time has now come to play a part in their own futures; to let their voices, so long silent, be heard; to share, as the faculty has asked to share, in the policies and procedures that will determine the direction of their personal and professional lives.... We urge that librarians on the various campuses organize to discuss the action they should take as responsible members of society who are proud of their profession and its vital importance to the University community. We urge that they prepare themselves to take an active role in the months ahead, rather than to wait meekly the decisions, however beneficent, that an administrative hierarchy may announce.

Following this impassioned plea, in November 1966 *CU Voice* again urged librarians to form a systemwide organization of their own and proposed that "a systemwide conference of rank-and-

file University of California librarians" be held for the purpose of forming a systemwide organization. They urged librarians to help organize the conference by arranging meetings on each campus.

So the stage was set for the first meeting of the Librarians Association in San Francisco in June 1967. Librarians on all of the campuses, responding variously to the visits of the Hoos and Spiess committees and to the widely distributed call published in *CU Voice*, had been forming campus groups. On June 8, for example, librarians at UCLA had met and voted to form an association of professional librarians on that campus.

The San Francisco meeting was announced by the "Southern Regional Planning Committee for the ALA Convention Meeting of Librarians," composed of Faye Blake (UCLA), Michael Costin (UCSB), Kay Forrest (UCR), Sharon McClure (UCSD), Katherine Palmer (UCSD) and Marjorie Reeves (UCI). The annual ALA conference had been chosen as the site not only because of its San Francisco location but because a large number of UC Librarians were active members of ALA and a large attendance was expected.

The meeting voted to form a systemwide librarians' association, to be patterned after the Academic Senate. It also decided that a division of the association would be established on each campus, with its own officers and committees to deal with local issues. Each division would elect representatives to the systemwide Assembly, which would deal with Universitywide matters. The systemwide officers were to be elected at large.

A Steering Committee was formed to establish the new association, composed of William Treese (chair, UCSB) and two members from each campus. After a series of meetings from July through October, the committee outlined the future organization of LAUC. To accomplish the tremendous amount of work required, they divided the tasks on a north-south basis; for example, the southern campuses were responsible for drafting the basic structure, the relation of the divisions to systemwide and the method of ratification, and the northern campuses for developing the structure of the systemwide Assembly.

A second systemwide meeting was held in conjunction with the California Library Association in Fresno in October 1967. The Steering Committee had the responsibility not only of planning the meeting but of guiding LAUC toward the status of a functioning organization. In September all UC librarians had been asked to vote on whether an university-wide organization of librarians should be formed and the proposed structure adopted. The result of the balloting, presented to the Fresno meeting, showed 299 librarians (81%) in favor and 69 (19%) against. The proportion voting on the various campuses ranged from 47% to 100%. Following the October meeting, nominations for officers were solicited from the campuses and the first systemwide election was held. Eldred Smith (UCB) was elected the first President, Richard Moore (UCSC) Vice-President/President-Elect, and Faye Blake (UCLA) Secretary.

The first meeting of the fully organized Librarians Association was held at Berkeley in April 1968, and the Bylaws were approved in September of the same year. This was a very impressive schedule, especially in view of the number of activities claiming the energies of librarians at the time.

Library Council's Working Papers

In August 1967, shortly after the San Francisco meeting, Library Council issued its Working Paper #1, which was the response of its Subcommittee on Personnel to a charge in April 1967 to provide a "long range study...concerning a personnel framework for the promotion and appointment of librarians which would be more equivalent to the system used for faculty members."

Primarily a philosophical exposition, a collection of ideas based on a series of assumptions about the classification and salary scales for librarians, it urged that:

- a. There should be a "high degree of equivalency" between the salaries of faculty and librarians;
- b. There should be greater academic preparation for librarians, i.e., degrees beyond the M.L.S., should be "rewarded by a higher annual salary at the inception of the working career";
- c. There should be some type of equation based on accomplishments during an individual's career, and the "equation" should be based on an 11-month appointment for both librarians and faculty.
- d. Librarians should be promoted through the ranks at the same rate as faculty.

Working Paper #1 also put forth some ideas for a faculty-like classification and salary scheme for librarians that included a three-level classification of Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian and Librarian, with advancement based on continued growth and development. It also set forth several new concepts: tenure and peer review; a higher professional content of responsibilities, to be achieved by increasing the number of library assistants and thus eliminating the need for librarians to perform clerical tasks; and a system of continuing education.

The paper was widely distributed and discussed on all the campuses by the newly established Librarians Association. Several divisions formed task forces to review it. All of them wrote responses, as did the UFL, directing them to the University Librarians since the paper had emanated from Library Council. No effort was made to develop a systemwide response.

The divisions were generally favorable toward the paper's assumptions and ideas, and enthusiastic for the 3-rank series. There was however disagreement over the suitability of other links with the faculty. In direct contradiction to the trend at academic institutions across the country, a large number of librarians were strongly opposed to faculty status. They stressed the differences between the responsibilities of librarians and those of faculty. Some suggested librarians were downgrading the profession by trying to emulate the teaching staff; many questioned whether librarians' functions could be defined in such a way that review and evaluation by faculty could be meaningful. On another issue, the UFL pointed out the need to reorganize the UC libraries in order to implement the proposed changes in the librarian classification scheme, since "the present hierarchical organization in the UC libraries must give way to one which is fundamentally collegial."

In March 1968 Library Council issued Working Paper #2, also prepared by its Subcommittee on Personnel, which was a plan for implementing Working Paper #1. This paper was also discussed on the campuses, but only three weeks—March 25 to April 15—were allowed for comment before it was forwarded to the Office of the President. The comments were gathered and reported by the Association's Committee on Library Status. Although some suggestions were made on specific items, most librarians were in basic agreement with the plan.

The UFL also submitted comments on Working Paper #2, voicing approval of several of its concepts: collegial as opposed to hierarchical relationships among librarians; promotion on the basis of increasingly complex responsibilities rather than administrative advancement; and judgment by peers. Other parts of the paper invoked its criticism: the criteria for advancement, which it considered too "faculty-like"; lack of provision for sabbaticals; lack of specific plans to implement the restructuring; the overlap of salaries; and the length of time required to attain security of employment in the beginning ranks.

The Battle for Recognition

Meanwhile librarians were working to create an organizational structure for their new association. In January one of the first actions of President Smith was to send a letter to Angus Taylor, UC Vice President for Academic Affairs, describing the new organization and forwarding a copy of the "Proposed Structure of the Librarians Association of the University of California." Dr. Taylor requested from the University Librarians comments on how he should respond to Smith's request for a consideration of LAUC's "place and role in the University."

The University Librarians were not unaware of the formation of the LAUC divisions on their campuses. In many cases librarians had been granted the right to meet on library time, released time and the use of University cars to attend meetings. Some divisions had even received tentative recognition. The method of sharing and requesting comments on Working Paper #1 indicated the University Librarians' awareness of the development of the Association. But although the Working Paper, as well as the Hoos and Spiess reports, generated a great deal of interaction between them and the librarians, their response to Vice President Taylor's request for advice made it clear that they did not accept the Association wholeheartedly. Only one of them, J. Richard Blanchard at Davis, advocated immediate recognition—as a means of heading off unionization. Those at Santa Barbara, Irvine and San Diego reacted favorably but recommended not making any commitment for the time being. Melvin Voigt at San Diego favored strong local divisions rather than a systemwide body. UCLA's Robert Vosper expressed the same opinion with extreme candor. In his letter to Vice President Taylor of January 23, 1968, Vosper wrote:

Quite frankly, I'm sorry that this newly formed Librarians Association of the University of California got started when it did and with the impetus it has. With equal frankness, it's my opinion that the University's traditional slowness in dealing creatively with personnel matters, outside the faculty group, impelled the formation of this group.... The Library Council for a long time has tried to make clear that a better definition of the status of academic librarians is required if we are to be competitive in the modern world. But reactions have been so slow that the librarians themselves have now taken it into their own hands by forming this

systemwide group to press the matter further.... [T]he University must not force these people off-campus and push them into the position of becoming a union-like bargaining agent. That over-reaction would be disastrous. The University must recognize them but guide them into responsible and rational mechanisms for growth within the University of California of the future, not the University of California of the past.

Vice President Taylor met with President Smith, Vice President Richard Moore and Secretary Faye Blake early in February. He said LAUC actually had a form of *de facto* recognition from the campuses but that formal recognition could not be considered until the Association had adopted a constitution. The LAUC officers requested funding from the Office of the President for systemwide activities; Dr. Taylor asked them to submit a formal proposal. The proposal was submitted, but was eventually denied on the ground of "budgetary obstacles which stand in the way under the present severe financial pinch," and because UCOP preferred such professional organizations to operate at the campus rather than the systemwide level.

The April 6, 1968 meeting of the Librarians Association was informed that in the previous nine months every campus had taken some steps toward formal organization, and five had adopted Bylaws. In his report to the membership, President Smith said that UC librarians had identified three distinct needs at this time:

1. A voice in the systemwide academic organization of the University;
2. Widespread and continuing communication with each other and with other sectors of the academic community; and
3. The establishment of recognized and agreed-upon professional standards.

The need for recognition of the Association by the University was the major topic of this first meeting. A motion established an ad hoc committee, chaired by the President, to draft a formal statement requesting recognition, to be presented to the October Assembly. The first standing committees of the organization were also established: the Constitution Committee (chair: Joanna Tallman, UCLA), the Committee on Librarian Status (Richard Moore, UCSC), the Committee on Library Policy (chair to be appointed) and the Nominations Committee (Martin Silver, UCSB). The Department of Special Collections on the Santa Barbara campus was designated as the official depository for the archive of systemwide LAUC.

The Association voted to hold its second Assembly at Irvine on August 16, 1968, instructing its President to request funding from the University. President Smith sent such a letter in due course to Vice President Angus Taylor, who responded:

We cannot under present policies and circumstances justify the expenditure of University funds for this purpose. I hope that you and your colleagues will come around to looking more favorably on the local campus approach to the establishment of means of dealing with the interests and concerns of the various

categories of academic staff members, both Senate and non-Senate. I think that significant developments must be worked out first at the campus level.

In the absence of funding, the Irvine meeting was held on a Saturday, August 17. Dr. Taylor's reference to divisional rather than systemwide groups reflects the discussions by the Academic Senate of the Spiess Report on May 24, 1968. One of the recommendations approved at that meeting, at which Faye Blake was permitted to speak, was the formation of non-Senate academic groups at the campus level. The Spiess Report was approved and forwarded to the individual campuses and to systemwide administration for appropriate action.

The University's denial of financial support led to a debate at the Assembly of means of funding systemwide activities, such as travel for officers and photocopying. It was decided that each division, using whatever method it preferred, should collect one dollar from each of its members and forward it to the LAUC Secretary, who became also the Treasurer for this purpose. It was assumed that these funds would be collected for only one year.

The Assembly also approved a draft letter petitioning UC President Charles Hitch for formal recognition of the Association, the right to use the University of California in its name, and membership on Library Council. The letter, sent by President Smith on October 14, 1968, made five specific requests:

1. That the Librarians' Association be recognized by the University of California as the official organization within the University structure which represents librarians as academic personnel.
2. That the University of California grant the Librarians' Association the power to investigate, discuss, and make recommendations to any and all offices and agencies of the University regarding matters of concern to University of California librarians as academic personnel.
3. That the Librarians' Association be granted permission to incorporate the name of the University of California within its own, so that it may become the Librarians' Association of the University of California
4. That the University of California provide financial support for the activities of the Librarians' Association, including University time for its officers and members to conduct Association business, travel expenses, office space, secretarial assistance, equipment, supplies, etc.
5. That the Librarians' Association be the means by which librarians are represented in an organization including all University of California academic personnel, should such an organization be created; however, that such an organization would not take the place of the Librarians' Association.

The letter was accompanied by a list of arguments in support of recognition, including academic status, academic voice, organization for voice, systemwide organization, academic functions of

librarians, and a brief history and purpose of LAUC. Before responding to the request Vice President Taylor sent a memo to the Chancellors requesting comments and opinions on recognition. The responses from the Chancellors were lukewarm, most favoring campus rather than systemwide recognition. They all agreed that it was desirable to "develop a useful relationship" with the Librarians Association, but that recognition was premature.

Some of the Chancellors and systemwide officers also expressed concern that the Association was in some ways more like a union than a professional organization. It was pointed out that the exclusion of University Librarians and Associate and Assistant University Librarians from the right to hold office vitiated the analogy with the Academic Senate and was closer to trade union practices. Both the concern over the exclusion of the ULs and AULs and the union-like nature of the Association were to surface again throughout the process of achieving recognition.

The third LAUC Assembly in San Diego was again held on a Saturday, October 25, 1968, because funding was again denied by the Office of the President. President Smith announced the appointment of Vernon Lust (UCD) as Vice President pro tem to fill the unexpired term of Richard Moore, who had left the University. Smith reported on the Recognition Committee's submission of the request to President Hitch. The Liaison Committee (chair: William Treese, UCSB), which had been charged to recommend a course of action should the request be denied, proposed that in the absence of clear recognition LAUC should consider affiliation with another organization such as a union or, as a divisional member, the California Library Association. The committee's report was accepted as read.

At the end of November, just as he was completing his term of office, President Smith met with Vice President Taylor and received word that recognition of the Association had been denied. Although Dr. Taylor had not mentioned them in the formal letter he sent on behalf of President Hitch, he now outlined certain conditions that LAUC needed to meet to be recognized by the University. Specifically, item 2 in the recognition request was seen as being "too sweeping"; some agreement was needed on the subjects to be investigated and discussed, as well as the appropriate channels of consultation.

Also questioned by the Office of the President was Article II, Section 2 of the Bylaws, which presented as one of the objectives of the Association: "To set and enforce professional standards and the rights and obligations of librarians at the University of California." UCOP felt that this was too strongly worded and that professional standards should be spelled out in the Administrative Manual, where they would be subject to administrative action. It was felt that the proper role of librarians would be advisory and consultative. The Association was also requested to reexamine Article III, Section 3, which precluded University Librarians and Assistant and Associate University librarians from holding office or serving as representatives to the Assembly.

On April 3, 1969, President Vernon Lust sent to Vice President Taylor a specific request for financial assistance through June 30 of that year. The amount, \$563.24, included travel and per diem for Spring Assembly, secretarial assistance, paper and photocopying. Among the justifications cited were professional development of librarians and the development of the Librarians Association.

Dr. Taylor attended the next LAUC Assembly in San Diego on May 10, and answered questions on the recognition and funding for the Association. In the most cogent statement of

UCOP's position to date, he said that the University had been trying to implement representation of all non-Senate academic personnel as recommended by the Hoos and Spiess reports. The efforts to establish these groups had taken place on the campuses, and the University had been urging the Chancellors to take action. In Dr. Taylor's view, the major role of a professional organization embracing all librarians was at the campus level, and it was the responsibility of each Chancellor and University Librarian to work out the plans and procedures to deal effectively not only with the Librarians Association but with other non-Senate academic staff groups. He felt that Universitywide involvement should be kept to a minimum. As for the possibility of financial aid for the Association, that would remain remote until the University had determined the fate of all non-Senate academic bodies. Financial aid would be based on whether or not the organization provided "an essential service or perform[ed] a function for the benefit of the University." The ensuing debate ended with the Assembly instructing the Bylaws Committee to revise the Bylaws, and the President to revise the recognition request and re-submit it to the Office of the President at his discretion.

On his return from the Assembly, Vice President Taylor sent a letter to the Chancellors and University Librarians describing his meeting with the librarians and asking for advice on the issue of budgetary support. The Chancellors and University Librarians unanimously supported Dr. Taylor's position that support must be justified by services performed for the University by the Librarians Association as an agency, rather than by the individual members in performance of their regular duties. Most felt that the Association had not yet demonstrated its benefit to the institution and that Universitywide involvement should be kept to a minimum. It was pointed out that there were several groups, such as the Architects and Engineers, Budget Officers and Personnel Officers, whose Universitywide meetings were funded by the local campuses.

On August 25, 1970, Vice President Taylor met with LAUC President Robert Lewis and asked him to submit a new request for recognition of LAUC. He did so on October 15. This initiative, and the fact that the Bylaws had been modified to meet the objections of UCOP, encouraged Lewis and incoming President Joanna Tallman to assume that recognition of the Association was imminent. But its time had not yet come. Another re-reading of the Bylaws by the Office of the President and the Chancellors unearthed several additional areas of concern.

On May 7, 1971, Dr. Taylor formally replied to Lewis' letter of the previous October, declaring that "in a certain programmatic sense the University has already recognized the Librarians Association." As an example, he cited consultations at the campus level that provided librarians with a voice in matters affecting them. At this point, however, there were two issues that needed to be addressed: the right to use the University name, and the manner in which the University would regard and deal with the Association.

He outlined several Bylaws changes that needed to be made. This time he asked that Article II, Section 4, naming LAUC as the official systemwide body

wherein librarians have the opportunity to participate in the deliberative and decision-making process of the University

be changed to something like

...to provide a University-wide structure for enabling librarians to have a voice and play an advisory role in University affairs.

He felt the present wording was too exclusive, since it suggested that librarians could not have a voice in University affairs except through the Association. He again requested that the section on membership in LAUC be reworded to include University Librarians and AULs. He also asked that Article V, Section 1(d), requiring Library Council to appoint one of its members as an ex officio representative to the Assembly, be removed; the Association was not empowered to make such a requirement of the Council. As a condition for granting the right to use the University name, he stipulated:

Relations between the Association and the University Administration shall be primarily at the campus level.... On matters of University-wide concern the Association should normally make its representations at the campus level. The views of the Association on such concerns should reach the President through the Chancellors.

Finally, he made it clear that the right to use the University's name did not imply any obligation on the part of the University to provide financial support.

President Tallman placed the letter before the Assembly at its May 15 meeting, which accepted all of the Bylaws changes proposed. There was considerable debate about the requirement that LAUC communicate primarily through the Chancellors. One of the reasons for forming the Association in the first place had been to work with the Office of the President as one group rather than take actions at each of the nine campuses. From later discussions it became clear that Dr. Taylor had inserted the provision because faculty groups did not communicate directly with UCOP or send reports directly, and to assure the Chancellors that they would not be bypassed. The Assembly agreed that *normally* channels would be at the campus level, but on systemwide matters the Association could communicate directly with the Office of the President.

In actual fact, despite Dr. Taylor's repeated written insistence that LAUC work through local channels, a regular pattern of communication with UCOP had developed over the years. The LAUC President would write to, and meet and communicate directly with, the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Dr. Taylor cooperated fully in the pattern and clearly expected it to continue, as indeed it has done to this day. On May 10 he responded to President Tallman's written invitation to attend the Spring Assembly, and after expressing his regrets he added: "In any case, I shall expect to hear from you again, presumably after your Spring Assembly."

The right to use the University name, a goal for which the Association had worked for more than three years, was granted to LAUC and its local divisions on December 14, 1971. There was little fanfare or applause; the letter conveying the decision was approximately three sentences long.

But it said nothing about recognition of the Association as part of the University, and the battle dragged on. At the Spring 1974 Assembly on the Los Angeles campus, it resurfaced as a major agenda item. A report, "The Status of LAUC," prepared by Ted Gould and current LAUC President Faith Meakin, had been distributed to all divisions before the meeting. It was basically

a chronology of LAUC efforts to achieve official University recognition, but also contained two proposed next steps: a review of LAUC's structure, activities, purpose and mission; and the development of a specific role for LAUC in the regular business of the University.

President Meakin reported to the Assembly that Vice President Taylor had recently held discussions with the Chancellors on the status of LAUC, and had asked for an opinion from University Council. The delegates unanimously instructed her to push for immediate Senate-like status.

At the Fall Assembly in San Francisco, Santa Barbara was not represented. This was the first and last LAUC Assembly to which any of the nine divisions failed to send a delegate. As a result of Vice President Taylor's categorization of LAUC as a voluntary organization, and following a discussion at the May Assembly on the "illegality" of the LAUC Bylaws, the Santa Barbara division voted to declare itself a voluntary organization until such time as the status of LAUC was resolved.

Dr. Taylor did however accept an invitation to attend. He assured the delegates that he wanted LAUC as an official part of the University. It had *de facto* recognition, and was already exercising most of the rights conferred by formal acknowledgment. He said the issue was in the consultation and review stage, and "like molasses in cold weather, it is a slow process." President Meakin announced that Library Council had passed a resolution reaffirming its support for speedy recognition of LAUC as an official University entity. There were however two Chancellors apparently opposed to Senate-like status for the Association. This fact became known from an August 9, 1974 memo sent by Dr. Taylor to the Academic Vice Chancellors proposing to give LAUC "a status as part of the University." The memo declared:

The intent of the proposal is to have the Regents authorize the President to declare LAUC an official organizational unit of the University and to assign it a specified role in helping to carry out the mission of the University, as an advisory body. Membership in LAUC would be automatic for persons in the Librarian series and for University Librarians, Associate University Librarians, and Assistant University Librarians, according to conditions laid down by the President.

