



Santa Barbara

*by Carol Gibbens, Robert Sivers, Lucia Snowhill
and Sally Weimer*

A SOCIAL HISTORY OF THE CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS

In the early 1960s the University of California granted its librarians academic status. At the Santa Barbara campus, librarians became acutely aware that this status brought neither the stature nor the associated security of employment for which they had hoped. The real status of UC librarians was revealed in the Ishimatsu decision, which affirmed the University's contention that any librarian could be dismissed without cause at any time, with no right of appeal. It was this decision, and the aspiration of UCSB librarians to achieve due recognition of their rights and privileges as professionals, that led to the first meeting and foundation of the UCSB Librarians Association on November 29, 1966.

What were the goals of those who attended that initial meeting? In many ways they were the bread-and-butter issues traditionally associated with the Union movement: job security, written promotion procedures and in-service training. At the same time there was clearly major support for the professional objectives of a direct voice in library affairs, sabbatical leave, representation in the Academic Senate and a clearer statement of what was entailed in the term "professional librarian." Having established what librarians should be trying to accomplish, this first meeting turned to the organizational structure to bring it about. That organization was formalized through the first Constitution and ByLaws which were approved six months later, on June 19, 1967.

The 1967 Constitution and Bylaws

The June 1967 Constitution and Bylaws served the needs of most UCSB librarians through 1974. Although the names of the committees under the first Constitution were frequently changed and the functions of its components altered from time to time, its mission remained constant. That mission was to serve as the advocate for the rights and aspirations of professional librarians on the Santa Barbara campus. The officers were typical of any organization: a president, a vice president, a secretary and a treasurer. The treasurer's chief function was to collect dues, which were originally mandatory, since no university funding nor meeting place was provided for the unrecognized association.

The hard business of bargaining with the Library administration was entrusted to the Liaison Committee (the name was later changed), which was primarily responsible for presenting new library policy and procedures to the University Librarian—or alternatively, for proposing the examination or reinterpretation of existing policy. Within the Liaison Committee there was an annual review and selection of specific objectives for the organization during the year. These objectives were aggressively pursued, often with confrontational tactics. Among the early achievements were the institution of substantive, written evaluations of librarians' performance, and local recognition of the Association by the University Librarian and the UCSB Chancellor.

Despite the organization's significant success in obtaining its objectives, the problem of the recognized right of the Association to speak for all UCSB librarians remained unresolved. In late 1973 the level of concern changed from serious to critical. It became clear that the University did not recognize LAUC nor any of its divisions as representing systemwide or campus librarians. On May 23, 1974, the LAUC-SB membership debated the legitimacy of its representative function in participatory management of the UCSB Library. Without such recognition, a majority contended, the division's right to speak for librarians had no foundation. As a consequence, most of the membership agreed that participation in LAUC was clearly illegitimate and possibly illegal. The membership directed the LAUC-SB President to appoint a committee to write Bylaws which reflected the structure, role and terms appropriate to a voluntary organization of UCSB librarians.

The 1974 Bylaws

On December 19, 1974, the committee issued a draft of the new Bylaws. Clearly, as the committee documented in its cover letter, they were to be used as an instrument for implementing significant changes in the role of librarians within the UCSB Library. "It is proposed," the committee wrote, "to establish a Library faculty...based on...teamwork and reason rather than upon position and power."

Later on the same page, it added:

We see as the Library Faculty's chief responsibilities the development and recommendation of academic and professional policy. The unique function...of the [Library] administration...is implementation [sic] of policy.

To carry out this concept of library operations, the Constitution established a Faculty-elected Executive Committee consisting of a Chair, a Secretary, the four chairs of the standing committees and the University Librarian *ex officio*. The duties of the standing committees corresponded to the enumerated responsibilities of librarians in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM). Of equal importance, the draft Bylaws assigned clusters of responsibilities to the standing committees which paralleled those groups of responsibilities assigned to each major division of the UCSB Library organization chart. Furthermore, the Executive Committee was charged to "advise and assist the University Librarian in the administration and management of the Library including staff and budgetary planning." The overall effect was to create a Library Faculty organization which exactly replicated the division of upper-management policy functions in the UCSB Library.

On February 20, 1975, the University of California declared all librarians to be members of LAUC and recognized its official role as an advisor on library matters to the systemwide and campus administrations. Four days later, the Library Faculty Bylaws, slightly modified to satisfy the UC stipulations for LAUC's recognition, were issued in their definitive form. The drive to transform UCSB librarians into the collegial authors of Library policy had begun.