President Meakin reported to the Assembly on the October 1974 meeting of Library Council. Her presence at that event marked the first time a LAUC President had been invited to attend an entire meeting of this body. Nearly all previous Presidents had been invited to specific parts of a Council meeting or to present a report on LAUC activities, but this was a real advance in achieving full Council membership for the Association. There had also been a review of the Library Council subcommittees in order to reduce duplication and to include LAUC membership on them for the first time.

On February 20, 1975, seven years after Eldred Smith's first approach to Vice President Taylor, UC President Charles Hitch sent a letter to LAUC President Norah Jones informing her that the Regents had recognized the Librarians Association as an official unit of the University of California. The molasses had finally warmed.

The letter established conditions for LAUC, including membership, purpose, authority and organization. Its purpose was outlined as follows:

The Association is accorded this official status in the University in order to serve a valuable purpose for its members and for the University in providing an organizational structure for utilization of the professional interests and skills of librarians in advising the University administration and in improving intra- and inter-campus communication on matters of concern in relation to libraries and librarians.

LAUC was authorized

through its Divisions on each campus to advise the Chancellors and the library administrations on matters of concern to librarians and the University in the operation of libraries, including collections, personnel matters and service,

and

through its Universitywide officers and Executive Board to advise the President through the Vice-President-Academic Affairs and Personnel on matters related to libraries and librarians which are primarily of Universitywide concern.

In December 1974, before taking the recognition proposal to the Regents, Vice President Taylor had met with the LAUC Executive Board to explain changes in the Bylaws which recognition would necessitate. Funding for LAUC, both systemwide and for the divisions, was also discussed. On the systemwide level funding was needed for travel by delegates to the Assemblies, travel by the President to regional meetings, clerical costs and the printing of the *LAUC Newsletter*. Divisional activities should be funded by the Chancellors.

On May 27, 1975, Vice President Taylor established a Universitywide account in the Office of the President to fund systemwide LAUC expenses. The allocation was \$400 for the remainder of 1974/75 and \$1,000 for 1975/76. (Round-trip airfare between Los Angeles and San Francisco was \$41.50 at the time). The expenses of the divisions were to be funded by the campuses.

The Berkeley Task Force Report

While work on the recognition requests was going forward at the systemwide level, the Berkeley division, under the direction of Eldred Smith, prepared a detailed report on Working Paper #2 for its University Librarian. The draft report was issued in May 1969, and the final version in November of the same year. This was to be a significant document, not only at Berkeley but for the future of the Association.

Each division set up a group to study and respond to the Berkeley Task Force Report, as it came to be known. Along with Working Paper #2, it became the basis of the Administrative Manual's sections on librarians. It covered a broad range of topics: appointment and promotion,

voice, appeals, professional and academic rights, privileges and responsibilities, and working conditions and benefits.

The Report recommended the 3-rank series for librarians as proposed in the working paper; appointment criteria; and promotion and review criteria, including peer review and the need for security of employment. A major concept in the section on classification of librarians was the separation of rank from type of duty. The criteria for promotion and review included professional service in the library, professional activity outside the library, research and publication, university and public service, and behavior on the job.

Following the Fall 1969 Assembly, LAUC's Committee on Privileges, Salaries, Conditions and Security of Employment, chaired by Norah Jones (UCLA), was charged with compiling the comments of the nine divisions on the Berkeley Task Force Report, focusing on the systemwide issues. This "Consensus" compilation was brought to the April 1970 Assembly. Although some delegates, particularly from Santa Barbara and Davis, objected to parts of the report, the Assembly concluded that its purpose was to discuss the document, not revise it. A motion to adopt the Consensus document passed by a voice vote.

The document differed from the Task Force Report in certain important respects: the introduction of the concept of acting ranks, the use of the term "tenure" rather than "security of employment," and the omission of the section dealing with specific working conditions, including the librarians' workweek. LAUC President Robert Lewis forwarded the Consensus Document to Vice President Taylor in April 1970.

The significance of the Berkeley Task Force report was quickly grasped by Library Council, which decided in June to use it as a partial guide in developing the Administrative Manual's sections on librarians. Vice President Taylor sent a copy of the report to the Berkeley Chancellor, Roger Heyns, on July 22. In his cover letter to Chancellor Heyns, Taylor wrote:

This document is certain to have a major effect on University policy in academic personnel policy as it affects academic appointees in the librarian category, not only those...[on the Berkeley campus...but] indeed in all of the libraries on all of our campuses.

He went on to urge Chancellor Heyns and his staff to carefully review the report "in light of personnel policies concerning the professional research staff, academic staff in University Extension, specialists, etc."

At a special Assembly of the Librarians Association held in Santa Cruz on October 11, 1969, the delegates were informed that Working Paper #2 was being used in the Office of the President as the basis for preparing the section in the Administrative Manual on librarians, and that the Berkeley Task Force Report would have a major influence on this project.

Meanwhile some of the campuses, primarily UCLA and Berkeley, were busy compiling reports that were to affect future LAUC trends. In February the UCLA Librarians Association held a Conference on Goals for Librarians, with the goal of defining "in local terms what academic status could mean to librarians at UCLA," and its papers were published under the title *Goals for UCLA Librarians*. The topics included salaries (by Joanna Tallman), peer evaluation (Edwin Kaye), tenure (Faye Blake), grievance, appeal and review procedures (Evert Vokersz),

workload requirements (June Armstrong), sabbatical and other leaves (John Thornbury) and staff composition (Marcia Endore).

Though focused upon UCLA, the document had systemwide ramifications, and was distributed to the other campuses. It did not engender the broad discussion that the Berkeley Task Force Report had, but some of its papers, especially Joanna Tallman's on salaries, played a major role in formulating future directions of the Association. An internal memorandum in UCOP of February 2 shows that it was reviewed there for "new ideas of special relevance to the personnel policies which we are presently trying to establish for librarians." The memo focused attention on the system of peer evaluation proposed for the UCLA library, and expressed concern that although the practices were under the jurisdiction of the University Librarian and the Chancellor, "it may establish precedents which could limit our choices in devising Universitywide procedures for peer group advice on appointment and promotion of librarians."

The Administrative Manual

On April 1, 1970, the Office of the President issued what was to become Section 82 of the Administrative Manual. This was the first formal attempt to incorporate UC librarians into the manual since they had been moved from staff to academic personnel in 1962. Although Section 82 was based on Working Paper #2 and the Report of the Berkeley Task Force, its drafts as proposed by the University administration never fully met the expectations of librarians. Even so, the influence of Working Paper #2 and the Berkeley Task Force Report—and, in later drafts, the Consensus document—can be seen in the concepts and exact phrases that were taken from these documents and incorporated into Section 82.

At the Spring Assembly in Riverside, a resolution opposing Section 82 was passed. As forwarded to UCOP by LAUC President Lewis, it read:

The Systemwide Assembly of the Librarians Association of the University of California resolves that the "Proposed Section 82 of the Administrative Manual--Librarian Series" dated April 1, 1970, is unacceptable in its present form and that this document must be substantially revised so that it will include the principles, policies, and procedures embodied in the LAUC document entitled "A Consensus of the Views of the Nine Campuses on the Systemwide Issues Contained in the Report of the Berkeley Task Force on Academic Library Personnel."

Among LAUC's major objections were the definition of librarian, the lack of tenure or security of employment for the Associate and Librarian ranks, the vagueness of the section on leaves and the proposed six-year up-or-out policy for Assistant Librarians. At a meeting between LAUC President Lewis and Vice President Taylor on June 2, the latter announced that Section 82-4 containing the definition of librarians would be changed to bring the wording more closely into line with that in the Consensus document. Parts of section 82-20 concerning conditions of employment were also to be revised for the second draft, which was issued on July 29.

In July 1970 the UC librarians received another blow. Because of a budget shortfall the State legislature did not fund range adjustments for the UC faculty. Librarians, as well as other non-Senate academics, were considered to be faculty for the purposes of this adjustment. Because librarians had not yet been included in the Administrative Manual and received few of the benefits that came to the faculty, they felt their inclusion with the faculty in this salary denial was unfair. Following a special meeting of the LAUC Executive Board, a letter was sent to President Hitch pointing out the inequity of the action. The same letter requested recognition for LAUC, the granting of tenure or security of employment to librarians, the appointment of the President of LAUC as an ex-officio member of Library Council, and the preparation of a revised salary plan for librarians to be implemented in better fiscal times.

To the Fall Assembly in Los Angeles came the report of the Committee on Committees, Rules and Jurisdiction chaired by Sherill Mann (UCSB) and Charlotte Oakes (UCSD). In April President Lewis had instructed the committee to study and report on the most vital issues facing LAUC, the order in which those issues should be addressed and the course of action that should be followed to resolve them. The report to the Assembly declared that the first and most important issue was voice in the development of library policy. Second was recognition by the University administration of LAUC and its local divisions. In third place was a group of related concerns including security of employment, sabbaticals, and access to research and continuing education. Among the other important issues were salaries, classification criteria for the new 3-rank librarian series, and the need to increase the professionalism of the University's librarians. Also mentioned were the necessity of establishing goals and beginning work toward the improvement of library services.

In July 1970 a second draft of Section 82 was issued, and in November of that year Section 51-4 was distributed. The latter outlined the "Criteria for Appointment and Promotion of Librarians," and was designed to incorporate criteria for librarians in the Administrative Manual paralleling those for the professorial series. Section 51-4 was developed by Library Council's Personnel Subcommittee, chaired by Anthony Greco, and based on the April 2 Consensus document from LAUC.

At the Spring 1971 Assembly at Santa Barbara, debate on the revised Section 82 focused on probationary appointments at the Assistant Librarian level. The wording of the section had been changed from six years to "after a reasonable number of years," which was considered too vague. Another area of concern was 82-6(b), which mandated a committee named by the Chancellor to advise on appointments, thus pre-empting committees established by the local divisions. The result was a resolution declaring the April 5 draft "unsatisfactory," and requesting that Vice President Taylor delay implementation until LAUC presented a consensus recommendation.

The Fall 1971 Assembly, informed that a final revision of Section 82 would soon be issued, decided that the divisions should respond individually through their University Librarians and Chancellors, since a systemwide response might be too slow. Several of the divisions, especially Davis, prepared detailed comments.

In February 1972 Vice President Taylor met with the LAUC Executive Board on the librarians' objections to Sections 82 and 51-4. A letter from President Michael MacInnes to Dr. Taylor on January 27 had suggested an agenda for the meeting, and included specific

recommendations for revisions to the two sections. Following the meeting MacInnes sent a letter describing its content to all divisional Chairs after sharing a draft with Dr. Taylor, who made several changes.

The letter characterized the meeting as "positive and generally constructive." It said that Dr. Taylor had agreed to several wording changes; disagreements on other phrases were described as "semantic" and "stylistic." Also discussed were continuity of employment and the use of the term "career appointment" rather than "security of employment" or "tenure." Vice President Taylor said that a librarian who received career appointment, as opposed to "potential career appointment," had the equivalent of security of employment based on satisfactory performance. Responding to LAUC's concern about career appointments at the Librarian I and II levels under the conversion, Dr. Taylor made it clear that the conversion would take place without additional monies to upgrade salaries for 1972/73, though he did not rule out the possibility of seeking a special allocation of funds for this purpose in the following year. On opportunities for leave, President MacInnes reported that some faculty had expressed opposition to a statement granting sabbaticals for librarians; Dr. Taylor felt the proposed wording was flexible enough to provide leaves.

The final versions of Sections 51-4 and 82 were issued by the Office of the President on April 3, 1972, with a cover letter from Vice President of the University Chester O. McCorkle announcing that the new 3-rank librarian series would be implemented beginning July 1, 1972. Academic Vice President Angus Taylor issued a follow-up letter to the Chancellors and the University Librarians on April 14, outlining procedures for the transfer to the new series. Campuses were instructed to complete the merit increase and promotion reviews using current procedures and salary scales; once these were concluded, incumbents were to be transferred to the new titles. Those who were at Librarian I and II levels became Assistant Librarians, Librarians III and IV became Associate Librarians, and Librarians V became Librarians. The letter further described how career status was to be achieved.

However, in the minds of most librarians the final version of Sections 82 and 51-4 did not reflect any substantive changes from the previous draft. In a letter to Vice President Taylor inviting him to attend the May 20 Assembly, President MacInnes wrote:

It is clear from preliminary responses which I have received that the librarians do not like the latest version any more than they did previous versions, and for the same reasons. Some divisions of LAUC have already notified me that the final version is unacceptable....

I am personally disappointed to find that changes in the previous version which I believed had been agreed upon at our meeting at Davis on February 23, 1972 were not made in the final version. You will recall that I reported to the LAUC membership on that meeting, and that in order to assure that my report would be as honest and correct as possible, I had you review the draft and suggest changes which would guarantee its accuracy.

I reported also that you agreed to reword Section 82-17b(s) in a manner that would be acceptable to the Executive Board. While the addition of the ultimate sentence in that paragraph is an improvement, I do not regard the wording of the

rest of that paragraph as meeting our strong objections, and as fulfilling your commitment to change that paragraph to our satisfaction.

On May 19, the day before the LAUC Spring Assembly, the UC Regents approved the implementation of Sections 82 and 51-4 effective July 1. Despite this, the LAUC Assembly on the following day passed the following resolution, and sent it to President Hitch by telegram:

LAUC Assembly strongly opposes the "final version" of Sections 82 and 51-4 as a final version and urges that implementation be suspended so that negotiations may continue.

Ted Gould, just installed as LAUC President, followed the telegram with a letter to President Hitch on May 30. There were several issues which LAUC felt were not adequately addressed in the final version, including security of employment, the grievance procedures and a "realistic" salary scale. The letter also included a list of what LAUC perceived as the positive accomplishments of Sections 82 and 51-4:

- a. *Two track system of advancement.* The present version acknowledges that librarians may advance through the librarian series without necessarily assuming administrative responsibilities.
- b. *Criteria for promotion.* This version presents well-defined and uniform criteria for advancement in the librarian series. These have been lacking heretofore.
- c. *Concept of peer evaluation.* The Chancellor's Advisory Committee and ad hoc committees embody the concept of peer evaluation. Librarians regard this as a highly desirable innovation.
- d. *Leave provisions.* Section 82-20.f states that librarians are eligible for leaves of absence with full or partial salary. Librarians regard this provision as a step in the right direction but feel that a leave plan similar to that of sabbatical leave for faculty would be preferable.

Accompanying the letter was a petition signed by 498 of the approximately 610 librarians in the University of California, also requesting the suspension of implementation.

No formal reply to the request was received until June 12, when President Gould received a letter from Vice President McCorkle on behalf of President Hitch. Dr. McCorkle wrote:

...I can readily understand [that] the members of the Librarians Association are not entirely satisfied with the policies expressed in Sections 82 and 51-4 of the Administrative Manual, because they do not regard these expressions of the new personnel policy for librarians as coming up to the expectations they would like to see fulfilled.

However, he suggested it would be best if the implementation proceed as planned and "further consultation on points of dissatisfaction...be continued." Sections 82 and 51-4 of the Administrative Manual were therefore implemented on July 1, 1972.

Salaries

At their meeting of August 25, 1970, UC Vice President Taylor had told LAUC President Lewis that his office had no data on salary and conditions of employment for librarians at other institutions. Lewis charged LAUC's Committee on Privilege, Salaries, Condition and Security of Employment to undertake a survey to uncover the comparative data. The committee's response, "Survey on Librarians Salaries and Conditions of Employment at Twelve Universities as Compared with the University of California," a factual study based on a questionnaire with no attempt to evaluate the findings, was forwarded to Dr. Taylor.

Apprehension over the new salary scales, and how the conversion to the new classification would take place, surfaced at the Spring 1971 Assembly. By this time there was concern that the Office of the President proposed to implement the new classification scheme without a salary scale. The previous November, Joanna Tallman had prepared a scale she called "Sequence to Bring Librarians' Salaries to Equivalent Faculty Salaries," which the Assembly now agreed to forward to Vice President Taylor. President Tallman also announced that Taylor had asked Library Council's Subcommittee on Personnel to develop a salary scale for the new librarian series, and that subcommittee chair Anthony Greco had asked Tallman to assist in drafting it.

But, as Dr. Taylor forewarned the Executive Board in February 1972, the scale that came into place on July 1 of that year simply reallocated existing salaries to the new librarian series, though the performance criteria had been expanded. Librarians received a 10% increase—9% general range adjustment and 1% inequity increase—the first enhancement in three years. In the same period the cost of living had increased approximately 17%.

At the May 20 Assembly LAUC had voted to establish an Ad Hoc Committee on Salaries, with a representative from each campus and Immediate Past President Tallman as chair. Provoking this action were the "unrealistic salaries" of librarians, and the perceived need to present detailed salary proposals to the Office of the President. In addition it had been announced there was a \$400-million-dollar surplus in the California state budget for the year 1972/73.

In July the ad hoc committee produced its salary conversion report, which was forwarded to UCOP. In September Vice President Taylor established a Special Committee to Study Librarians Salaries, to be composed of members of Library Council's Personnel Subcommittee and representatives from LAUC. LAUC was requested to submit the names of six librarians for these positions, of which Dr. Taylor selected three: Gwendolyn Lloyd (UCB), John Tanno (UCR), and Joanna Tallman (UCLA), who was named to chair the committee.

The UFL had not been silent on either the provisions of Sections 82 and 51-4 or the issue of salaries for librarians. It sharply criticized the University on both matters in the October 1972 issue of *Librarians' Advocate*, taking a strong position on the need for an increase in librarians' salaries at a September meeting between the UFL and the University administration. President Gould attended the meeting as an observer, although LAUC had not endorsed the UFL's position on salaries. Coincidentally, on the following day Vice President Taylor informed the LAUC President of his intention to establish the Special Committee to Study Librarians Salaries.

The special committee issued its first report in October. It documented the inequities previously alleged, and recommended a 9.3% special inequity increase for 1973/74. It noted that the salaries of UC librarians had not essentially changed since 1962, and compared them with those of other UC non-senate academics as well as those prevailing at the eight institutions the University had used to compare the salaries of faculty: Harvard, Yale, Cornell, Stanford, SUNY-Buffalo, and the Universities of Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin. The committee cited problems in attempting to compare the various institutions, recommending instead a stronger focus on internal comparison with other UC series. It also discussed the gender bias in librarians' salaries.

In all, it found the inequities to be so great as to recommend that additional adjustments be made for the 1974/75 fiscal year. One chart in the report showed that when entry level salaries for librarians were compared throughout all Californian academic institutions, those of the University of California ranked lowest. The report resulted in the UC Regents approving a 14.7% salary increase for 1973/74: 9.3% as inequity increase and 5.4% as general range adjustment. Unfortunately, librarians never received the inequity adjustment; though approved by the legislature, it was vetoed by Governor Ronald Reagan.

A large part of the 1973 Fall Assembly was devoted to a discussion of Report #2 from the Special Committee to Study Librarians Salaries, and more specifically to a proposal made by Vice President Taylor to Library Council and the Regents on librarians' salaries. Since the proposed 9.3% inequity increase had been vetoed, Vice President Taylor was proposing for 1974/75 a lower augmentation: 5.9%. The Assembly passed a resolution strongly endorsing the second report of the special committee, which had documented the need for 9.3%. The proposed 1974/75 salary scale was seen as inadequate not only because the inequity increase was only 5.9% but because the proposed funding, although raising salaries at both the top and bottom of the scale, compressed the middle and placed undue emphasis on the entry-level salary. The resolution also asserted the Assembly's belief that the University administration had acted in bad faith: first by disregarding the recommendation from the Special Committee to Study Librarians Salaries, and secondly "in requesting a response from campus officials and LAUC and then preparing its proposal to the Regents before that response was received."

The resolution was forwarded to Vice President Taylor, who replied that he was in the process of arranging a meeting with the Special Committee to Study Librarians Salaries. He added:

I regard the charge of bad faith as stated in the fourth part of the resolution to be unwarranted. The advice and information provided by the Special Committee has been helpful and appreciated both last year and this year. The University administration has not disregarded the committee's recommendations even though it has not fully followed them. That management used its prerogative of judgment in arriving at such decisions cannot be construed as disregarding the advice of the Special Committee. As for campus consultation about the second report, I did send the report to all Chancellors and University Librarians and I did receive responses from the majority of them. I also discussed the matter with all Chancellors at a meeting on October 31.

Vice President Taylor enclosed a copy of a letter he had sent to the University Librarians, in which he argued that he did not feel the 9.3% increase, augmenting the salaries of all librarians

by the same amount, had been justified by LAUC as strongly as he would have liked. He decided instead to seek a change in which the percentage increase was much greater at the bottom of the scale than the top. A 4.74% general range adjustment was also proposed in addition to the 5.9% salary inequity; and the beginning salary for entry-level librarians was increased from \$9,624 to \$11,004.

The following Assembly (Spring 1974) was told that according to Vice President Taylor the legislature might provide a 4.7% range adjustment for all academic employees, and special funds might be available to increase the total figure for librarians to 7.2%. The Assembly resolved to convey to Dr. Taylor its support for the "equal dollar distribution" of all funds available for 1974/75. The resolution further opposed any attempt to remove the bottom two steps of the librarian series and emphasized that approval of the equal-dollar distribution did not change LAUC's strong belief in the need to restructure the entire salary scale. The final results for the 1974/75 budget year were a 5.4% increase for all academic employees and an additional \$340,000 for librarian inequity, which was distributed on an equal-dollar basis.

At the beginning of October 1974, the Special Committee to Study Librarians Salaries, now known as the McCoy Committee after its current chair William McCoy (UCD), issued its third report. The introductory paragraph read:

The \$340,000 provided for inequity salary increases for librarians in the fiscal year 1974/75 was the initial step in correcting the salary disparities that were demonstrated in the committee's October, 1973 Report. That those funds were only the first step is clearly evidenced by the fact that the University's present entry level for Assistant Librarians (\$9,864 per year) is less than that in all of the comparative libraries except Stanford and the University of Southern California.

The report noted that seventeen comparative libraries averaged 15.68% above the entry-level salary for UC's librarian series and 5.02% above its present top salary. It also documented gender bias in the librarian series because of the number of women in its ranks: 68% in 1973. Finally it recommended that the University request a 15.2% inequity increase for librarians in 1975/76 in addition to any range adjustment.

In November 1974 the Regents approved a special 5.25% salary increase for librarians, over and above the 10.77% general increase for all academic employees approved at their October meeting. Both the special and general increases were to be used to remove existing inequities in librarians' salaries and to restructure the entire scale.

On May 9, 1975, the Spring Assembly at Riverside debated the latest report from the McCoy committee. Vice President Taylor had asked the committee to draft a restructure proposal for the salary scale because the University had been unsuccessful in obtaining an inequity increase. McCoy reported that his group had submitted a restructure plan the previous January, based on the 10.77% general and 5.25% special inequity increases. Governor Jerry Brown eliminated the inequity increase completely and reduced the general one to 8.5%.

Dr. Taylor then asked the committee to revise its proposal so that the restructure could occur with the 8.5% range adjustment plus \$55,000. The response, presented on April 19, reduced the number of steps in the series from 43 to 18 by eliminating the half-steps. Reviews would be held biennially after reaching Associate Librarian step III, and triennially after reaching Librarian step

III. The conversion to the new scale would be phased in over a number of years, with several transitional steps. One of the objectives was to make the top of the Associate Librarian range an acceptable career goal, since it was assumed that not everyone would reach the rank of Librarian. Another was to expand the ranges of the Associate and Librarian ranks and reduce that of the Assistant Librarian.

Two members of the McCoy Committee were opposed to the new scheme, feeling that restructure should not be attempted without additional funds. Some librarians demurred because their salary position was only marginally improved, and they feared that accepting the restructure might eliminate continued activity on behalf of a further inequity increase. After the Assembly, President Jones polled the divisions on whether the restructure plan should be accepted. Davis, Irvine, Riverside, Santa Barbara and Santa Cruz registered general approval. Opinions were split at Berkeley, Los Angeles and San Francisco, and there was considerable opposition at San Diego. Those opposed were concerned about insufficient funding and the possibility that the University might regard the restructure as a substitute for inequity funding. In addition, librarians at San Diego were opposed to the elimination of the half-steps, and to what they saw as artificial improvements at the beginning and top of the series which, while they may have been beneficial to librarians entering the system, were disadvantageous to incumbents. Despite these reservations, which were strongly expressed to the Office of the President by the San Diego division and other librarians, the restructured salary scale was implemented on July 1.

LAUC and Other Organizations

The 1972 Fall Assembly, held at Davis on November 17, debated the relationship between LAUC and the University Federation of Librarians. Discussions centered around the two organizations working together to achieve common goals, and whether or not LAUC was a bargaining agent. The Assembly passed a resolution to form an Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Relationship of LAUC and Voluntary Employee Organizations, including the UFL and the American Association of University Professors.

The committee's report, presented to the Irvine Assembly on May 3, 1973, produced a long and vigorous debate. One question was whether a conflict existed between the Bylaws clause declaring all UC librarians to be LAUC members and the University policy that permitted mandatory membership only for groups approved by the Regents as requiring such membership. The LAUC President was instructed to request clarification on this issue from the Office of the President.

The questions President Gould asked Dr. Taylor were two: Does the membership of LAUC have a choice in deciding for voluntary or mandatory membership? If LAUC does not have a choice, in which category has the University placed the Association? Dr. Taylor replied that LAUC was a voluntary organization, and the University had placed it in neither of the two categories, that is, neither an official University entity or a Registered Organization—Affiliated. He added that the last official written statement on the status of LAUC was the letter of December 1971 granting the Association the right to use the University name.

The report on LAUC and voluntary employee organizations was taken up again at the Assembly of November 16 at Santa Cruz. It had recommended that LAUC "should assume a position of active cooperation with other employee organizations," and should pass a resolution

supporting those organizations with whose position it agreed. The Assembly rejected the recommendations and, with two dissenting votes, decided that instead LAUC should "pursue the matter of status as an official University entity representing librarians with the University in order to become an effective integral body to benefit the University and librarians." President Gould wrote to Vice President Taylor on November 26, requesting that the Librarians Association be placed in a category comparable to the Academic Senate.

The Position Papers

The primary goal for President Jones in her 1975 term of office was increased communication, not only with UCOP, campus administrators and Library Council, but also among the divisions. She began a series of North/South regional meetings with the division chairs, which were to prove extremely valuable and were continued by later LAUC Presidents with various modifications. But her most far-reaching achievement was perhaps the launching of the LAUC Position Papers, the texts of which appear in an appendix to this chapter.

The purpose of the Position Papers was to establish a LAUC position on crucial, broad, recurring and lasting issues of common concern among the divisions. The statements were sent to the Office of the President, Library Council and others, to provide guidance and direction in defining the LAUC consensus on particular issues. In the *LAUC Newsletter* for December 1975 Jones wrote:

By building consistency in this way, we can establish a body of policy which will give us an identity, and we will facilitate understanding of our aims by new colleagues and by the University administration.

The first two Position Papers were issued in December 1975, though each was augmented and reissued in later years. The other three first appeared between 1976 and 1983, and have been revised and updated through 1990. Papers #1 and #4 dealt with Peer Review, and #5 with the Definition of a Librarian; their genesis and history are described in this chapter under those sections. Paper #2 was a report of the Committee on Committees, Rules and Jurisdiction, chaired by Nelson Piper (UCD), on the development of effective channels of communication between LAUC and Library Council.

Position Paper #3, "Documentation Guidelines for the Review of Librarians," was issued by President Lan Dyson in October 1976, a month before the Fall Assembly of that year. The sequence of its adoption is unique. In the course of his report to the 1975 Spring Assembly for the Committee on Privilege, Salaries and Conditions of Employment—on the topic of leaves of absence for librarians—chair John Tanno (UCR) asked if there should be uniform guidelines for the documentation of reviews. At the following Assembly he reported that a draft proposal on guidelines for documentation in the peer review process was being reviewed by the divisions. The minutes of the 1976 Spring Assembly contains no mention of any such guidelines, and there is no evidence that they were ever voted upon by a LAUC Assembly. Instead they were distributed to the divisions for comment and approval, then issued by the LAUC President and sent to Library Council—but not to the Office of the President.

Because of the uncertainty about how Position Papers came about and who was responsible for drafting them, the Executive Board in 1981 established a small 2-person ad hoc committee, Judy Horn (UCI) and Gary Peete (UCSB), to define and establish guidelines for their formulation. The guidelines, which were approved by the membership at the 1982 Fall Assembly, explain that position papers normally emerge from the report of a committee after its acceptance by the Assembly. The Executive Board and the LAUC President determine when a Position Paper is appropriate, using such criteria as the importance of an issue to the membership, its enduring nature, and the depth of support the membership has demonstrated for the position taken. Position Papers are written by the President, with the assistance of the Executive Board, from the committee report. Drafts of the Position Paper are reviewed by the divisions before final approval by the Executive Board.

Assistant and Associate University Librarians

LAUC members were concerned about the role of Assistant/Associate University Librarians in the review process and how members of that series were to be evaluated. In 1974, LAUC passed a resolution asking the Office of the President to extend appropriate sections of APM 51-4 to include Assistant and Associate University Librarians. Shortly after this, on May 31, 1974, UCOP issued a draft of APM Section 83 covering the appointment and promotion of Assistant and Associate University Librarians. In reviewing this draft at the Spring 1975 Assembly, LAUC reiterated its views that AULs should be subject to peer review and should have dual appointments and retreat rights, provisions not included in the proposal but no resolution was offered. It was decided that each division would submit comments to the LAUC President for forwarding to UCOP. Section 83 took effect on December 1, 1975; its sub-section 83-80 stipulated that the LAUC division on each campus was to have a voice in the development of procedures for the appointment and merit increases of Assistant and Associate University Librarians.

By 1980, the LAUC membership had reversed itself on the issues of retreat rights and dual appointments for Assistant and Associate University Librarians. The Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Inter-Series Movement and Retreat Rights for Assistant/Associate University Librarians generated extended debate. Two of the three recommendations were accepted: that there should be no retreat rights for Assistant and Associate University Librarians, and that existing University policy governing movement from one series into another--by an appointment process requiring open recruitment and peer review--be sustained. The third recommendation, on dual appointments for Assistant or Associate University Librarians, invoked lengthy debate and was returned to the committee for further study and comment. The concept of dual appointments was rejected by the following Assembly.

Automation and Media

One of the first non-personnel issues tackled by LAUC was that of library automation. At the membership meeting following the 1970 Fall Assembly, Fred Bellomy of the Library Systems Development (LSD) Program was the featured speaker. The purpose of the Program was to develop a centralized UC online catalog. It was funded by the Office of the President and

endorsed by Library Council. The topic returned to the agenda of the Spring 1971 Assembly, when LAUC resolved to take a stronger role in advising on the new program. The Assembly voted to establish an Automation Committee to assist in evaluating any further LSD studies or programs for the future automation of the UC libraries.

In 1975 the University was discussing the adoption of Stanford University's BALLOTS as the online bibliographic and circulation control system for the University. LAUC passed a resolution at the Spring Assembly affirming the desirability and priority of an online bibliographic system, but recommending that participation in BALLOTS or any other such system be made only after receiving clear assurance from the University administration and the State government that they will provide all necessary funding in addition to, rather than at the expense of, existing levels of support for library acquisitions and services. Through the years there were various discussions of the development of MELVYL, which was to become the UC online system.

Also in 1975 the Long Range Planning and Development Committee, chaired by Beverly Toy, responded to a Joint Powers Agreement for the University to join CLASS (Cooperative Library Agency for Systems & Services), focusing primarily on the source of financial support for CLASS projects. Library Council discussed the committee's report at length before deciding to join the agency.

The Committee on Library Policies, chaired by Marjorie Morse (UCSC), had been charged with recommending standards for physical and bibliographic access in view of the centralization proposed by the Office of the President. Its 1975 report, which considered the implications of Universitywide bibliographic access, the need for standardization and quality control, adequate record content and frequency of record cumulation, was forwarded to Library Council and to James Albertson, Assistant Vice President for Academic Planning.

Over the years LAUC established a number of committees on automation, and especially on unifying automation and other access issues on the campuses. Among them was the report from the Committee on Library Policies, chaired by Lynn Smith (UCR), which had been charged with "developing general guidelines regarding the role of the University of California libraries in the acquisition, housing, use and bibliographic control of non-print media." Its report in 1975 made ten specific recommendations, including planning for media in each library; the appointment of a media librarian on each campus; circulation, including interlibrary loan, of media; the inclusion of media in the discussions of Library Council's Collection Development Committee; and asking Library Council and the Office of the President to support the concept of media in the UC libraries. It was approved by the Assembly and forwarded to Library Council and to Director of Library Planning Steve Salmon.

At the end of 1979 LAUC established the Ad Hoc Committees on Textual and Numeric Databases and on Microcomputer Applications in the University of California. The report from the former, which had been officially commended by Library Council, was discussed at length at the 1984 Spring Assembly. With a few wording changes, the delegates adopted each of the nine recommendations: that a needs assessment study be conducted on each campus; that responsibility for textual and numeric data files be assigned to a specific person on each campus; that campus advisory committees be established; that the library be the central repository and referral center for information about the databases; that the UC libraries cooperate on a systemwide level in negotiating contracts; that funds be allocated to provide access to the data

files; and that textual and numeric data files be included in long-range planning for the University libraries. The LAUC President was directed to transmit the report to Vice President Bill Frazer for appropriate implementation.

While the MELVYL System was used by all UC libraries, its design did not meet all of the libraries' needs. Librarians saw the need for local integrated online systems, and several of the campuses developed systems independent of MELVYL. In February 1987, Senior Vice President Frazer established the Library Automation Review Committee (LARC) to investigate the current and future status of library automation in the University of California. Its report was issued in December 1988, under the title "Library Automation in the University of California, 1987-1992." It recommended that the University finance the development of local library automation systems while continuing to support the MELVYL catalog. The recommendation has never been realized; the UC libraries have placed a high priority on developing local integrated systems, but they have been funded from existing library budgets with some additional support from the campus administrations.

Library Instruction

In 1974 LAUC established an Ad Hoc Committee on Library and Bibliographic Instruction. Its final report was presented at the Spring 1976 Assembly at Davis, whose theme was "Librarians as Teachers." The featured speaker was Robert Hayes, Dean of the UCLA Graduate School of Library and Information Science,

Following Hayes' presentation, the Assembly considered the final report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Library and Bibliographic Instruction, chaired by Beverly Toy (UCI). Its major recommendations were analogous to those suggested by Dean Hayes: that UC libraries be recognized as academic departments, and "that librarians teaching such courses use their own academic titles as librarians and that these academic titles qualify them to serve as Officers of Instruction." The report also recommended that library budgets be revised to provide staff FTE on the basis of students taking the courses, so that the courses would be self-supporting. The Assembly voted to reserve judgment until a later time on the recommendation that libraries be recognized as academic departments, since it presented budgetary and administrative problems not fully identified; with this exception the report was adopted.

The issue of librarians as "officers of instruction" was brought before the Academic Senate by Dean Hayes, but the initial tone of the faculty discussion was negative. Upon learning of this, LAUC President Lan Dyson met with the Chair of the Academic Senate; both agreed that discussion should begin with the Office of the President. Further discussion of the topic at the systemwide level does not appear in the LAUC documentation.

Peer Review (Before 1984)

Although peer review has always been a local option, the application of the APM criteria on the various campuses has occasioned many LAUC discussions at the systemwide level. The goal has been to achieve some semblance of uniformity or standardization. The first discussions, from 1970 to 1972, revolved around the provisions of APM Sections 82 and 51-4. In 1974 the Committee on Privileges, Salaries, and Conditions of Employment, chaired by John Tanno

(UCR), had been charged with recommending criteria for promotion or appointment to the rank of Librarian. Its report was referred to the campuses for comment. Irvine submitted a minority view which took the position that the crucial point in the review of a librarian's career should be from Assistant to Associate rather than from Associate to Librarian, as the committee report proposed. The committee recommendations were accepted by the Assembly and became the basis of the first LAUC Position Paper, "Criteria for Appointment or Promotion to the Rank of Librarian" which was first issued in December 1975.

In 1976 the Committee on Professional Standards, chaired by Barbara Tillett (UCSD), undertook what at first seemed a fairly simple charge: to prepare criteria for the promotion from Assistant to Associate librarian rank, paralleling the work done by the previous year's committee on the criteria for promotion from Associate to Librarian. But this proved to be another controversial topic. The divisions generally agreed that sections 82 and 51-4 of the Academic Personnel Manual adequately defined the criteria, but not how these criteria should be articulated. At the Fall 1976 Assembly consensus was finally reached that the committee's report would become part of a revised Position Paper #1, to be renamed "Criteria for Appointment and Promotion." Also incorporated into the paper would be the report of an Ad Hoc Committee on the Top Step of the Librarian Rank, which was set up with Marion Taylor (UCSC) as chair.

At the 1977 Spring Assembly at Santa Cruz, the Assembly accepted a statement from the Ad Hoc Committee on the Top Step of the Librarian Rank, charged with recommending general standards and procedures for advancement to this level. The accepted statement was sent to the Office of the President, and on August 10 Vice President Kleingartner issued a memo to the Chancellors which added to the section on "Normal Periods of Service" in the Academic Salary Scales the following:

Advancement from Step IV to Step V is reserved for Librarians with a distinguished career history who have demonstrated significant achievements since attaining Step IV.

This statement was also added to LAUC's Position Paper #1, which was reissued in January 1978.

A few years later, in January 1980, one of the most controversial letters ever received by LAUC was on the same theme of the two APM sections. It came from the pen of Ann Hinckley, Head of Reference at UCLA, who had noticed a gradual evolution toward requiring an increasing proportion of criteria 2-4 as necessary conditions for promotion or merit increase. In her view, the requirement of outside activities for librarians was inconsistent with the goals of a service organization; the library was in fact becoming an arena for professional development rather than one for the delivery of services. She felt that academic librarians ought to have patterned themselves after the lecturer rather than the professorial series, and that part of the problem was the lack of specificity as to what proportion of criteria 2-4 were relevant in the review. President Joyce Toscan distributed the letter to the divisions, where it stirred up warm debate, as revealed in several of the other chapters of this book. But in the end, after receiving reports of their discussions, Toscan concluded that "there is no unified consensus of opinion on any campus," and decided against making it a topic for LAUC that year. Nor was it ever discussed at the systemwide level again.

Though it was not part of its specific charge, the Committee on Privilege, Salaries, and Conditions of Employment raised the topic of standardized documentation for reviews in 1975, and drafted guidelines which became Position Paper #3, "Documentation Guidelines for the Review of Librarians."

It came to the attention of LAUC that on some of the campuses there were members of the librarian series who were not under the jurisdiction of the University Librarian or were responsible to a systemwide authority, and thus were not subject to peer review. In 1975 the Committee on Committees, Rules, and Jurisdiction (chair: Eric MacDonald, UCI) was asked to recommend peer review procedures for these appointees. Its report was discussed at the Fall 1976 Assembly and became the basis of LAUC's Position Paper #4: "Review Procedures for Librarians Outside the Normal Campus Review Process."

This Position Paper was issued by President David Saxon in August 1977. His letter to the Chancellors reported that Section 82 of the APM would be revised to include the provisions outlined in the paper, so that librarians not under the jurisdiction of a University Librarian would be officially covered by the review procedures.

There was much curiosity among LAUC members over how the review process was conducted on campuses other than their own. Did they all have a real peer review system? Were all librarians being moved upward? Were there discrepancies between the campuses in the ease or difficulty with which librarians attained merit increases and promotions?

The curiosity led to the establishment of two ad hoc committees by the 1978 Spring Assembly. The first, on Comparative Standards for Peer Review (chair: Daniel Richards, UCLA), followed an especially lively debate, since despite their curiosity many delegates were strongly committed to local options and resisted any further systemwide standardization. The committee fulfilled part of its charge by preparing documentation on the local application of Sections 82 and 51-4 of the APM; but when turning to the second charge, to examine these documents and interpretations for differing standards and to report to the membership, it found there were too many variables to make recommendations on standardizing the process.

The other committee, on Reporting Peer Review Statistics, has proved to be one of the most durable though controversial of LAUC projects. Its first progress report, under chair Linda Hoffmann (Kennedy) of UCD, contained a proposed form with definitions for reporting the statistics, was warmly debated. Some of the smaller campuses were afraid that confidentiality would be abridged if statistics were reported. The issue was further complicated by local variations in the peer review process and the need to have precise definitions if the statistics were to be meaningful. A consensus was eventually reached—though, as seen in a later chapter, the Riverside division's opposition recurred from time to time for more than a decade—and peer review statistics were published annually in the *LAUC Newsletter* until that publication's demise.

Confidentiality

Throughout 1976 there was considerable discussion on the confidentiality of personnel files for librarians. This issue had a rather long and convoluted history, beginning in early 1975. At that time Vice President Taylor had asked President Norah Jones for information on the practices on the nine campuses as well as LAUC's views on the subject. The reason for his request was

the bill before the State legislature proposing that individuals have free access to all records kept on them. If passed and implemented, the legislation would have a profound effect on peer review in the University of California. The letter that President Jones sent to Dr. Taylor indicated a wide diversity of opinion and practice:

[I]n my discussions with the nine campus Chairmen, I have found a strong tendency to favor open access by a librarian to information contained in his/her personnel file, with reservations mainly expressed concerning protection of the anonymity of peer review committees or of authorship of letters of reference requested under assurance of confidentiality There is general agreement that librarians should see all evaluations of their performance made by those in a supervisorial relationship and should know of all recommendations made by supervisors concerning personnel actions affecting them. Beyond this, no unanimous conclusions have so far been reached.