With minor changes, the 1975 Bylaws of the Library Faculty governed the activities of LAUC-SB until 1980. An important accomplishment was the introduction of librarians to the prolix and often intractable multi-problem environment of policy making. Specific accomplishments by the standing committees included studies of referrals between public service desks, codification of library reference policy, and analysis of a number of options related to the closure of the card catalog. Nevertheless, organizational problems plagued Library Faculty functions from the beginning, and increased steadily with each year of operation. On April 27, 1979, an Ad Hoc Reconnaissance Committee reported on a number of problems within the Library Faculty structure. Among those cited: "committee charges are frequently decided in a vacuum" and "some of the charges have resulted in wheel spinning and duplicative effort [with that of the Library Administration]." As for the Bylaws' overall imperative to assist with the management of the Library, the committee commented: "When LAUC-SB initiates and controls policy formation it sometimes finds that it does not have the knowledge or the resources to establish policy..." Within two months the division's Executive Committee had had enough, and directed that a By-Laws Revision Committee be appointed to investigate the ills of the Library Faculty and propose a cure.

To the By-Laws Revision Committee, the disarray demanded a major rethinking of the organization. These thoughts were presented and incorporated in a complete redrafting of the Bylaws. Because the ensuing debate developed into a series of arguments on the basic purpose and expectations of LAUC-SB, discussion occupied two long meetings of the membership and ultimately required a ballot referendum. It was apparent to those who proposed the new Bylaws that a major source of frustration and disillusionment resulted from the Library Faculty overreaching itself. In turn, it was believed, such overreaching resulted from the unrealistic assumption that LAUC-SB had the mission, the energy, the knowledge and the skills to produce all Library policy. The new Bylaws replaced these assumptions with the principle that all such sources of power were in fact severely limited. Then, based on such realizations, they called for

LAUC-SB to participate only in those parts of library planning and implementation which the membership deemed to be of the very highest importance.

The 1980 Bylaws

In May 1980 the division approved a modified version of the proposed Bylaws. It thereby opted to try a much leaner, more focused organization composed of an Executive Committee and two standing committees.

The Executive Committee included the LAUC-SB Chair, the Chair-Elect, the former Chair, the Secretary, the chairs of the two standing committees and the University Librarian. The presence of the University Librarian was later declared by systemwide LAUC to be inconsistent with its own Bylaws.

The foremost responsibility of the Executive Committee was to win approval for a carefully formulated set of goals for the year. This was accomplished by gathering information about the professional needs of the membership, prioritizing actions designed to meet such needs, adopting an explicit plan for the year, winning support for the plan and monitoring progress toward achieving the goals.

The Committee on Advancement and Promotion (CAP) was established by the 1980 Bylaws to ensure that the critically important reviews for merit, retention and promotion were thorough, constructive and unbiased. The professional development and research subcommittees were placed under the purview of CAP, so that a single committee was in the position to relate reviews for advancement up the career ladder with the support for those professional activities which became increasingly important as each rung of that ladder was climbed.

The Committee on Appointments, Assignments and Reassignments (CAAR) was created to monitor the judgement, the fairness and the openness with which significant new responsibilities were matched with internal librarian candidates. The duties of CAAR members included chairing all recruitment committees, attending planning conferences for vacated positions and working with the UCSB Library Administration on plans for significant assignments or reassignments of duties.

The selectivity in choosing among competing priority objectives, as required by the 1980 Bylaws, allowed LAUC-SB to concentrate its energies on a number of complex challenges to the role of librarians within the University. On the systemwide level the division played an important, sometimes decisive role in reviewing the consequences of the Library Specialist proposal and the move to grant retreat rights of appointees to the AUL classifications. Balancing these important successes was LAUC-SB's failure to convince Library administrators of the benefits which its advice might bring to the planning process preceding the assignment or reassignment of significant duties among its librarians. The complexity of negotiations in new assignments or reassignments, and the sometimes confidential information used in discussing such changes, proved to be major impediments to LAUC-SB participation. These barriers have yet to be overcome.

The Current Bylaws

By the end of the decade the Bylaws were redrafted, since they no longer adequately addressed important changes in political reality or priorities. The new Bylaws first recognized the exclusive role played by union negotiations in determining working conditions and salary for the great majority of LAUC members. Secondly, they established subcommittees to consider renewed emphases on professional development and research.