In January the University administration's Report of the Special Committee on Personnel Records (the Taylor Committee) was released, and LAUC was asked for a response. The report, written from the faculty point of view, recommended standardizing University policy on personnel records for academics. It proposed that academics not have access to references or evaluative letters received in confidence, to the letter of appraisal from the chairperson or head of the unit, or to reports and recommendations from ad hoc and standing committees, but only to non-confidential documents in the personnel file.

The recommendations were studied by the LAUC divisions, and again there was no consensus. In his March 30 response to Vice President Kleingartner, President Lan Dyson identified three common themes in the replies from the divisions:

1. Librarians felt that "it is basic to our professional structure that we have access to departmental recommendations;
2. It was the view of most librarians that there should be more access to personnel records than proposed by the committee; and
3. The "Bodenheimer Dissent," which recommended that a copy of the departmental evaluation be made available to the individual prior to submission to the Dean and that the recommendations of the ad hoc committee (but not the names of the committee's members) be made available to the individual, was favored by a majority of the campuses as an acceptable middle ground between the competing requirements of confidentiality and full disclosure.

President Dyson's letter continued:

To sum up, librarians are most concerned that the procedures recommended by the Special Committee would result in a step backward, especially regarding the confidentiality of departmental letters. We see no useful professional, academic

or managerial purpose served by keeping departmental evaluations confidential. Many of us would hope this might be a general principle applicable to all academic classes, but if not, we would argue that the special hierarchical nature of libraries mandates for librarians a procedure different from those for other academic classes.

Dr. Kleingartner responded on May 17 that he had no objection to having the personnel process for librarians structured somewhat differently from that for faculty.

The matter did not end there. UC President Saxon established a committee, chaired by Vice Chancellor Horowitz of UCLA, to prepare revisions to the appropriate sections of the APM on confidentiality of personnel records. In December Vice President Kleingartner asked LAUC for its advice on the Horowitz Report ("University Policy Relating to the Maintenance and Use of Academic Personnel Records and Procedural Safeguards Designed to Assure Fairness in the Academic Personnel Process"), writing:

Although the policy has been designed principally for the needs of ladder-rank faculty (or the equivalent) you will find that the general statement of purpose (Part I) applies to all academic appointees and that other provisions in the document may be adaptable to the needs of the professional librarians and others covered by Sections 82 and 83 of the Academic Personnel Manual.

He added that he would welcome comments and suggestions from LAUC for developing a similar policy for the librarian series.

The LAUC President again gathered comments from the divisions, and in his response to Dr. Kleingartner on December 21 listed four major policies that were important to librarians: minimum confidentiality, open supervisory evaluations, peer monitoring of the adequacy of summaries of confidential documents, and an effective grievance procedure. He further suggested establishing either a LAUC committee or an administrative advisory committee with LAUC representation, to recommend language governing the Librarian series that would parallel that developed by the Horowitz Committee.

In February 1977 President Toy charged the LAUC Committee on Professional Standards, Privileges, Salaries and Conditions of Employment, chaired by Joyce Toscan (UCLA), with making recommendations that would allow for the implementation of the principles of the Horowitz Report to be applied to the Librarian series. She also requested recommendations for revisions in Section 191 of the APM which would apply the grievance procedures for librarians to the peer review process. Vice President Kleingartner established an administrative task force with a similar charge. The LAUC representatives to the task force were Joyce Toscan (UCLA), Marilyn Lewis (UCB), Katherine Garosi (later Mawdsley, UCD) and William McCoy (UCD).

The task force proposed revisions to Section 82 of the Academic Personnel Manual on privacy and access to personnel records, and revisions to Section 191 (Non-Senate Academic Grievance Policy and Procedures). Because of the close cooperation of the LAUC Committee on Professional Standards, Privileges, Salaries and Conditions of Employment, the recommendations of the task force were speedily approved, and the revisions to sections 51-4, 82 and 83 of the APM were issued by President Saxon on September 13.

Career Status

One of the points of dissatisfaction with Section 82 of the Academic Personnel Manual was its perceived failure to provide security of employment to librarians. There was uncertainty about the meaning of the term career status, and its relationship to the terms "tenure" and "security of employment." Since these terms continually raised questions, LAUC established an Ad Hoc Committee on a Clearer Definition of Career Status for Librarians, chaired by Michael MacInnes (UCI). At the 1977 Fall Assembly, held at Santa Barbara on December 2, it reported that its comparative analysis of security of employment, tenure and career status had found only one major area of difference between the latter two terms: positions may be reserved for an incumbent under tenure but not under career status. No precise definition of career status was forthcoming from University Counsel, and there had been no alleged abuse of career status to test and clarify the definition. Given this, the committee recommended that further efforts toward defining career status be discontinued. The report further recommended that the divisions incorporate into their peer review procedures provisions for a thorough review of librarians with career status whose competence was questioned. Both recommendations passed unanimously.

Salaries: Comparisons and Gender Bias

In 1977, in response to language in the 1977/78 State Budget Act, the California Postsecondary Education Committee established a Task Force on Librarian Salaries. Katherine Mawdsley (UCD) and William McCoy (UCD) were appointed to the Task Force by the Office of the President.

The task force report, "Librarians' Compensation at the University of California and the California State Universities and Colleges: The Search for Equity," was issued in May 1978. It found that librarians' salaries in the University of California were competitive in relation to comparison institutions, partly because there was a surplus of qualified librarians seeking employment. It suggested that the higher salaries paid to community college librarians be closely examined, since they were not justified by educational requirements or professional responsibilities. It further suggested another study be undertaken in three years, because of the rapid changes taking place in academic librarianship.

The report launched a major debate at the June 2 Assembly of that year in San Francisco, which bore down hard on its inadequate treatment of gender bias in librarians' salaries. A resolution was passed which read in part:

[T]he Librarians Association of the University of California regards the present study of librarians' compensation as an incomplete, inaccurate and therefore unacceptable basis for 'evaluating requests for salaries and benefits for librarians at the University'."

The Assembly further requested that the report be not used to evaluate or determine librarians' salaries.

At the 1978 Spring Assembly a resolution passed calling for a further study of the comparative salary position of UC librarians. The Ad Hoc Committee on Salary Inequity

reported to the 1979 Fall meeting, reconfirming the 1974 findings of the McCoy Committee "that inequities currently exist in salaries for all ranks in the Librarian series" when compared with the salaries of other UC academic staff. It asserted that the July 1975 restructuring did not correct the inequities first documented in 1971, and recommended that LAUC petition the University to request a 15.2% inequity increase for the librarians series for 1980/81. The report was accepted by the Assembly and forwarded to the Office of the President.

Bylaws and Organization

The first LAUC Bylaws, approved in September 1968, were developed by a committee chaired by Joanna Tallman (UCLA). They were patterned very closely after the "Proposed Structure of the Librarians Association of the University of California," which was approved at the Fresno meeting of October 1967. With a few changes, the 1968 Bylaws were to remain the basis of the Association until about 1976.

They stipulated that all librarians employed in the University at least half-time were members of the Association. They further mandated that persons "holding the rank of University Librarian, Associate University Librarian, Assistant University Librarian or the same ranks in an acting capacity" were not eligible to hold office or to serve as representatives to the Assembly. They set out in more detail than did subsequent Bylaws the role of the campus divisions as well as that of the systemwide organization.

As already related, the provision against the AULs holding office was to become highly controversial. At the very first Assembly after the Bylaws' approval, the Davis delegation offered a resolution characterizing the restriction as "arbitrary and discriminatory," and proposing full membership for persons in these ranks. By a vote of 12 to 5 the Assembly went on record as opposing the resolution, but in the same session voted 14 to 2 to place it on a ballot. The restriction was finally removed in 1974.

Transition of LAUC officers has generally been very orderly; each elected Vice President has succeeded to the Presidency with only three exceptions. The first Vice President, Richard Moore (UCSC), left the University while still in that office. The confusion was greater in 1971 when Maryll Lenkey (UCI), who had been Vice President through the year, resigned her employment less than two months before she was due to become President. In November an election was held for all three offices: President, Vice President/President-elect and Secretary. Michael MacInnes (UCI) was elected President—but resigned on May 19, 1972, after four and a half months in office, on being named Assistant University Librarian at Irvine. The appointment revealed some doubt as to whether the prohibition on AULs holding office in LAUC had been removed from the Bylaws. Ted Gould (UCD), who had been elected Vice President, completed MacInnes' term as President as well as his elected term in 1973. Transitional confusion did not recur until 1989, when Patricia Kreitz (UCB), elected as Vice President/President-elect, left the University before she could assume the office. The special election to fill the position was won by Sylvia Curtis (UCSB).

A panel discussion on "LAUC Governance and Communication" was held at the 1975 Fall Assembly. Panelists were Keith Blean (UCSB), Kate Garosi (UCSD), Justine Roberts (UCSF) and Barbara Robinson (UCR), and the moderator was Ted Gould (UCD). They focused on the

functions and interaction of the Assembly, the Executive Board, the divisional chairs and the membership. The original LAUC concept in 1968 was that autonomy remained with the local LAUC divisions, but with recognition and the number of issues involving the Association, there was a growing need for quick communication between the Assemblies. It was agreed that the Bylaws needed to be studied to find a more efficient means of communication and a better definition of the role of each LAUC body. An Ad Hoc Committee on the Bylaws was formed, with Sharon Baker (UCD) as chair.

The Spring 1976 Assembly received the committee's report and passed its recommendations unanimously. The major ones:

1. Changed the LAUC year from calendar to academic year (September 1-August 31);
2. Defined the duties of systemwide officers;
3. Expanded the Executive Board to include divisional Chairs;
4. Described the function of the Assembly and enabled the body to take a stand on
5. Provided for petitions of referendum and recall; and
6. Reduced standing committees from four to three. (The Committees on Professional Standards and on Privilege, Salaries and Conditions of Employment were merged.)

The revisions were approved by the membership in a special election held in September 1976.

The change in the Bylaws from calendar to academic year required moving the date of the systemwide LAUC elections from fall to spring. LAUC Vice President/President-elect, Beverly Toy, served from January 1977 to August 31, 1977, with Kate Garosi (Mawdsley) assuming the LAUC Presidency September 1, 1977.

In 1977, the Bylaws were further revised to include the Immediate Past President on the Executive Board.

Since 1971, LAUC had been seeking ways of making the Assemblies more effective and efficient. Frequently there were more items on the agenda than there was time to cover, and many topics generated considerable discussion and disagreement before a consensus was reached. At the early Assemblies, time had been set aside for reports from each of the divisions on activities that had taken place since the last meeting. At the Fall 1971 Assembly a resolution unanimously passed which instructed each divisional Chair to distribute a brief written report in advance of the meeting, in order to provide more time for discussion of critical agenda items. This provision was followed for only two or three years before it vanished.

At the end of their terms two LAUC Presidents, Beverly Toy in 1977 and Katherine Mawdsley in 1978, shared with the membership their thoughts on the organization of the Association. President Toy expressed her concern about the composition of LAUC standing committees in the *LAUC Newsletter* (v.5, no. 2, July 1977). Members were being named to standing committees before the charge to the committees was written, and sometimes they had no particular interest or background for the charges as finally determined. She proposed that the Vice President, working with the President, present to the Executive Board the scope of each

charge so that incoming committee chairs could appoint appropriate members. She also addressed a question that had surfaced many times: whether committee members spoke as individuals or for their divisions. She felt they should speak for the division in order to avoid committee reports being pulled to pieces at Assemblies.

President Mawdsley issued a paper on leaving office entitled "Thoughts on LAUC Organization." She did not feel committee members should be bound by the campus view but should be free to use their own individual expertise, especially if there was other convincing information available. She proposed a process by which committee members would gather data and campus views on the charge, then meet and discuss the issue. The members would present both their own individual views and those of their division. A draft report for divisional discussion prior to the Assembly would provide the means of gathering information on areas of strong disagreement. She also raised the issue of standing committees not completing their charges in one year. This problem had been exacerbated by the academic calendar, which mandated the completion of reports in approximately seven months if they were to be considered at the Spring Assembly. She asked the question whether standing committees should continue work until the charge was completed. She even questioned whether they were necessary at all. In a related organizational matter, she proposed a joint meeting of the old and new Executive Boards before the end of the academic year, to plan and set the tone for the following year.

The Fall 1978 Assembly at Irvine on December 1 debated the issue of standing versus ad hoc committees. After much discussion it was resolved to permit the Executive Board to disenable the standing committees on Professional Standards, Privileges, Salaries and Conditions of Employment and on Library Planning and Policies for two years, after which they would be reviewed. A resolution instructing the Executive Board to meet on the day preceding or following the Spring and Fall Assemblies was also passed.

Delegates to the following Assembly found the item back on the agenda. Some of the ad hoc committees had not been making progress; some members thought there were too many committees on specific topics. A brief and inconclusive discussion on how the work of LAUC committees chairs could be evaluated ended with an agreement to leave the matter to the Executive Board.

The Board, naturally enough, charged the Committee on Committees, Rules and Jurisdiction with investigating the use by LAUC of standing and ad hoc committees. The report presented in Spring 1980 recommended that standing committees be eliminated and the systemwide committee roster discontinued. The recommendations passed the Assembly, which also voted to charge the Committee on Committees, Rules and Jurisdiction with preparing Bylaws revisions which would eliminate all standing committees except itself.

In 1979 LAUC had ten ad hoc committees, eight of which were immersed in personnel issues: the Ad Hoc Committees to Investigate Demotions and Terminations in the Librarian and Assistant/Associate University Librarian Series (chair: Jacqueline Wilson, UCSF), to Investigate Deferred Reviews (George Lupone, UCSB), on Temporary Appointments in the Librarian Series (Karen Feeney, UCSD), on Comparative Standards for Peer Review (Daniel Richards, UCLA), on Salary Inequity (Alvis Price, UCLA), on Berman Act Collective Bargaining vis-a-vis LAUC (Joyce Toscan, UCLA), on Reporting Peer Review Statistics (Linda Hoffmann, UCD), and on Inter-Series Movement and Retreat Rights for Assistant/Associate University Librarians (Jack Leister, UCB). The two non-personnel topics were Numeric and Textual Databases (Gail

Nichols, UCB) and Regional Storage Facilities (Jack Leister, UCB). Three of the committees presented final reports to the Fall Assembly that year.

The proliferation of standing committees continued to be the norm for LAUC until the end of 1984, when the Memorandum of Understanding was signed. At the beginning of her 1982/83 term, President Jane Kimball prepared charges for seven ad hoc committees as well as the standing Committee on Committees, Rules and Jurisdiction. They illustrated the variety of LAUC's involvement in library affairs at the time. Four of them—the Ad Hoc Committees to Revise Position Paper #1 (chair: Judy Horn, UCI), to Review the Academic Personnel Manual (Barbara Tillett, UCSD), to Review Library Council Guidelines on Dual Appointments (Larry Millsap, UCSC), and to Review University Layoff Policy for Librarians (Garrett Bowles, UCSD)—were involved in personnel issues, the latter two on topics referred to LAUC from the Office of the President. The other three—on Textual and Numeric Databases (chair: Julie Kwan, UCLA), on Microcomputer Applications in the University of California (Justine Roberts, UCSF), and on Special Collections in the University of California (Peter Hanff (UCB)—were designed to advise Library Council and UCOP on Universitywide library issues.

Demotion and Deferred Reviews

Two major reports, each generating considerable discussion, were considered at the 1980 Spring Assembly at Davis on May 30. The report on demotions and terminations in the Librarian and AUL Series included the concept of demotion as a less severe alternative to termination; but the Assembly rejected this feature vigorously. It voted instead that procedures for both demotion and termination review should be developed by each campus. It further established the concept that any change in rank and step, including demotion and termination, should go through the peer review process, and that the APM should be revised to specify this. The divisions were instructed to include specific peer review procedures for all cases involving possible demotion or termination.

The second report at this Assembly was from the Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate Deferred Reviews, whose eight recommendations included a definition of a deferred review. The definition agreed upon by the Assembly was:

A deferred review is the omission of a personnel review during a year when a review would normally take place. It is a neutral action.

It was decided that deferred reviews would be for one year, "with the option of continued deferral for one additional year under appropriate circumstances." Discussion was continued at the following Assembly on two postponed items: interpretation of the salary scales and plateau points. The recommendations accepted by the Fall Assembly were that if promotion did not occur at the Assistant VI and Associate VII steps, written evaluations should occur at normal intervals as specified in the salary scales. Likewise, Librarian IV should be reviewed every three years and Librarian V every three or four years.

The Library Assistant Series

Beginning in late 1977 and continuing through the following year, widespread discussions took place on the "Report on the Investigation of the Library Assistant Series," prepared by Library Council's Personnel Committee. Each of the LAUC divisions prepared comments on the report, which proposed to restructure the duties and responsibilities of the library assistants and create a new Library Specialist series. Great interest and concern were expressed in the divisions' comments, but no overall consensus. The *LAUC Newsletter* for January 1978 contained a summary of several of the recurrent themes in this discussion. It concluded:

Support for improved financial status and recognition of the aspirations of library assistants and their increasingly important role in university libraries in general was universal; there was not general support for the separate series proposed in the Committee's report.

In April 1978 Library Council voted to add a Library Assistant V step and revise the guidelines for Library Assistant I-IV rather than create a new Library Specialist series. A new subcommittee was established to prepare class concepts for the new levels and to suggest changes in the classification guidelines for Library Assistant I-IV.

The Personnel Committee continued work on restructuring the series. A report was issued in February 1980 proposing a new Library Specialist series with five titles, the first four paralleling Library Assistant I-IV. President Joyce Toscan responded to the proposal on behalf of LAUC on May 27, asking why the Library Assistant series needed expansion. Statements in the committee's report suggested that few library assistants would be appointed to the top steps; there was indeed a perception that they were being created to ameliorate existing or potential personnel problems. If this was the case, LAUC felt the existing steps should be used. The Association also wanted a definition not only of the Library Assistant but also of the Librarian series, so that the designation of tasks to be performed at each level would be clearer. The Fall Assembly rejected the Library Assistant proposal because of the lack of distinction between the duties and responsibilities of the two series. The concept of the Library Specialist series was rejected by Library Council and returned to the committee for a clearer differentiation between library assistants and librarians.

10-Month Appointment Option

At the Assembly at Santa Barbara on May 29, 1981, a resolution was adopted on 10-month appointments for librarians. The concept had been discussed for some time, and the January 1981 issue of the *LAUC Newsletter* had included a questionnaire on the ten-month option. The response to the survey was heavy, with a large number favoring the ten-month option and an almost equal number uncertain. The resolution asked the University to form a committee, including LAUC representatives, to develop a flexible ten-month work option for librarians. It has never been implemented.

The Definition of a Librarian

The definition of a professional librarian in the University of California had been a concern for many years, not only in LAUC but also in the Office of the President and Library Council. In 1976 LAUC had set up an Ad Hoc Committee on the Duties and Responsibilities of Academic Librarians, chaired by Katherine Garosi (Mawdsley) of Davis. Its report, presented and approved at the 1977 Spring Assembly, had focused on the responsibilities of librarians within the library, to the academic community and to the profession.

The need for a definition had also become apparent in the proposal to restructure the Library Assistant series. Library Council's Personnel Committee was instructed to prepare a general philosophical definition of librarianship. At its October 1980 meeting the Council accepted in fulfillment of the committee's charge a paper by Alan Veaner, University Librarian at Santa Barbara, entitled "Continuity and Discontinuity: a Persistent Personnel Issue in Academic Librarianship." LAUC divisions did not feel the paper met their needs.

Earlier, in May 1980, the Executive Board had decided that LAUC should take responsibility for a statement of professional responsibilities. President Toscan prepared a statement, "Major Principals Outlining Academic Librarian Responsibilities," in August 1980, which was discussed at a joint meeting of the 1979/80 and 1980/81 Executive Boards. In November of the same year President Jack Leister established the Ad Hoc Committee on the Definition of a Professional Librarian in the University of California, with Eric MacDonald (UCI) as chair. Its charge was to provide "a comprehensive definition of the professional setting of the nine campuses of the University of California." The committee's report, which came before the 1982 Spring Assembly at Santa Cruz, was mainly based on information from the Academic Personnel Manual and the Labor Relations Management Act. President Judy Ganson stressed the critical need of a statement on the responsibilities of librarians, especially in the budget crunch the University was undergoing. She urged full discussion of the issue rather than simple editorial changes.

This action foreshadowed a change in the nature of discussions at the semi-annual meetings. It can be seen from the minutes of subsequent Assemblies that there was movement away from rewriting documents during the meetings and toward a discussion of the issues. The deliberations on professionalism in Spring 1982 centered around the length of the statement as well as the detailed functional listing of librarians' responsibilities, which was taken from Section 360-4 (formerly 260-4) of the APM. The Assembly was in favor of a shorter document retaining only the conceptual aspects of the statement. After extended debate it instructed the Executive Board to turn the report into a LAUC Position Paper. The Board and President Ganson began work on the paper, and at the Fall Assembly President Jane Kimball announced that it had been approved by the Board and she had decided to issue a functional statement about which there was still disagreement among the divisions. It was published in January 1983 as Position Paper #5, "The Academic Librarian in the University of California."

A definition of the librarian's work week has also been a persistent problem since the beginning; it has generated much debate at LAUC Assemblies and in the divisions. In 1969 the Berkeley Task Force included a section on the Academic Work Week:

The number of weekly hours required of an academic library staff member may vary according to the pressures of the season, service needs, and specific responsibilities, but they average thirty-five. It is expected that the individual librarian will assume responsibility not only for maintaining his own attendance in accordance with the schedules and demands of his department, but that he will also commit himself to the interests of the library and the University, the general advancement of his profession, and his own professional growth.

In reality, the work week for librarians in the University of California has never averaged thirty-five hours. It is understood that, as academic employees, they are exempt from the 40-hour-per-week restriction placed on non-academic staff. However, until 1984, no official statement ever attempted to define the work week, and its interpretation varied greatly from campus to campus, frequently following the views of the University Librarian. Some adopted a liberal interpretation, while others were much more restrictive, even to the point of requiring librarians to work a 40-hour week.

The Memorandum of Understanding of 1984 finally codified the concept. It made it clear that the set work week of librarians in many unionized institutions has no counterpart in the University of California. Here, to the extent possible, librarians have control over their time. One is expected to be in the library when one has commitments there and may work at home at other times, though the interpretation of the principle continues to vary somewhat from campus to campus. While this has helped increase librarians' flexibility, it has also tended to augment their working hours, since few can perform both their primary position responsibilities and professional development activities within a week of forty hours.

Collective Bargaining

LAUC's role under collective bargaining was first debated at the Fall Assembly of 1978. A consensus emerged that regardless of whether librarians accepted collective bargaining, LAUC must continue. A resolution passed instructing LAUC President Virginia Sherwood to communicate to Vice President Kleingartner that LAUC

reaffirms its continuing vital role as official advisory body to the administration of the University. This role operates and shall continue to operate independently of any collective bargaining agreements or agents.

The Assembly also resolved to establish an Ad Hoc Committee on Berman Act Collective Bargaining vis-a-vis LAUC, to inform the membership of alternatives available to librarians under the collective bargaining legislation. Its report was accepted without discussion at the 1979 Spring Assembly, since it was primarily an information report recommending its own distribution to all LAUC members.

In 1977 legislation was passed extending limited collective bargaining to State employees. It did not cover UC or the California State University and Colleges, though legislation to that effect was expected to pass during the next session. (In fact, the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations (Berman) Act, establishing collective bargaining for the University of California,

became law in August 1978.) An Ad Hoc Committee to Provide Background Information on Collective Bargaining, chaired by Joyce Toscan (UCLA), reported to the Assembly of Spring 1978. It had been charged "to prepare brief and basic information on the important concepts and steps in the process of implementing collective bargaining," and to consider whether and how the advent of collective bargaining might affect the role of LAUC in University governance. The need to educate LAUC members about collective bargaining was noted at the Assembly, and each campus was asked to hold discussions on the report.

If the LAUC officers felt it necessary to complete this education process in a short time, it was to be disabused. It took the Public Employment Relations Board more than four years after passage of the Berman Act to certify labor organizations and prepare for the elections, which finally took place in June 1983.

The first part of this year became known as the "laboratory period" for LAUC. Its role remained uncertain, despite the many letters written and meetings held involving LAUC officers and the Office of the President on the subject. Several divisions wanted to sponsor programs presenting various points of view on collective bargaining—one planned to focus on the future of LAUC if an exclusive representative was chosen—but University legal counsel ruled that it would not be appropriate for LAUC, which was supported by University funds, to sponsor such discussions. Its position was that during the pre-election period University management should not solicit advice on issues within the scope of representation; and if such issues were discussed at all, it should not be at joint meetings with managers and non-managers. This was especially troublesome to LAUC, since it embraced both employee categories. A letter of March 10, 1983 to President Kimball from Lube Levin, Director of Academic and Staff Employee Relations in UCOP, advised LAUC to refrain from formulating recommendations during this period.

It was clear that LAUC could not function in a "business as usual" mode. In spring 1983, for the first time in its history, it did not hold a scheduled Assembly meeting. In a letter to all LAUC members in March, Kimball wrote:

The cancellation of a LAUC Assembly is not a matter that should be taken lightly. It has never been done before in the history of LAUC. In fact, the Assembly is considered to be of such importance to the vitality of the organization that the LAUC Bylaws stipulate that an Assembly may be canceled only if the majority of LAUC members casting ballots approve of such an action (Article VII. Section 2.d).

A ballot for voting was attached to the letter.

In the June election on representation for collective bargaining, the only union filing was the University Federation of Librarians (UFL), an affiliate of the American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO). With 85% of the eligible librarians participating, the vote was 170 (51.8%) in favor of representation and 158 (48.2%) against. In August the Office of the President advised President Kimball of those activities in which LAUC could participate pending the outcome of the labor negotiations. Several activities could continue as before: the peer review process; service by librarians on Academic Senate committees; LAUC participation in the research grants program; released time and financial support for LAUC activities; and participation in LAUC by supervisors as well as librarians in the bargaining unit, so long as the Association did not

undertake any issues under the scope of representation. As for LAUC committee reports, which were regularly submitted to UCOP, it was decided that while the University was prohibited from consulting with LAUC on matters within the scope of representation, they were not precluded from receiving reports initiated by LAUC or from considering reports outside the scope of representation.

Just before the Spring Assembly, word reached LAUC of a proposed new "Tier Two" in the University's collective bargaining negotiations with the University Federation of Librarians. Tier Two was a second level of agreement being discussed by the University and UFL, under which recommendations for the administration and mechanisms of certain professional issues, such as peer review, professional governance, professional standards and research funds, would still come from LAUC. The concept was developed firstly because the University would not allow peer review to be subject to arbitration, and secondly because the UFL negotiating team included members of LAUC—its chief negotiator was Joyce Toscan, a former LAUC President—and none of these wanted LAUC to relinquish any of the academic privileges it had worked so hard to attain. In developing Tier Two, the basic assumption of the University and UFL was to preserve the quality of librarians and libraries in the University. Both groups saw peer review and LAUC's role central in this process.

Tier Two was a development without precedent in collective bargaining agreements, and it signaled a new direction for LAUC, which since the laboratory period had judiciously avoided any discussion of issues under the scope of representation. LAUC officers had a number of meetings with University officials, to discuss not the contents of Tier Two but the role the Association was to play.

At Los Angeles on May 18, the Assembly passed a resolution affirming LAUC's willingness to provide a mechanism for the operation of peer review. The resolution declared that

LAUC strongly believes

that the peer review process should be preserved and continued;

that LAUC is the appropriate body to administer peer review and to ensure that due process is observed;

that LAUC's role in peer review should be strengthened and enhanced; and

that LAUC should develop mechanisms to assure that peer review is exercised with equal authority on all campuses.

Following the submission of this resolution to the Office of the President, there was a formal exchange of letters between Vice President Frazer and LAUC President Marion Taylor on LAUC's willingness to participate and advise in the maintenance of peer review, professional governance, professional standards and librarians' research.

The University of California and the UFL formally issued a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on August 30, 1984, just one month after their agreement on the Statement on Professional and Governance Concerns (Tier Two). On behalf of both represented and non-

represented librarians, LAUC charged three committees with carrying out the provisions of the Compact (as it came to be known) and identifying necessary changes to the Academic Personnel Manual and the LAUC Bylaws. The Ad Hoc Committee on Peer Review/Revision of the APM (chair: Nancy Koller, UCR) was to recommend specific revisions to the APM which would incorporate the "Professional and Governance Concerns" statement. It was also asked to review the final reports of the Ad Hoc Committees to Review the APM and to Review Position Paper #1, dealing with advancement to Librarian Step V—reports that had been submitted during the "laboratory" period and never reviewed by LAUC. The task of Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Standards (chair: Margaret Robinson, UCSC) was to draft a Librarians' Code of Conduct to be inserted in the APM, and that of the Research Committee to recommend procedures for allocating funds for research and creative activity. Monies for research on the campuses were specified in the Memorandum of Understanding.

The Tier Two compact brought about a new and more important role for LAUC and a higher status within the University. Having become responsible for proposing rules by which librarians were to be governed, and establishing a structure to monitor peer review procedures on the campuses, it had exchanged its reactive posture for an active one. Further changes to its structure were necessary, for standing committees were now needed to deal with the issues mentioned in the statement on "Professional and Governance Concerns."

An Evolving Structure

Since the recognition of LAUC in 1975, the format of the Assemblies and the role of the Executive Board—composed of the President, the Vice President/President-Elect, the Secretary and the divisional Chairs, had been evolving. From the early 1980s, and especially during the term of President Ganson, the Board's function was tangibly augmented. It reviewed committee reports before they were presented to the delegates, allowing Assembly discussions to focus more on concepts and issues, less on detailed editorial changes. This in turn lowered the temperature at the Assembly meetings, though there were still many unexpected and lively debates. President Mawdsley had begun the practice of sending memos and reports to the Board members several times a year, keeping them abreast of current happenings; the practice was continued by subsequent Presidents, and the Executive Board began to assume the role of steering committee for the Association. It also took over from the Assembly the major initiative in establishing ad hoc committees. Formal minutes of the Board's meetings first appeared about 1983.

The extra Executive Board meetings, and the need for increased communication with both the divisions and the Office of the President, augmented the amount of time the LAUC President needed to carry out the responsibilities of the office. The expectations and workload increased gradually from 1975 through the 1980s, until Presidents were spending half of their time, and sometimes three-fourths or all of it, on LAUC business. In the mid-1970s UCOP augmented the funds budgeted for LAUC to include a half-time replacement for the President at the mid-Associate Librarian range. The money was sent to the President's library to cover the time the President was unable to perform his or her primary duties. Some libraries used it to create a temporary professional position; others hired clerical assistance for the President, or a combination of the two. In the mid-1980s funds for clerical assistance for the LAUC Secretary were also provided.

In 1975 President Jones had begun the practice of holding regional meetings with the LAUC divisional chairs. In the late 1970s the Board initiated the practice of meeting on the eve of the Assembly to discuss major items on the following day's agenda. This helped to keep the Assembly focus on the most important aspects of some of the more controversial topics. However, during the late 1970s there were some Assemblies at which there was not enough time for presentation of all the reports because of the extended discussions provoked by some of them. Many of the meetings were very lively; specific details were sometimes hotly debated.

Some Assemblies were confusing because the specific wording of recommendations was amended and voted on at the meeting. The role of the appointed parliamentarian thus became more important in keeping the Assembly on track; the need for such an official indeed became very obvious when none was present. In the late 1970s Katherine Mawdsley (UCD) usually served as Parliamentarian for meetings held on the Northern campuses, and Bruce Pelz (UCLA) for those in the South. From 1985 Pelz assumed the role for all LAUC Assemblies; only when he was unable to attend was another Parliamentarian designated.

Following the hiatus caused by the confusion over the role of LAUC in the laboratory period, the bi-annual Assemblies were resumed on November 18, 1983 in San Francisco. None of the issues before the delegates concerned personnel matters; instead reports were given by the Research Committee and the Ad Hoc Committees on Textual and Numeric Databases, Special Collections in the University of California Libraries and Microcomputer Applications. The major topic of the day was "Future Directions for LAUC."

A list of ideas from most of the divisions of non-personnel topics to be undertaken by LAUC had been distributed in advance of the meeting. Several of them centered around research by librarians. Other topics were the need for MELVYL user education, a functional directory of UC librarians, promotion of professional development, and development of an active LAUC Publications Board that might publish research done by members. Resolutions were passed to establish two committees: one "to coordinate the training of users of the online catalog," the other to plan a functional directory of UC librarians.

An Expanding Advisory Role

The Association's role as an advisory body to the University was expanding. The number of non-personnel matters LAUC considered, the number of issues referred to it by the Office of the President, the number of Library Council committees on which LAUC had secured membership—all these continued to grow.

In the early 1970s there were only two systemwide administrative committees to which LAUC members had been appointed. The first was the Special Committee to Study Librarians Salaries in 1972; the other, the Library Policy Task Force of the Academic Planning and Program Review Board. Martha Peterson (UCSB) was selected to represent LAUC on the task force. It was chaired by Vice President Taylor, and its purpose was to develop acquisitions rates for UC Library collections, especially on the smaller campuses. The request for a LAUC member followed the association's response to a report from the Academic Planning Program and Review Board on planning for the development of the nine campus libraries through the 1970s. The report, "Tentative Statement of the University of California Library Policy to 1980-81," contained the first statement of the concept of one library system for the University of California.

In 1975, for the first time since the beginning of LAUC, the Office of the President underwent a major reorganization, not only in the team players but in basic philosophy. UC President Charles Hitch was replaced by David Saxon, who was strongly in favor of the one-University concept, a notable change from the decentralization view of the late 1960s and early 1970s. Angus Taylor left his position on July 1, 1975 and was replaced by two men: Donald Swain as Academic Vice President and Archie Kleingartner as Vice President, Academic and Staff Relations. At the Fall Assembly, held at Berkeley on December 5, 1975, Donald Swain, the new Vice President for Academic Affairs, gave a presentation on the new Universitywide approach to library planning, the concept of one library rather than nine separate ones. The Library Policy Steering Committee now had responsibility for Library Planning, Steve Salmon was appointed to the new position of Director of Library Planning, and a Master Plan for the University of California Libraries was being formulated.

LAUC's expanding role was especially notable in 1977/78, when it was asked not only by the Office of the President but also by Library Council to respond to a number of issues: the mandatory retirement age, a Universitywide benefits study, a report on the 8-year rule for lecturers and instructors, recognition of LASAC (Library Assistants and Staff Advisory Council), procedures for the appointment of temporary librarians, and whether UCOP should set up a committee to study the movement of individuals from staff to academic classifications. Librarians were also participating in and offering advice to Library Council subgroups, especially the Collection Development Committee and the Advisory Committee on Library Studies. In the early 1980s LAUC provided advice to the University on such topics as the future of, and selection process for, the position of Assistant Vice President for Library Plans and Policies; a management review of the Division of Library Automation (DLA); and the development of the UC Prototype Online Catalog, the embryo of MELVYL. These and similar topics began to occupy an ever-increasing amount of attention at the Assemblies and Executive Board meetings.

In 1984 a LAUC member was added to Library Council's Bibliographic Products Advisory Committee (BPAC), and one to its Personnel Committee. Since that time a LAUC member has been appointed to each newly created committee of this organization. As LAUC secured membership on Council committees, reports from the representatives, who were appointed for a term of three years, became a regular feature of the Assemblies. LAUC also achieved representation on the Northern and Southern Regional Library Facility Boards, and UCOP designated the LAUC President a member of the Universitywide Affirmative Action Advisory Committee.

The Office of the President provided increased funding for systemwide LAUC activities, and designated staff liaisons for the committees working on the provisions of the Compact. This level of support from UCOP was unprecedented. Julie Gordon, the University's Principal Policy Analyst for Academic Affairs, was assigned to assist the Peer Review/APM Revision Committee; Myron Okada, Principal Administrative Analyst, Academic Affairs, the Professional Standards Committee. They not only attended committee meetings and offered guidance and advice; they also attended the LAUC Assemblies as resource persons when these topics were discussed. They also willingly assisted the Association in every possible way as these issues were discussed. The Compact itself was issued by University President David Gardner in January 1985 as Section 360A of the APM.

Yet another sign of LAUC's growing influence was a presentation to the Fall 1984 Assembly by David Gardner. This was the first time a President of the University had addressed an Assembly of the Librarians Association.

There was other evidence during the late 1980s and early 1990s of LAUC's continuing influence within the University of California. In 1987 Library Council was restructured. Until this time Council membership was composed of the nine University Librarians (the ULs, or directors of the campus libraries), a representative of the Academic Senate Committee on the Library, and the President of LAUC. It was chaired by one of the ULs on a rotating basis. Under the restructuring Senior Vice President Bill Frazer assumed the chair; one of the ULs served as Vice Chair on a rotating basis. Several additional academic members were added, including representatives of the Academic Vice Chancellors and the Deans. The LAUC Past President also became a voting member. LAUC members now served on all Council committees and subcommittees, though LAUC Presidents had to remain alert that representation was not overlooked. The pattern allowed LAUC to respond to topics discussed by Council, and a substantial part of each Assembly and some Executive Board meetings was devoted to issues being considered there. The LAUC Presidents continued the tradition of presenting a written report on LAUC activities to each Council meeting, as well as reporting on Council activities to the LAUC membership.

The 1987 restructure was a result of a reorganization in the Office of the President following the resignation of Michael Buckland as Assistant Vice President for Library Plans and Policies. The Office of Library Plans and Policies was abolished and replaced by the Library Affairs Office, with Dennis Smith as Director. The Division of Library Studies and Research, which had reported to the Office of Library Plans and Policies, was dissolved. The Division of Library Automation, with its responsibility for the MELVYL system, was transferred to the office of Associate Vice President Richard West. These actions consolidated all the various automation programs of the Office of the President under one unit, but removed a major library component from the jurisdiction of Academic Affairs. Dennis Smith first addressed LAUC at the 1987 Fall Assembly, and he has appeared at all subsequent Assemblies permitted by his schedule, to report on events taking place in the Office of Library Affairs, with a focus on the budget. Attendance at LAUC Meetings, like his attendance at Library Council meetings, has become an expected duty of his position. Myron Okada, Assistant Director for Academic Personnel, has continued to attend LAUC Assemblies and serves as an important link between LAUC and the Office of the President, especially on issues related to personnel and to identifying the dividing line between MOU and non-MOU issues.

Peer Review/APM Revision (After 1984)

The Ad Hoc Committee on Peer Review/Revision of the APM began its work in September 1984 and was formally discharged in December of the following year, after reporting to the Fall 1984 and Spring 1985 Assemblies and revising the documents approved at these meetings. Its recommendations, as with those of the Professional Standards Committee, not only needed approval by the LAUC membership but had then to be sent to the Office of the President, which distributed them for formal and informal review by the Chancellors, Vice Chancellors and

University Librarians as well as LAUC before they could become part of the Academic Personnel Manual. UCOP originally planned to have the final recommendations incorporated into a revision of the APM by July 1985. This 1985 revision renumbered the various sections; what was formerly Section 82 became 360, and Section 51-4 became 210-4.

The first report of the Peer Review/Revision of the APM Committee was given after only seven weeks of work, and its recommendations on peer review were adopted with several amendments after an exhausting debate. One of its recommendations was to establish a standing Committee on Professional Governance "to serve as an advisory body to the LAUC President and the Office of the President on issues concerning APM revisions, peer review and other professional governance issues not covered by other standing committees." The new committee was also given responsibility for preparing and maintaining a LAUC Manual containing various documents needed for the peer review process. On receiving a letter from its chair Nancy Koller, LAUC President Beverly French gave the ad hoc committee the additional charge to prepare documentation setting forth LAUC's position on temporary appointments/appointees and deferred reviews, for inclusion in the Academic Personnel Manual.

Temporary Appointments

The Ad Hoc Committee on Temporary Appointments, established in 1978, reported to the Spring 1980 Assembly. That body referred the report back to the committee, to recommend whether time spent in a temporary appointment should count toward career status. It was the sense of the Assembly that temporary appointees in the Librarian series should be treated as full professionals. Discussion was continued at the Fall Assembly after the committee handed in its final report, with extended debate on each of the eleven recommendations, of which eight were adopted. Temporary positions should be used only when no other option was feasible; individuals should be limited to two years cumulatively in temporary status; temporary positions ought to be posted and affirmative-action guidelines followed and reviewed by a committee of peers; time spent in temporary status should be credited toward time spent in potential career status; and further study needed to be given to the feasibility of developing a pool of temporary librarians. Several of these concepts were already in the APM; the purpose of the resolution was to assure their uniform interpretation and implementation throughout the system. The decision that time spent in temporary status be counted toward career status was sent back to the committee for further guidance on implementation. The issue reached its final stage in the spring of the following year, when the recommendations accepted at the Fall 1980 Assembly, and a resolution setting forth the basic agreements on temporary appointments, were forwarded to the Office of the President.

The issue resurfaced in 1984, when, as noted above, the Ad Hoc Committee on Peer Review/Revision of the APM was charged with preparing documentation setting forth LAUC's position on temporary appointments/appointees. As it fulfilled the charge in its second report, to the 1985 Spring Assembly, some of those who had been present at the 1980 Spring Assembly experienced a feeling of *déjà vu*. The 1985 debate was an extended one, and several changes were made. A major one clarified the length of a temporary appointment with the statement: "an appointee can hold a given temporary position for no more than two (2) years unless the position is funded by extramural funds for a longer time period."

It was also agreed that because of the confusion over counting temporary time towards potential career status, "if appointed to a permanent position, service contribution for time spent in temporary status will be given consideration in determining rank and step." The proposed APM revisions on peer review, temporary appointments and deferred reviews were forwarded to the Office of the President in two separate segments. They were sent out by that office for review, with the deadline for comments set for November. Approval was given in 1986 for inclusion of the recommendations, with some minor revisions, in the Academic Personnel Manual.

Professional Standards

The road toward resolution of the professional standards issues was much more difficult; in fact, the topic was destined to become one of the most complex in all of LAUC's history. Discussions to meet the requirements of the Compact began in 1984 under President French, and continued through the terms of the three succeeding Presidents before reaching a rather unsatisfactory resolution under Nancy Koller in 1987/88. The purpose of the Code of Professional Conduct, a portion of the APM's Section 360A, was to provide LAUC with the opportunity to develop a structure similar to that of the Academic Senate's Privilege and Tenure Committee and to provide librarians with self-governance. Discipline for librarians had been administratively imposed and they had only "post-action" protection. 360A would provide "pre-action" protection, and at the same time expand the concept of peer governance. However, rather than working to build a peer governance system, LAUC stalled over details or "pieces of the whole."

A report submitted to the 1984 Fall Assembly, by Margaret Gordon (Robinson) for her Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Standards, had proposed four documents for inclusion in the APM: Rights of Librarians, Code of Ethics, Types of Discipline for LAUC Members, and Safeguards and Procedures for Discipline for LAUC Members. A fifth proposed changes to the LAUC Bylaws establishing a Professional Standards Committee. After extremely lengthy debate, the Assembly rejected the recommendations and referred the matter to the Executive Board for further action. There appeared to be confusion on the part of some members over the purpose and need for these documents, especially since ethics and a code of conduct had never previously been discussed by the Association. There was also concern and confusion about distinguishing between performance and ethical problems, and determining which should be considered under performance and which under professional standards.

The Board thanked the ad hoc committee for its service and assumed responsibility for further work on the documents. Revisions were issued by the Board and discussed at the Fall Assembly. After another lengthy debate and several amendments, the four documents were approved for inclusion in the Academic Personnel Manual and the Professional Standards Committee formally established. Following the Assembly, the documents intended for the APM were sent to the Committee on Professional Governance for a recommendation on where they should be positioned in the Manual; the committee felt they should appear together in Part I, "General University Policy Regarding Academic Appointees." With the agreement of the Executive Board, President Bob Bellanti forwarded them to Senior Vice President Frazer on May 18, 1986.

In August 1986 the Office of the President requested a meeting with President Bellanti to discuss the documents submitted. A meeting was held on September 22, attended by LAUC officers and representatives from UCOP. The latter expressed concern about the very general nature of the Code of Ethics. LAUC contended that it was necessary at this time for the statement to be general, but that it would have more context once the guidelines and procedures were drafted. Following the meeting Camille Wanat, the new LAUC President, sent a letter to Dr. Frazer asking him to withhold the documents from the preliminary review process until LAUC submitted guidelines and procedures to accompany them.

The Bylaw establishing the systemwide as well as divisional professional standards committees was approved by the membership in a special election in December 1986. The Committee on Professional Standards was then charged with developing guidelines and procedures for two broad classes of actions: complaints brought against a librarian for violations of the Code of Conduct; and grievances brought by a librarian to the Professional Standards Committee.

The LAUC Professional Standards Committee was created in March 1986. Chaired by Ivan Arguelles (UCB), it was charged to develop a bylaw with guidelines and procedures for "complaints brought against a librarian for violation of the Code of Conduct," as well as for grievances brought by a librarian to the committee. It used several Academic Senate documents on grievance and discipline as models, and in September the first draft was distributed for discussion.

The proposed Bylaw was approved by the 1986 Fall Assembly, again after lengthy debate, and forwarded to the Office of the President by President Wanat. In 1987 the LAUC documents on professional standards were distributed by the Office of the President to the Academic Vice Chancellors on the campuses for review and comment. Following the review LAUC received word that UCOP was unable to accept the documents because of negative reactions from the campus officers. The overriding objection was to the multiple and overlapping routes for appeals provided for in the Memorandum of Understanding, APM 140 and the proposed divisional and systemwide professional standards committees. There were also perceived problems in distinguishing between an ethical and a performance issue. In a letter to LAUC President Nancy Koller on December 2, 1987, Calvin Moore, the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, wrote:

The campuses prefer that the LAUC documents not be promulgated unless the "ambiguities," "overlap" and "confusion" within, and between, the documents, the APM, and the MOU can be clarified. There were a number of comments related to the lack of "cohesiveness" of the documents. Campus comments also questioned the intended rights and jurisdiction of LAUC on "professional" issues relative to the MOU and to University administration.

LAUC was now faced with a dilemma. It had made two good-faith attempts at creating professional standards documents at the request of the Office of the President. Discussion of them had been lengthy, at times even acrimonious. But it had not mutually agreed upon a philosophical basis for the standards—had never even had a philosophical discussion on them—before the documents were written, so the disagreements were not surprising.

President Koller therefore proposed such a philosophical discussion. It began at the transitional Executive Board meetings held in August 1987, and was continued by the divisions during the fall. The first question was whether LAUC needed the documents at all. The 1987 Fall Assembly at San Francisco on December 4 featured a panel discussion on the subject. The moderator was Paul Wakeford (UCSF), and panelists were Ivan Arguelles (UCB), representing the Professional Standards Committee; Miki Goral (UCLA), presenting the views of the University Federation of Librarians; Richard Cooper (UCSF), substituting for Jackie Coolman (UCSD), representing the library administrations; Ellen Switkes, voicing the concerns of the Office of the President; and Jacqueline Wilson (UCSF) giving the perspective of the APM 140 Task Group (Appeals Procedures for Non-Senate Academics).

Although a variety of opinions were aired in the discussion following the panel presentations, it became clear that LAUC members did not feel this issue should be pursued until after the revisions of APM 140 (Appeals Procedures for Non-Senate Academics) had been completed. Ellen Switkes, Director of Academic Personnel Affairs, assured the group there would be no legal repercussions if LAUC chose not to draft a document on professional standards as mandated by APM 360A, since it had made several good-faith attempts to develop one. Miki Goral said the provisions of the Compact could be eliminated if both the Union and the University agreed they were unnecessary. Following the discussion President Koller sent a letter to Associate Vice President Calvin Moore, saying that LAUC wanted to put further work on professional standards on hold pending the revision of APM 140, after which it would evaluate the revised sections and determine if there were issues still needing to be addressed.

The APM Section 140 Task Force had been established by the Office of the President in July 1986 to evaluate issues associated with the revisions to APM 140, and to review standards and procedures for the discipline and dismissal of non-Senate academic appointees. LAUC was asked to provide a member to this committee, and Jacqueline Wilson (UCSF) was appointed as the LAUC representative. She had been a member of LAUC's Ad Hoc Committee on Peer Review/Revision of the APM. The final report of the task force was sent to Associate Vice President Moore in January 1987. It recommended that a working group basically comprised of members of the task force be established to draft the revisions to the Section. The work group was established, and Wilson continued as a member.

The first draft of the revised APM 140 was issued in February 1988. It was first reviewed at the LAUC Executive Board meeting of April 13. A summary of that discussion revealed concerns about the absence of any mention of academic freedom in the document, unrealistic time limits, whether both represented and non-represented librarians were covered by its terms, procedures for filing a grievance, and who would decide which procedure would be followed. President Koller then charged the Professional Standards Committee with reviewing the revision of the APM Section.

The review of this and subsequent revisions (1989-1991) spanned the terms of four chairs of the Professional Standards Committee—George Gibbs (UCLA), Kathryn Creely (UCSD), Judy Bube (UCI) and Sally Weimer (UCSB)—and the final revision was submitted to LAUC for its reaction in October 1991. LAUC stressed the need for a definition of "grievance," clarification of non-Senate academics covered by Section 140, elimination of the list of items that could be grieved, and removal of the section on demotion. It also felt that the time limit of 30 calendar days was too short for the filing of formal grievances, recommending limit of either 45 days or

30 working days. The report from the Professional Standards Committee commenting on the October 1991 final review draft of APM 140 reveals that "the committee observed substantial changes in [this] draft." The major areas of concern, however, remained in the draft in spite of earlier comments from LAUC; chief among these were the calendar and the list of issues eligible for a hearing, which LAUC felt should be eliminated since they were seen as unnecessarily restrictive and imposed requirements on non-Senate academics not enforced for other series,

In October 1991 LAUC was asked to review APM 150, Non-Senate Corrective Action and Dismissal. In its comments, which were forwarded to Associate Vice President Calvin Moore by LAUC President Ellen Meltzer in February 1992, the Professional Standards Committee wrote:

The committee perceives the need for a non-Senate policy on corrective action and dismissal There are serious concerns that several sections of this proposed policy are unnecessarily vague. The proposal appears to ignore both the considerable diversity of employees subsumed under the heading "non-Senate academic appointees" and well-evolved procedures of very cohesive groups.

One of LAUC's major concerns was the absence of a provision for peer input when "peer review is the foundation of our academic framework." It was also concerned that the section was based on the staff rather than the faculty model. Furthermore the time frame for responding to disciplinary actions was felt to be too short and inflexible. Overall, LAUC found APM 150 to be a disappointing document that fell "short in providing the same procedures, safeguards and peer involvement offered other academic appointees within the University."

Professional Governance

Another group for which life was not completely smooth was the newly established Professional Governance Committee. Established in September 1985, its major responsibility is defined in the Bylaws, though it also receives specific charges from the LAUC President. In 1985/86, when its chair was Judy Steen (UCSC), it recommended on the placement in the APM of the professional standards documents. Its comments on the proposed revisions to APM 360, 210-4, 160-20, 145, 710 and 730 as issued by the Office of the President were forwarded to that office. The committee also began a review of the peer review statistical reporting forms and procedures.

The 1986/87 committee, chaired by Dick Vierich (UCR), focused its energies on creating a new LAUC Annual Peer Review Statistics form, and on devising and maintaining a LAUC manual. The former was approved by the 1987 Spring Assembly, after concern was expressed over the issue of confidentiality in the statistics. The following motion was passed:

Peer review statistics shall be reported confidentially each year to the LAUC Professional Governance Committee, which is to review and forward them to the Office of the President, by way of the LAUC President. Confidentiality shall be maintained by the Professional Governance Committee, the LAUC President and

the Office of the President, but each LAUC division retains the option of publishing its own statistics locally. This does not preclude the distribution of aggregate or cumulative data as long as such does not compromise confidentiality.

Statistics on personnel actions were to be gathered first for the 1985, 1986 and 1987 years by the 1987/88 Professional Governance Committee, chaired by Barbara Kornstein (UCB), which was also charged with developing a model call and with drafting an explication of criteria a-d (APM 210-4e(3)a-d) for peer review. In issuing the latter charge on October 19, 1987, LAUC President Nancy Koller wrote:

I urge the Professional Governance Committee to consider the oft discussed topic of level of participation in each of the criteria and the balance between each and further address the related and controversial issue of whether we are escalating our expectations to unrealistic heights when our major job responsibilities are enlarging in scope or whether expectations are being maintained at a satisfactory level.

The Professional Governance Committee presented two documents to the LAUC Executive Board at its April 13, 1988 meeting: the "Model Call" and "Criteria Guidelines for Librarian Personnel Action." The Board made some revisions to the "Model Call" before presenting it to the 1988 Spring Assembly, where it was approved. There was however no agreement on the Professional Governance Committee about the "Criteria Guidelines for Librarian Personnel Actions" and the accompanying "Criteria Explication Document." The committee questioned whether a systemwide document was needed, and whether the campuses could agree on systemwide criteria. Many LAUC members felt that Position Paper #1 alone contained sufficient explication. Following discussion at the April 13 Executive Board meeting, LAUC President Koller instructed the divisions to hold discussions on the issue. The Executive Board raised the topic again at its May and August 1988 meetings, and finally, without taking it to the Assembly, decided to release the Professional Governance Committee from the obligation of further work on the charge due to a lack of consensus within LAUC.

The committee had yet to address Bylaws requirements to develop a LAUC Manual and to determine how the committee could serve as a review body for divisions requesting evaluations of local peer review procedures. Work on a manual began in 1986/87 and was completed by the 1988/89 committee, when Terry Ferl (UCSC) served as chair. In the intervening years the committee struggled with an interpretation of what it should include. Rather than creating a new manual, it was decided that one containing all the policies and procedures currently followed would be the most effective means of fulfilling the charge. The result, in 1989, was *LAUC Peer Review Documents: A Compendium*, a two-volume collection of non-confidential campus and Universitywide documents relevant to the review process of UC librarians. The *Compendium* stays with the chair of the Professional Governance Committee, who responds to requests for specific documents; a detailed outline of its contents are available on MELVYL.

The charge to establish procedures for reviewing local peer review practices was considered by both the 1988/89 and 1989/90 committees. The 1989/90 chair, Patricia Inouye (UCD), brought to the Executive Board in November 1989 the document "Evaluation of LAUC Divisional Librarian Review Procedures by the LAUC Committee on Professional Governance." Approved by the Spring 1990 Assembly at Riverside on May 19, it defines procedures for librarians or a LAUC division to request the Professional Governance Committee to evaluate certain aspects of the divisional procedures and practices relating to the librarian review process. It has not however been one of LAUC's most heavily used documents. Gail Nelson (UCLA), the 1991/92 chair, reported to the 1992 Spring Assembly that no formal request had been brought to the committee in the first two years of its existence.

The Plan

When Steve Salmon was appointed Director of Library Planning in 1975, he began developing the *Master Plan for the University of California Libraries*. Throughout 1976 and the early part of 1977 the divisions held extensive discussions on the *Plan*. President Beverly Toy forwarded LAUC's responses to the Library Policy Steering Committee and to Salmon; the divisions also sent separate responses. The *Plan* was approved by Library Council and the Office of the President and became official University policy in July 1977.

In 1983, after Salmon's resignation, UCOP decided to enhance the stature of the appointment in recognition of the importance of libraries to the University, by creating the position of Assistant Vice President for Library Plans and Policies. The Association responded with recommendations for the responsibilities of the position, and LAUC President Marion Taylor was appointed to the search committee. In 1984 Michael Buckland, Dean of the School of Library and Information Science at UC-Berkeley, was appointed. Dr. Buckland felt it was important to establish communication between LAUC and the Office of the President, and throughout his tenure he attended LAUC Assemblies, providing an update on activities in the Office of Library Plans and Policies and answering questions.

Shortly after his appointment, Buckland began writing Volume 2 of the 1977 *University of California Libraries: A Plan for Development*, better known as the Library Plan or Master Plan. It presented a new vision of the manner in which the UC libraries would provide information services, focusing on the impact of automation, electronic information and telecommunications. In 1985 and 1986 Dr. Buckland issued a series of discussion papers for Phase II of the *Plan*.

The 1984 Spring Assembly set up an Ad Hoc Committee on the *Plan*. Chaired by President Taylor, it was to coordinate a systemwide LAUC response to the discussion papers and proposals. Each division was also asked to establish a local committee to review the documents. When the original Master Plan was discussed in 1976 and 1977, LAUC had relied upon the divisions responding directly to Steve Salmon, the author of the *Plan*, with the LAUC President preparing a brief summary of the campuses' presentations. This time LAUC adopted a more coordinated approach. The ad hoc committee was to review the process by which the *Plan* was further developed and explore how LAUC could participate in the process, to comment on the drafts produced by other groups, and to consider how LAUC might take up other topics it felt should be addressed by the *Plan*.

The first report of the committee was presented to the 1985 Fall Assembly. A year later, in Fall 1986, a report the committee had issued the previous June, to be known as the "Consensus Report," was debated at the Assembly. It made three recommendations:

1. That LAUC issue consensus statements on various topics under discussion for the Plan;
2. That LAUC appoint an Ad Hoc Committee on MELVYL to improve communication with the Division of Library Automation; and
3. That the Ad Hoc Committee on the Plan become a standing committee.

The report contained two consensus papers, both of which were adopted by the Assembly: one on the MELVYL catalog and the other on local automation needs. The first spoke to the need for "an effective mechanism to contribute our ideas and to help set development priorities for MELVYL with the users' needs in mind." The second strongly urged that Universitywide funding be made available for local automation. The Assembly voted not to establish the proposed ad hoc committee on MELVYL, but approved to set up a standing committee on library planning, which began its work in 1988 as the Committee on Library Plans and Policies. Assistant Vice President Buckland resigned in 1987, and work on the revision of the Plan was discontinued.

Research

The keynote speaker at the 1976 Spring Assembly was Vice President Kleingartner, on the theme: "How can academic librarians in the UC system become even more academic?" He acknowledged that librarians had made remarkable progress in a brief period of time in making peer review work, but that they needed to seek opportunities to increase their involvement in the full academic mission of the University. The speech prompted intense discussion about the need for librarians' research, appropriate leave time and financial support, as well as continuing discussion on the issue of library instructional programs.

It also led directly to the Librarians' Research Program. At the October Library Council meeting Steve Salmon suggested the establishment of a Library Council Research Fellowship Program, funded with \$50,000. Anita Schiller (UCSD) and Susan Martin (UCB) were appointed to a task force formed by Edward Blakely, Assistant Vice President for Personnel, to complete plans for a program of research leaves for librarians. The task force held meetings in 1978.

Little progress was made until LAUC President Virginia Sherwood wrote Academic Vice President Donald Swain on March 6, 1979, encouraging him to recommend \$30,000 for librarians' research in the University's 1979/80 budget. Dr. Swain responded in April that he agreed with "the importance of research to librarianship and the appropriateness of the project." However, because of recent cuts in the University's budget, he did not feel he could recommend the program at that time.

But in 1980 LAUC reached another milestone in its history, with the establishment of the Universitywide Research Grants for Librarians Program. It was launched with an allocation of

\$30,000 from the Office of the President to support research on the campuses, with \$10,000 remaining in a central fund. The general guidelines stated that topics for research should be "academic and not administrative research and should result in a contribution to librarianship." Those proposals "directly related to increased understanding or improvement in information" would receive preference. Funds could be used for research support, such as secretarial help, research assistants, travel, etc. but not to pay librarians' salaries. The LAUC Vice President/President-Elect was designated to serve as the non-voting chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Research.

The first report of this committee was given at the Spring 1981 Assembly by Vice President/President-Elect Judy Ganson. Nineteen research proposals had been received for systemwide consideration. They came from every campus except San Francisco, and two involved librarians from more than one division. Funds requested amounted to over \$19,000, against a systemwide allocation of only \$10,000. The response to this first year of the program was especially gratifying since there had been only a few months for the preparation of the proposals, their review by the committee, and the establishment of general guidelines.

The Fall Assembly of 1981 passed a resolution encouraging UCOP to continue its support of the Librarian Research Program. Vice President William Frazer, responding to the resolution, said he supported the program but felt that financial support should come from the Chancellor on each campus through increases in federal grant overhead funds. LAUC was concerned that under this proposal librarians might have to compete with faculty for research monies. Other sources were suggested, such as Affirmative Action funds. After LAUC appealed to Vice President Frazer, \$10,000 was allotted to the program in February 1982. This created an extremely tight schedule for the submission and approval of research proposals, since they had to be in the Office of the President by June 30. Though the committee extended the deadline for proposals as long as it reasonably could, only five were submitted, and four funded for a total of \$5,522.

UCOP did not allocate funds for librarian research after the first two years, and the Research Committee undertook the coordination of and communication between the corresponding committees of the divisions. A long discussion at the Fall 1983 Assembly centered around the topic, and suggestions were made for future LAUC activities: research colloquia, research programs presented at the Assemblies, reports on research projects, and the sharing of ideas on such aspects as research skills and proposal development.

In 1984, following the election on collective bargaining representation, the long-desired goal of formal and dependable University funding of librarians' research became a reality. A Memorandum of Understanding between the University and the representing union specified dollar amounts for research on the campuses; and in addition a sum of \$30,000 a year, \$21,810 of it for represented librarians, from the Office of the President but administered through LAUC. The contract states that "this fund may be used to support an individual research project, research involving more than one campus, joint support with one or more campuses of a research project, and other similar research ventures."

LAUC charged the Research Committee to recommend procedures for allocating funds for research and creative activity. The committee fulfilled its mandate by drafting a charge for the new standing Committee on Research and Professional Development in time for the 1985 review

of LAUC research proposals. The guidelines developed by the latter committee, though they required the approval of UCOP, did not become part of the Academic Personnel Manual.

The report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate the Universitywide Research Grants for Librarians Program was funded by a LAUC research grant and presented to the 1989 Spring Assembly. The survey of past LAUC research grant recipients, to determine "their experience with the research program, including the research climate within which they worked, factors which helped or hindered the research environment," revealed that the major hindrance to research was finding the time to complete the work given the pressure of primary position responsibilities.

In addition to the systemwide Research and Professional Development Committee, each division has a committee that reviews research projects for local funding. In order to determine whether local or systemwide funds are appropriate for a project, all projects are reviewed by the divisional committees before being submitted to systemwide. The trend is that systemwide monies are awarded to larger or multi-campus proposals, while the divisions fund small projects and those of a more local nature that do not meet the systemwide criteria. The Research and Professional Development Committee reviews the proposals critically. After a preliminary consideration, many are returned to the principal investigator for review and revision; time for rewriting has been built into the calendar. Proposals approved by the committee are forwarded to the Office of the President for further review and funding. This review is also a highly critical one; not all proposals recommended by the committee have been approved.

In most years since the Memorandum of Understanding, LAUC has not spent the total allotment of \$30,000. Often the combined budgets of all proposals submitted have exceeded the amount available, but those funded by the Office of the President have requested a total of less than \$30,000. Sometimes this has occurred because the funds reserved for librarians in the bargaining unit, though not from the non-represented librarians, have been more than adequate for the meritorious proposals from this group.

Funds are encumbered by the Office of the President by June 30 for the year in which the awards are granted. The committee's calendar takes this into account and the grants are announced at the Spring Assembly each year. Beginning about 1986/87, LAUC has issued either one or two calls each year. The first invites proposals with a deadline of October; an additional call may be issued in January if insufficient proposals have been approved from the first call.

The topics of the approved projects have varied widely. The original 1980 insistence on academic research contributing to librarianship rather than administrative projects has been retained, though it has been broadened to include contributions to scholarship in any discipline. The "Guidelines for Application: Universitywide Research Grants for Librarians," which were revised in 1984 and again in 1986/87, sets forth the criteria for judging the proposals. A new dimension was added to the program in 1988 when, under a cooperative project with the two UC library schools, a project could use a library school research assistant. In 1991, acknowledging the problem of finding time to complete projects due to the pressures of primary position responsibilities, the Office of the President granted permission for a three-year pilot project under which funds could be requested to pay for a replacement position while the principal investigator took time off to do research. This was a major change from 1980, when the same office rejected this option. The Research and Professional Development Committee will evaluate the pilot project at the end of the 3-year period.

Professional Development

Professional development had been a major issue for LAUC since the beginning. One of the first requests that went forward to the Office of the President was for a policy concerning leaves and sabbaticals. A working paper on the availability of opportunities for professional development for UC librarians was prepared by the Committee on Professional Standards in 1975. On receiving the report, LAUC passed the following resolution:

Be it resolved that LAUC undertake vigorous effort, working through University Hall, to clarify and expand opportunities for librarians to receive the privileges of leaves with pay for research and creative activity.

In 1976 the report of the Committee on Privileges, Salaries and Conditions of Employment (chair: Dora Biblarz, UCD), on the availability of leaves for librarians, generated much debate on the need for sabbaticals and leaves. It suggested that the use of the former term was not appropriate for librarians, since the Academic Senate was the only group within the University eligible for sabbaticals. It recommended that, rather than developing new policies and procedures, Section 176 of the APM pertaining to leaves be publicized and used by librarians.

The Fall 1982 Assembly at Irvine resolved to inform UCOP and other budgetary officers of the importance of travel funds to the responsibilities of librarians, and request that funds for these activities be protected from budgetary reductions. In response Academic Vice President Frazer wrote that though he appreciated LAUC's advice, the anticipated reduction in the University's budget for 1982/83 was of such a magnitude that "I doubt it will be possible to exempt any group or function from taking a share of the cut."

LAUC's Committee on Research and Professional Development began discussing the funding support for professional development provided by the various campuses in 1985/86. In Article III.c, the Memorandum of Understanding allocates minimum amounts of funding to each campus to be used for "research, creative activities, professional meetings, conferences, seminars, and workshops" for members of the bargaining unit. The campuses are expected to provide a like sum for the professional development of non-represented librarians.

The amounts allocated to the campuses did not appear to be consistent, and it was unclear how the allocations had been determined. An attempt made in 1984/85 by the Research and Professional Development Committee to gather consistent data on financial support by the campuses was not successful. The Research and Professional Development Committee recommended to the Executive Board that an ad hoc committee be established to compile data on the extent to which professional development activities were supported. At the same time, because of the declining number of research proposals and a lack of data concerning the reasons, the Research and Professional Development Committee also formed a small subcommittee, chaired by Gary Peete (UCSB), to survey past recipients of LAUC research grants to determine what environmental factors had helped or hindered their research.

In 1986 LAUC President Bob Bellanti appointed the Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate LAUC Members Research and Professional Development Needs. Chaired by Margaret Mooney (UCR), this small five-member southern regional group issued its final report at the 1989 Spring Assembly. In the three years of its existence it had undertaken several projects. In 1985/86 it

collected data by means of a worksheet on which LAUC members provided travel and other professional development information. The committee found however that the data gathered varied widely from campus to campus and, although interesting, it was not comprehensive enough to reflect an accurate picture of the funding situation on each campus. At the 1987 Spring Assembly, the committee was formally charged to gather comprehensive data on professional development support for a one-year period beginning August 1, 1987. To support the project, the chair submitted a research proposal to the LAUC Research and Professional Development Committee and was awarded a grant of \$3,070 in June 1987.

A representative number of librarians in each rank and step, as well as all non-represented librarians, were asked to participate in the project by submitting forms detailing professional expenditures for a 1-year period. Of the 239 librarians chosen to participate, approximately 65% did so actively. The data collected was presented with detailed charts for each campus in a report given to the 1989 Spring Assembly at Los Angeles. It revealed that the average librarian received funding support from the University for 51% of the cost of the professional development activities undertaken. The remaining 49% came from the librarian's own pocket; 16% was never even reported. Variations among campuses in the amount of support provided were also documented. In the discussion of the report at the Assembly, it was noted that this topic was covered by the Memorandum of Understanding, and therefore one on which LAUC cannot advise. The report was filed and sent to the Office of the President for its information.

The Delphi Study

By 1988 most of the Compact issues LAUC needed to consider had been tackled, if not fully resolved. When Susan Starr took office as President in 1988, she proposed that the Association conduct a Delphi Study to determine new issues of concern to the membership. The 1987/88 Executive Board had discussed a number of possible topics for LAUC to undertake, such as affirmative action, library school curricula and systemwide library networks, but it was felt that the views of other LAUC members should be solicited. In the Delphi Study, members were asked: "What are the issues facing UC libraries and librarians which you feel LAUC should address during the next three years?" A wide variety of responses were received; they were grouped into categories by a small subcommittee of the Board. Members were then asked to rank the categories, following which the Board decided on the three top-ranked issues: the need for a LAUC professional development program, coordinated/cooperative collection development among the campuses, and the impact of electronic formats on the UC libraries.

To address Issue #1, an Ad Hoc Committee to Develop a UC Professional Development Program was established by President Starr. It was a small northern regional committee chaired by Judith Paquette (UCSC), with a representative from the library schools at Berkeley and Los Angeles. The committee surveyed the membership on their professional development needs and interests, and reported at the 1989 Spring Assembly at Los Angeles that the three ranking highest were microcomputer use, research and management skills. The priorities varied greatly by campus; there were no specific topics of high interest to LAUC members on all campuses. The survey also revealed that in spite of its high ranking in the Delphi Study, there was a wide variation of opinion among LAUC members about the importance of this topic. Some held that it was essential that the ever-growing need for professional development be supported by time

and funding; at the opposite extreme, some believed LAUC should not get involved in the "workshop business" at all.

In 1989 the committee announced that it planned to make one of two recommendations: either that LAUC establish regional programs supported by funds from the Office of the President and administered by the local program committees, or that it develop a more modest program that relied upon identifying UC "experts" and better communication between the campuses. The committee also reported an additional suggestion at the 1990 Fall Assembly: that a list of UC "experts" available as consultants be included in a LAUC directory. Interest on the part of both the membership and the committee in this topic dwindled, and the committee was discharged by President Meltzer upon receipt of a letter from Judith Paquette summarizing its work. The letter acknowledged the many changes that had occurred in technology, budgeting and staffing in UC libraries since the committee was set up.

Resource Sharing

Issue #2 from the Delphi Study, resource sharing among the UC libraries, was tackled by an Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Resources, with Nancy Koller (UCR) as chair and membership from each of the campuses. It issued a series of reports and recommendations between the 1990 and 1992 Spring Assemblies. The committee chose to focus in sequence on each of its three charges. In fulfillment of the first, to document current formal and especially informal efforts toward coordinating collection development in the UC, the committee issued a document in May 1990 titled: "Cooperative Collecting in the University of California Libraries."

On the second charge it offered recommendations for discussion to the 1990 Fall Assembly, to "delineate barriers to coordination which currently exist, including problems in identifying library holdings, sharing library materials between campuses, and assigning collection responsibilities." The recommendations were prefaced by a paper by committee member Jane Kimball (UCD), "Cooperative Collection Utilization in the University of California Libraries: A Concept Paper." The Assembly approved a committee proposal to train bibliographers, and another to incorporate Stanford University into UC's collaborative collection development activity by recommending the loading of Stanford shared-purchase titles onto MELVYL and agreement by Stanford to expedite interlibrary loan on those titles. President Sylvia Curtis was directed by the Assembly to forward the recommendations to Library Council; the other proposals of the committee were tabled pending further discussion by the divisions. It happened that at the same time the Assembly was discussing the role of Stanford, which had participated for several years in the University's shared purchase program, Library Council was discussing the same topic. LAUC's recommendations played a part in the Council's discussion and decision.

The committee's report to the 1991 Spring Assembly on its third charge, to make "recommendations on resources, programs, or structures which would enable UC libraries to share resources with greater efficiency and effectiveness," contained twenty recommendations. This "model" report covered a range of suggestions, among them better use of library duplicates; listing all microform sets on MELVYL and including full analytical cataloging for titles funded by shared-purchase monies; more innovative use of the regional storage facilities, and exploring the applicability of the British Library's Document Supply Centre; housing complete sets of heavily illustrated periodicals in the regional facilities for preservation purposes; stressing the

increased importance of rapid interlibrary loan and document delivery to facilitate collaborative collection development; increased communication and joint projects of subject bibliographers from all campuses; rapid implementation of the updated electronic version of the LAUC directory to facilitate bibliographer communication, especially in relation to serial cancellations and the last copy of titles; use of joint regional purchases for libraries with complementary strengths; upgrading campus serial records in MELVYL; shared access to campus automated acquisitions files; and the review of UC membership in the Center for Research Libraries.

All of these recommendations were approved by the Assembly, some after lengthy debate and amendments. The two postponed from the 1990 Fall Assembly—one to develop a systemwide clearinghouse so that UC could negotiate with publishers for lower prices, especially on expensive sets; the other a pilot project to test the effectiveness of a publisher-based cooperative collection system—were also approved and forwarded to Library Council for further discussion. They were reviewed by various committees of Council, especially the Collection Development, Preservation, and Bibliographic Projects Advisory Committees. At the 1992 Spring Assembly, the Committee on Shared Resources presented its final report which included "further thoughts on issues which have an important impact on the effectiveness of sharing resources within UC libraries." It was discharged with thanks for its work over 38 months, and its outstanding reports.

Electronic Formats

The third Delphi Study topic, the effects of electronic formats on UC libraries, was assigned to the new Committee on Library Plans and Policies. Chaired by Rochelle Clary (Minchow) of Irvine, it was charged in 1989 to describe the current issues of electronic formats in UC libraries, review the literature on the topic, and consider how UC libraries would need to adapt staffing, services and organizations. The committee prepared a final report for the 1990 Spring Assembly, with a detailed literature survey and chart showing the status of electronic formats in the campus libraries. This was not however to be the committee's final report or work on the topic. Meeting the day before the Assembly, the Executive Board lauded the committee for its work, discussed the report, and referred it back for further elaboration. Despite a number of specific recommendations, as well as general suggestions throughout, there was no indication of how or by whom they should be implemented. The committee was asked to further define the recommendations and propose implementation strategies.

A new report summarizing that of April 1990 and adding suggested actions to realize the recommendations was issued by its chair Susan Jurist (UCSD) on December 1, 1990. Campuses were asked to discuss it and provide feedback to the committee before the 1991 Spring Assembly on its recommendations: to create a mechanism to integrate electronic formats into the collection development policies, fund new electronic products and services with new budget lines, develop mechanisms to assure that existing local databases were available systemwide, take a more proactive role in working with publishers for standardized interfaces and pricing, examine and discuss new models of librarianship, and identify a minimum level of technological skills for librarians. At the 1991 Spring Assembly Jurist reported that there had been no consensus on the recommendations among the divisions. Some wanted the examples of potential organizational models removed, others had objections to the continuing education section. The Assembly

debated the report and agreed to file it, instructing the Executive Board to determine what further action should be taken.

The Board charged the 1991/92 Committee on Library Plans and Policies, under its chair Roy Tennant (UCB), with continuing work on the issue. The committee continued to grapple with it while the technology rapidly changed, making the information in the first two reports less and less relevant as time passed. It presented a new report to the 1992 Spring Assembly held on May 8 at Irvine, entitled "UC Libraries and Technological Change: A Blueprint for Action," which recommended the creation of "a structure that will help LAUC and the UC libraries respond to technological change on an ongoing basis." It noted:

Our ability to respond quickly and effectively has been limited by poor communication and coordination, while our ability to affect change has been limited by a lack of plans and tools for responding.

The report made six recommendations: establishing a Technology Watch Committee; setting up a mechanism with Library Council to coordinate the work of the multiple committees addressing various aspects of library automation; recommending to Council that every librarian have a personal workstation with appropriate technology access; forming a LAUC ad hoc committee to recommend strategic alliances between UC libraries and other constituencies; review by Library Council's Computer Files Committee of existing guidelines for including databases on MELVYL; and asking the Research and Professional Development Committee to solicit research proposals examining the impact of technology on UC libraries and librarians. All of the recommendations except one were adopted by the Assembly with some wording changes. After much discussion the suggestion of a Technology Watch Committee was referred to the Executive Board for further consideration of its role, its name, and whether it should be an ad hoc or standing committee. Finally, after three years of struggling with the issue, the Committee on Library Plans and Policies fulfilled its first charge and could move on to other fields.

Communication

Given the number and complexity of the University of California libraries and the structure of LAUC as it evolved, communication within LAUC and among the divisions has always been a problem. The topic of communication, of several varieties, has been a reoccurring one through the history of the Association. A newsletter was suggested at one of the first LAUC Assemblies. No action took place until Fall 1971 when the Assembly set up a committee to recommend a semi-annual or quarterly newsletter. The *LAUC Newsletter* made its debut in January 1973 under the editorship of Laura Nanna (UCSB). It contained summaries of the LAUC Assemblies, summaries of major committee reports and news from the divisions. It was published, usually quarterly, until its demise in 1982. There were several reasons why it ceased, among them the increasing cost of its production and the lack of information submitted by LAUC members for inclusion. It had first been funded by contributions from the divisions and later, after 1975, by LAUC funds from the Office of the President.

LAUC's second Position Paper dealt with the issue of "Development of Effective Communication Between Statewide LAUC and Library Council." Prepared by the Committee

on Committee, Rules and Jurisdiction, chaired by Nelson Piper (UCD), the paper was approved and sent to the Office of the President and Library Council in December 1975. Although nearly all of the recommendations in the paper had been implemented by the 1980s, it remains a significant statement on the importance and need for effective communication between the two groups.

In addition to internal communication, LAUC also discussed ways of publicizing LAUC and the activities of its members to the UC community. In the Spring of 1987 the Executive Board voted to appoint a Coordinator for Public Communications. The purpose of the position was to raise the visibility of librarians as academic employees in the University. The coordinator was to gather information on publications or honors of UC librarians, to send this information to the Universitywide publication *UC Focus*, and to prepare an article on LAUC for inclusion in the Academic Senate Newsletter *Notice*. This was to be a one-year pilot project. Jean Smith (UCSD), the Coordinator, recommended in her May 1988 report that it be continued. In 1989 LAUC agreed to establish an ad hoc committee to continue publicizing LAUC activities. The Executive Board developed guidelines to assist the small three-member committee in carrying out its charge.

The topic of a LAUC newsletter or other vehicle of communication resurfaced at the 1989 Fall Assembly at Davis. The delegates considered the need of better communication among LAUC divisions and members, and of a means of publishing research done by LAUC members. The Assembly directed the President to establish an Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate a LAUC Vehicle of Communication. President Judy Horn charged a small northern regional committee, chaired by Alan Ritch (UCSC), to investigate the possibility of launching a LAUC publication. Its report, presented to the 1991 Spring Assembly at Santa Barbara, gave the results of the survey of LAUC members conducted by the committee in October of the previous year. Of the 262 LAUC members responding, about 40% were opposed to the idea of another vehicle of communication. Many felt there was not too little communication but too much. A preference for receiving information in electronic format was voiced by most of the respondents. The Assembly was asked whether or not LAUC needed any kind of vehicle beyond those currently used. The discussion centered around the use of electronic mail, electronic bulletin boards and MELVYL. The issue was resolved by a motion "that we abandon the idea of a new vehicle but use existing vehicles more effectively" which passed unanimously.

The Directory

Minutes of many Executive Board meetings and LAUC Assemblies mention efforts to improve communication. At transitional Board meetings, it was customary to remind the new incoming Board members of existing communication links, such as sending minutes of divisional meetings to the other divisions. In 1988 President Koller compiled the *LAUC Handbook* (the Red Book), still used today, which contains all of the basic LAUC documents, such as the Bylaws, Position Papers, Model Call, appropriate APM sections, documents concerning LAUC origin and authority, and a list of LAUC Past Presidents. Each year it is passed on to all incoming LAUC officers and divisional chairs by their predecessors.

A desire often expressed by LAUC members was for a means of identifying subject specialists or counterparts on the other UC campuses. In 1984, President Marion Taylor established an Ad

Hoc Committee on a LAUC Functional Directory. A database was to be established, and the committee held discussions with the University's Division of Library Automation (DLA) on the possibility of putting the directory on MELVYL. Because of the technological and personnel problems, the project never reached fruition, and in 1986 further work on it was postponed. However, one result of the discussions was that DLA agreed to place a LAUC news screen on MELVYL. This was to be used by the President and the divisions to post news items for members and the roster of LAUC Officers. The screen however had only limited success in achieving the desired communication.

The need for a membership directory, especially one that listed librarians by functional expertise, remained and resurfaced again in 1986/87. Margaret Gordon (Robinson), LAUC Secretary in 1987/88, agreed to prepare a directory that indexed names by campus, professional specialty, subject specialty and working title. The data-gathering sheets were distributed in 1988 and the first edition of the *LAUC Membership Directory* was printed the same year. It contained all of the planned indexes with the exception of the one on working titles, which was omitted because of the divisions' inconsistencies in designating them. The cost of the printing came from LAUC funds. As soon as the *Directory* was published, there was an immediate demand for a second updated edition, which was completed by the same editor in 1990.

One of the first recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Resources was to convert the existing *Directory* to an online file, to assist in collaborative collection development efforts. In May 1990 the Executive Board charged the committee with investigating the feasibility of an online directory and submitting an implementation proposal. Jeff Selth (UCR) volunteered to resolve the problem of inconsistent terminology by creating a Thesaurus of terms for both professional and subject specialties; he also converted the directory to online form. Committee chair Nancy Koller began active negotiations with DLA and Richard West, UC Associate Vice President for Information Systems and Administrative Services, to include the directory on MELVYL. Although the technological problems were minor, procedural details, such as the type of database and the updating of the directory, proved difficult to resolve.

Cultural Diversity

Work on the final two top-ranking issues identified by the Delphi Study—cultural diversity, and librarian participation on University committees such as the Academic Senate—was begun in late 1989. President Starr met with a group of librarians in August 1989 to discuss how LAUC might sponsor workshops on cultural diversity. The group sent a proposal to the Office of the President requesting \$10,000 for two LAUC regional workshops on cultural diversity; it received \$3,000.

In December 1989 President Horn established the Ad Hoc Committee to Plan LAUC Regional Workshops on Cultural Diversity. Each division sent a representative to the committee which, because of the level of funding, decided to hold only one workshop rather than the two originally planned. The workshop's goal was to prepare recommendations for LAUC and the Office of the President on new or modified cultural diversity programs or services in the key areas of bibliographic access, collection development, reference service and bibliographic instruction. The committee developed issue papers, to provide basic information and promote discussion at the

workshop. The divisions held meetings to discuss the papers and develop comments and recommendations for the committee.

The workshop was held at UCLA on October 15, 1990 with 82 librarians in attendance. It was successful in beginning a dialogue on cultural diversity within the LAUC membership. It generated "hundreds" of recommendations and was the basis of the committee's report, "The Many Voices of Diversity," which was submitted by committee chair Richard Chabran (UCLA) before the 1991 Fall Assembly. The report was discussed extensively by the divisions and the Executive Board. The Board, at its meeting the day before the Assembly, was supportive of the report but asked the committee to make several editorial changes and bring the revised report to the 1992 Spring Assembly for discussion. However, at the 1991 Assembly President Meltzer asked the delegates to address its first recommendation, to "establish a permanent systemwide committee to deal with issues of cultural diversity in the University's libraries as well as implement the recommendations of this report." After a brief discussion the recommendation was approved by the Assembly and submitted to the Committee on Committees, Rules and Jurisdiction to develop a new section for the Bylaws to be voted upon by the membership.

The 1992 Spring Assembly debated the full report. Its 26 recommendations were far-reaching. Among them were training in multi-cultural communication and sensitivity for all library employees; especially the public services staff; maintaining core collections of cultural diversity material on each campus; establishing a Target of Opportunity library diversity program; proactively recruiting, hiring and encouraging the advancement of librarians from under-represented groups; ensuring access on MELVYL to core ethnic collections; conducting a LAUC-sponsored study on the retention and advancement of under-represented librarians; and requesting funding from the Office of the President to initiate, develop and implement cultural diversity recommendations. In addition to the recommendation already approved the previous fall, the Spring Assembly accepted twelve others without wording changes. The remaining recommendations were approved with some wording changes, the report was accepted by the Assembly, and the committee thanked for its extensive work. President Meltzer forwarded the report and recommendations to the Office of the President, Library Council and its Committees on Collection Development and Heads of Public Services, highlighting for each the important recommendations in relevant areas.

University Governance

From the beginning, LAUC members had hoped for increased participation in the governance of the University, especially membership on the Academic Senate. At the 1971 Spring Assembly there was much discussion on the opportunities for librarians to become members of this body, which varied greatly from campus to campus. Interest and support for membership was highest at Irvine; less support was seen at some of the Northern campuses, especially Berkeley. The Assembly was informed that systemwide action seeking membership could be taken through members of the Academic Senate who might sponsor a "memorial" to the Regents requesting membership for librarians; but because of the inter-campus variation in support of the change, no action was taken.

Five years later, Beverly Toy organized a panel discussion for the Spring 1976 Assembly on LAUC's relations with the faculty governance structure. The purpose was, first, to learn the

extent of LAUC's participation in faculty committees on the various campuses, and second, to encourage further efforts in this direction.

In January 1990 the Ad Hoc Committee on Librarians Participation in University Governance was established. The Delphi Study had identified as one of its major issues the desire of UC librarians for increased participation on Academic Senate and campus administrative committees. This desire was parallel to that expressed in LAUC's early days for participation in the Academic Senate. President Horn charged the committee, which was chaired by Heidi Hutchinson (UCR), to "develop a model of the involvement of librarians in the educational and administrative programs of the University." The purpose of the model was to help the divisions work toward a comparable level of participation.

The committee's report, which was discussed at the 1991 Fall Assembly in Santa Cruz on November 22, included a study of the situation at other institutions as described in their literature, a survey of current involvement at the nine campuses, and representative histories of LAUC involvement at four of them. It also made "a set of recommendations or strategies to be followed by LAUC and administrations at both the campus and systemwide level." The survey of the divisions revealed that the level of participation in Academic Senate and administrative committees varied widely from campus to campus. It was recognized that it would be more difficult for some than for others to readily achieve greater participation because of campus culture and history. Therefore, rather than creating a model, the committee decided to make recommendations that would help bring those campuses with a lower level of participation closer to that of the more active divisions. The report asserted that divisions should take the primary responsibility for ensuring and increasing librarians' participation in University governance.

The recommendations, which were adopted by the Assembly, asked each division to identify appropriate standing committees and follow through with efforts to place librarians on them, monitor ad hoc committees, and mentor LAUC members on how to assume an active role in University governance. They further proposed that LAUC collect data and information on such participation, and that University Librarians be urged to encourage and support it. Membership for librarians on newly formed systemwide committees concerned with such topics as academic programs, service needs (i.e. enrollment) and library-related issues was also recommended.

Don Abbott (UCD), the chair of the Academic Senate Committee on the Library (UCOL), had served as a member of the LAUC committee. After the report was issued he wrote to Heidi Hutchinson that UCOL was pleased to endorse the report and would recommend to the Academic Council the appointment of a LAUC member to UCOL as a first step in implementing it. Because the role of the divisional chairs was so important in implementing the recommendations, President Meltzer had the report added to the *LAUC Handbook* to alert incoming chairs to their responsibility.

New Campuses

The University of California began planning for new campuses in 1989. The first was projected to open between 1998 and 2000. As part of the planning process, a number of committees were formed by the Office of the President, including the Committee on Long Range Planning for Academic Support Services. The components of support services were defined as the library, academic computing and educational technology. The Office of the President asked

LAUC to name a representative to this committee, which was chaired by Stanley Chodorow, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning and Dean of Arts and Humanities at San Diego; LAUC Past President Susan Starr was appointed.

As part of its work to inform itself of current technology developments across the country, the committee sponsored an Advanced Technology Seminar in March 1990. The LAUC President, Vice President and Secretary were invited to attend the Seminar, along with staff from the Office of the President, Academic Vice Chancellors, the Directors of the computing facilities and the University Librarians. In August 1990 the committee's report was distributed to the divisions for comments, which were conveyed to Associate Vice President Moore by LAUC President Curtis in October 1990. In her letter she wrote: "LAUC is impressed with the comprehensive vision offered in this document, and with the recognition of the library as a player in academic support services on new as well as existing campuses." She noted that instruction in the use of library services needed to be added to the goals for the library section, and that if the Voigt-Susskind formula remained the basis for future collection development funding, the vision of new and existing libraries presented in this report would be severely hampered without additional financial support.

Recruitment and Retention of Librarians

In 1979 the topics of removal expenses and the proposed home loan program for UC faculty were brought before LAUC. Section 116 of the Academic Personnel Manual, on removal expenses, does not specifically mention librarians. On some campuses payment of removal expenses were provided for all new librarian appointments; on others expenses were paid for librarians hired at certain ranks; on yet others no funds were provided at all. To avoid jeopardizing those campuses that were already providing removal expenses, the Assembly decided against a formal resolution, instead instructing the LAUC President to discuss with the Office of the President the question of revising the APM section to include librarians.

President Sherwood wrote to Assistant Vice President Edward Blakely. She mentioned the problems of recruitment of librarians, and urged his support for including them in the program. Dr. Blakely's response was not encouraging. In a May 21, 1979 letter he said:

Your request for inclusion of librarians in this program is certainly a good one. However, I would not hold out a great deal of hope regarding immediate inclusion for librarians. The entire rationale for embarking on this effort has been the severe problem related to faculty recruitment. Similar problems may also obtain among librarians but they have yet to be well documented. Furthermore, I believe it is correct to say that our attrition among librarians is seldom related to housing problems per se.

He added that if sufficient resources could be identified, he would press for the inclusion of librarians in the program after the initial year's experience.

Ten years later the topic was again brought before the Executive Board. Several programs had by this time been developed to help new faculty with housing, but on most of the campuses librarians were still not eligible for them. LAUC members felt that the lack of affordable housing

near the campuses was creating problems in hiring and retaining librarians. President Horn took a draft of a letter LAUC proposed sending to Senior Vice President Frazer on the issue to the December 1989 meeting of Library Council, in order to garner Council's support for its position. Because data was not available on the number of librarians who had not accepted a position with the University or had left because of the lack of affordable housing, Council's Personnel Committee was asked to work with the Office of the President in compiling it. The findings of the committee's report, "UC Librarians Recruitment and Retention Survey," was presented to the 1991 Fall Assembly by Judy Steen (UCSC), LAUC's representative to the Personnel Committee. Data was gathered from 42 individuals who had either declined to accept a position or had left the University in the year 1990/91, on the reason for their decision. The results did not show that housing costs were a factor. Opinions were expressed at the Assembly that the results were "suspect" or "invalid," especially since it was such a small sample. No additional action was taken on the issue, though the Personnel Committee was asked by Library Council to continue to collect data.

Administrative Stipends

Administrative stipends have been a recurring and unresolved issue for LAUC ever since it first surfaced in 1973. In that year a report by the Committee on Professional Standards listed the arguments for and against stipends, and recommended that LAUC continue to investigate the matter. The report emphasized that before any stipends could be implemented there must first be agreement on the definitions of "administrative duties" and "department heads." L A U C committees reviewed the issue in 1977/78 and 1978/79. In the very comprehensive 1978 report from the Committee on Committees, Rules and Jurisdiction (Herb Ahn, UCI), no recommendation was made for or against stipends; instead it proposed that the report be adopted as the basis for further study, and that it be distributed to all librarians as well as Library Council members for this purpose. The Assembly filed the report and instructed the Executive Board to continue with the study of the difficult subject.

In September 1980 President Leister established the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Use of Administrative Stipends, instructing it to investigate the use of temporary as well as administrative stipends. The 1981/82 Executive Board also charged the committee with preparing a position paper, but withdrew the request when confusion arose over who had responsibility for preparing such papers. It was decided that no further work would be done on administrative stipends until this issue was resolved.

At the Spring 1982 Assembly a lengthy discussion took place on temporary stipends. The committee's recommendations were that

1. A systemwide policy allowing the use of temporary stipends should be established;
2. Such stipends should be given to permanent appointees to the Librarian series for added duties and responsibilities of a significant nature lasting no less than three months and no longer than two years; and

3. Temporary stipends should not be limited to administrative assignments.

After a lengthy discussion and two separate votes, the motion to accept the three recommendations was adopted and forwarded to the Office of the President.

Following the reorganization of Library Council in 1987, ULs began meeting as a group on the eve of the Council meetings; neither the LAUC President nor Past President were invited. As a result of discussions at these meetings Dorothy Gregor, Vice Chair of Library Council, named a subcommittee of the Personnel Committee to make recommendations on the implementation of administrative stipends for librarian managers not in the bargaining unit. The subcommittee included the campus Personnel Officers but not the LAUC representative.

The result was a proposal of November 7, 1990, which was presented to Council by Dorothy Gregor on behalf of the University Librarians, for the "introduction of administrative stipends for members of the librarian series who are 'designated librarian managers/supervisors' (exempt only)." The proposal suggested that librarian managers/supervisors be "compensated by administrative stipends for their managerial responsibilities following the model established for faculty department chairs." It cited complex environmental changes over the last ten years including collective bargaining, affirmative action programs, "rising staff expectations for the workplace to satisfy personal and social goals as well as to provide a means of livelihood," increasing substance abuse problems, sexual harassment, legal problems of workers compensation, and the increasing difficulty many of the campuses were experiencing in recruiting and retaining librarians with managerial skills. It was further recommended that compensation be based on the number of FTE supervised, not performance, and that the use of administrative stipends be a local option.

The proposal was discussed briefly at the Council meeting and referred to the Office of the President, which on April 12 asked LAUC to respond by May 30. How it would do so was heatedly debated by both the Executive Board and the LAUC Assembly on May 9 and 10. In earlier discussions the Association had gone on record as opposing administrative stipends; but the divisions had not discussed the current proposal. LAUC had decided to wait until asked by the Office of the President to respond, not expecting the response period to be so brief. At its wide-ranging discussion of several hours, the Executive Board tried to reconcile the need to respond with the concern that the divisions had not discussed the proposal. The next day the Assembly decided to put forth a sense-of-the-Assembly resolution to be sent immediately to the Office of the President, and to be followed by the formation of an ad hoc committee to consider the issue. The resolution, which passed unanimously, was:

Resolved that the LAUC Assembly is opposed to the proposal for administrative stipends for librarians as forwarded for response by the Office of the President on April 12, 1991.

A second resolution establishing an ad hoc committee "to investigate the problems that motivated Library Council's proposal for administrative stipends and propose alternative solutions, other than stipends, to address the problems" was debated at length. Some delegates said that LAUC did not need another committee on this issue. Others saw in the proposed committee the oppor-

tunity to work with the ULs creatively rather than just rejecting their recommendations without offering alternatives. The resolution passed, though not unanimously.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Management Options was established by President Meltzer in September 1991. Originally established as the Ad Hoc Committee on Stipends, the name was changed at the request of the Executive Board in October. It was suggested that the name was confusing and misleading, since the intent was not to reopen the discussion on administrative stipends but to explore other alternatives and methods of rewarding managers. The committee was a small one of five members, co-chaired by Judy Horn and Nancy Koller, with University Librarian Gloria Werner (UCLA) serving as a consultant and representing the viewpoint of the ULs. Myron Okada, Assistant Director for Academic Personnel Relations, also attended one of the committee's meetings and provided advice.

Although the deadline for comments to the Office of the President on the original proposal had long since passed and there had been no objections from the Academic Vice Chancellors, UCOP had taken no further action on the issue, awaiting the results of the committee's report. Contrary to the view expressed in the Gregor report, that "this proposal does not reflect a change in the 'two-track' philosophy underlying the merit and promotion structure," knowledgeable individuals in the Office of the President saw it as signaling a fundamental change in the way librarians were defined in the University.

In determining how to face its complex charge, the committee decided to send a questionnaire to all non-represented librarian managers (exempt). The questionnaire asked respondents to rank possible alternative methods of compensation, and to give their personal views on administrative stipends and on whether LAUC should follow the faculty model in providing them to department heads during the time they were serving in a management capacity. There was also a place for comments and for information on the number of people supervised, amount of time spent on management, and length of time as a librarian manager in the UC system and elsewhere. A questionnaire was also sent to the UC Personnel Officers to verify the statement in the proposal that libraries were facing difficulties in recruiting and retaining managers.

After receiving the responses, the committee decided to solicit the opinions of the librarians in the bargaining unit. Knowing that this second questionnaire was on a matter under the scope of representation, the committee chairs notified both the UFL representative and the Office of the President of their intentions. Because the questionnaire was designed merely to gather information and the committee was responding to a proposal involving librarians not covered under the MOU, neither the UFL nor UCOP voiced objections.

Both managers and non-managers were very candid and wrote long comments. As might be expected, the former group favored stipends, the latter did not. The committee's report, completed in August 1992, identified a number of issues and problems based on the comments received, and made recommendations on each of them. The main point insisted upon by the committee was "that even if administrative stipends were to be considered, the reasons stated in the University Librarians proposal are not compelling reasons for their adoption."

Some of the problems were the inconsistency in determining which managers would be exempt and which non-exempt; frustration among all librarians, both managers and non-managers, in not having enough time to carry out assigned responsibilities; concern over the current administrative style of centralized decision making; distress over funds earmarked for staff positions being used

instead for special projects; lack of understanding about the two-track system and the role of the union versus the role of LAUC; and low morale among all librarians. Several different perceptions that managers and non-managers had of each other, which helped create the differing views about the need for administrative stipends, were also identified. At the 1992 Fall Assembly, following a brief discussion, the committee's report was accepted and filed, and the committee discharged. LAUC President Alan Ritch forwarded the report to the Office of the President with a cover letter summarizing those issues that the Executive Board and the Assembly considered the most important.

CONCLUSION

In 1992 LAUC completed 25 years of existence in the middle of one of the most severe budgetary crises in the history of UC. To avoid layoffs, the University offered a Voluntary Early Retirement Incentive Program (VERIP) in 1991 and 1992 to encourage its employees to take early retirement, with tempting inducements offered to both faculty and staff. For the purpose of the program non-Senate academic employees, including librarians, were considered to be staff. In December 1992 the Professional Development Committee reported that preliminary data showed, as a result of VERIP and budget reductions, a systemwide 10% increase in the student/librarian ratio between October 1989 and October 1992, the figure varying from campus to campus. As a result of these programs LAUC lost many librarians who had been involved in its early days, signaling the end of another era in its history.

Did LAUC accomplish what its founders set out to do in 1967? The answer is both yes and no. In some areas it exceeded their original vision, in some it has not met their goals.

LAUC's first goal was to establish a separate academic series for librarians. It was seen by many of the early members as an alternative to unionization. A majority were opposed to faculty status, feeling that librarians would be best served by a separate academic classification with its own review process. They felt that librarians were unique within the University, and that their role and responsibilities were different enough from faculty to warrant a separate employment category.

LAUC has been extremely successful in establishing a performance review system for its members. Although modeled on the faculty review criteria, those for librarians emphasize primary position responsibilities first, and after that professional activities outside the library, university and public service, and research and creative activity. Librarians have job profiles, but the review process is based on individual accomplishments, not on the position held. Positions may be filled at any level, depending on the qualifications and accomplishments of the individual.

There is no set pattern for advancement within the series. The higher the rank, the more achievement is expected in the three criteria beyond the primary duties. Some librarians are reviewed on activities in all four criteria, others have chosen to focus on one or two of them. The overriding theme has been an emphasis on "the many paths to heaven," providing all with the opportunity to structure their career and advancement.

This is a unique system, in which individuals may reach the top ranks without administrative responsibilities. According to the Academic Personnel Manual, "All librarians at a given rank

and step shall be paid identical salaries...regardless of the presence or absence of administrative responsibilities."

Whether the criteria by which librarians are evaluated are flexible enough for these recessionary times is one of the most important questions now facing LAUC. With a reduction in the number of professional staff but no reduction in the number of students, most librarians have assumed additional responsibilities. Furthermore, funding for professional development has been reduced, and these two factors are limiting professional development time and opportunities for many. Two divisions have issued statements, "The Librarian Series in the 90's and Beyond," both affirming the flexibility of the APM criteria to accommodate diversity in career paths and professional contributions. The basic concept of the documents, first prepared by Berkeley and then endorsed with some revisions by Los Angeles, is that no revisions to the APM criteria are necessary, but there "is a need to exercise appropriate flexibility in their interpretation."

Because of the uniqueness of this performance evaluation system and salary structure, the question of administrative stipends for librarians has reoccurred at intervals throughout the history of the association. Whether administrative responsibility is just another activity of librarianship—along with "selection and development of resources; bibliographic control of collections and their organization for use; reference and advisory service; development and application of specialized information systems," to quote from APM's Section 210—or whether it is more difficult than the others has been the subject of continual debate.

The goal of LAUC that has met with the least success has possibly been the achievement of sabbaticals. In 1968 the association requested sabbaticals and leaves with pay from the Office of the President; UCOP took no action. However, as the 1976 report from the Committee on Privileges, Salaries, and Conditions of Employment pointed out, non-Senate academics are not entitled to sabbaticals. Librarians are allowed leaves with pay (see APM 176), but the provisions of these are not as generous as are sabbaticals for faculty. Lack of "sabbaticals" is a frequent complaint from a number of UC librarians.

LAUC is also unique in having funds allocated by the Office of the President specifically for research by librarians. The action recognizes and encourages the expectation for research in academic librarianship; it also recognizes that librarians are not entitled to sabbaticals and that funds from granting agencies are much less likely to be awarded to them than to faculty.

The goal of Academic Senate membership for all UC librarians has also been elusive. This has been a campus rather than systemwide issue; some divisions have been more successful than others in achieving representation on Senate committees. Likewise, eligibility for faculty programs such as housing assistance has been differently determined on the different campuses.

It is ironic that the Office of the President and the University Librarians originally welcomed LAUC as an alternative to a union about which they were all apprehensive. The vote by librarians in June 1983 for representation by the UFL was seen by many as a message to the legislature, motivated by the lack of pay increases during the late 1970s and early 1980s. The UFL itself has not become a major influence. Its negotiators are LAUC members who have fought to keep the peer review process under LAUC. Its actions have served to maintain and increase the professionalism of LAUC members.

LAUC has been extremely successful in providing a voice for librarians in systemwide library issues, an achievement which would have been impossible if it had followed the more traditional

faculty-status model. Both the LAUC President and Past President are full voting members of Library Council, and a LAUC representative serves on every Council committee. The association also has representatives on the Board of each Regional Library Facility. Over the years the focus of its attention has moved from the status of librarians to library service, to issues such as resource sharing and greater involvement in the educational mission of the University.

LAUC has also developed close and cordial working relationships with the Office of the President. Not only do the LAUC officers go to Oakland to meet with UCOP staff; the latter attend LAUC Assemblies as an expected part of their duties, and are ready and willing to offer advice and assistance at any time. This acceptance of the association and the role that librarians play in the governance of the University by the Office of the President has been one of LAUC's major achievements.

Another has been its success in bringing together librarians from the nine campuses to work together for common goals. It has been extremely difficult to reach consensus among the divisions on some topics, but overall there has been a spirit of cooperation and a willingness to unite for the benefit of all librarians and libraries. LAUC has been a unifying force for the campuses.

The accomplishments of LAUC, especially in establishing the status of librarians as a separate academic group within the University and as a voice in library policy, have been tremendous. The association has put its stamp on the UC libraries, and any look into the future by a LAUC member usually assumes that LAUC will be there, offering advice on issues of concern to all librarians and on the operations and policies of the University of California libraries.

But despite these achievements at the University level, the heart of LAUC is in its local divisions. Systemwide could not be effective, or even exist, without them; they have been its underpinning through all the 25 years. Systemwide consensus on issues arises from discussions at the local level, and many of the topics worked on by LAUC are first introduced by the divisions. Committee work at the local level also serves as a training ground for members and chairs of systemwide committees and future systemwide officers. But more important, each local division has its unique history in lobbying and developing procedures for peer review, professional development, librarian research and many other activities now taken for granted, and in making its voice heard in the governance of the library and the campus.

The chapters that follow describe the most important of these divisional activities over the last 25 years. Each chapter is different, reflecting the environmental differences on the various campuses. But each chapter tells something of the ways in which the division has given advice on professional and governance matters of concern to all librarians and their libraries. They are accomplishments of which LAUC and all its members can be proud.