These changes positioned LAUC-SB to focus on two long-term objectives. The first concerned a partnership with Library management in an all-out effort to develop a Library structure and outlook supportive of diversity. The second focused on active campaigning for increased investment in an infrastructure to support the rapid transformation of librarians into information specialists within a computer environment.

PEER REVIEW: THE COMMITMENT TO ACADEMIC LIBRARIANSHIP

The early LAUC-SB documents mentioning peer evaluation for librarians date from 1963. Yet the procedures for review of academic personnel were unwritten, and largely based on practices existing before librarians were granted academic status. One of the driving forces behind the establishment of the UCSB Librarians Association was to develop appropriate review procedures for its members.

Based on the faculty model, peer review for librarians began to develop in 1969 with the creation of an ad hoc committee. Working with the Library administration, the committee studied the activities of the Chancellor's committee that reviewed all academic actions on the campus. The members of LAUC-SB elected the first Committee on Personnel, with John Johnson as chair; it began the rudiments of the review process in early 1970, and worked with the Chancellor's committee until 1972.

The librarians at UCSB strenuously opposed confidentiality in reviews. Debate after debate on the issue took place with the administration during the early 1970s. The proponents for open letters and non-confidential material were eloquent and forceful, and LAUC peer reviews procedures reflected confidentiality for the first time only after APM Sections 51-4 and 82 were developed, with policies of confidential letters. Documents show that the library administration at one point decided not to ask for any review letters because of the continued opposition to confidential material.

The basis of the current peer review practice was discussed and developed in 1975. Librarians first contributed professional information (a résumé) to the review packet in 1976. LAUC-SB decided to form two review committees, on merit and promotion, and to have separate packets for each kind of action. Librarians under consideration for promotion prepared a merit packet for the current review period and a career review packet for promotion. In 1989 the Committee on Advancement and Promotion revised the procedures to require one review packet for merit consideration and promotion, to eliminate duplication.

In 1977 the University Librarian was granted authority for final decisions in all cases except promotion or career status. In 1991 the authority was extended to promotion cases as well.

Currently, librarians serve on confidential ad hoc review committees to provide peer evaluation in matters of merit, promotion and career status. The chair of CAP meets regularly

with the AUL for Personnel and members of LAUC-SB to discuss concerns, policies and review matters.

APM GENERATION AND REGENERATION

In the late 1960s librarians at UCSB eagerly began to collect information and develop strategies to assist in the development of relevant sections of the Academic Personnel Manual. A survey of the librarians on issues of faculty/academic status, security of employment, grievance and appeals, representation and governance, education, sabbaticals, research, appointments, promotion, salary, policy making and personnel policies resulted in a commitment to strongly define the role of the librarian in an academic situation.

The first drafts of APM 51-4 and 82 were very disappointing to the members of LAUC-SB. A great deal of discussion took place to determine the most appropriate method to influence future policies on the governance of UC librarians. One area of unified commitment was non-confidentiality in merit and promotion reviews. The Santa Barbara division was strongly committed to open files, and recommended non-confidentiality in all elements of the process. It soon became apparent that the systemwide policy would not be changed by local concerns.

Disillusioned by UC systemwide politics and apparent non-support of librarians, LAUC-SB considered the future of the Association. In a general forum members expressed their concerns of contributing to "sweetheart unionism." The discussion centered on methods that might improve the professional status of librarians, and concluded with a straw vote on a variety of options. In 1974 Santa Barbara did not send any representatives to the LAUC Fall Assembly. The division continued to debate and consider many options. By the following Assembly it was even more strongly committed to a systemwide forum, and firmly closed ranks with the rest of LAUC.

All APM revisions continued to be carefully analyzed and discussed by the Santa Barbara division. Various members served on the systemwide committees that reviewed each section. LAUC-SB continues to actively support improvements that enhance the professional status of its librarians.

SUMMARY

A retrospective view of LAUC-SB's first twenty-five years reveals both the continuity and discontinuity of its history. From the beginning its members were concerned that the basics of salary, security of employment and due process be secured as the platform necessary for their further development as professionals. Those same concerns exist today, but the responsibility is now divided between a national union's negotiations on the basics and the division's emphasis on professional development. The polite, somewhat technical means employed to promote professional development of members today contrast sharply with the confrontational claims to participative management which characterized the objectives of earlier decades. Yet the overall mission of LAUC-SB has remained constant: to work with library management to build staff, collections and services of the highest quality for the campus community. There could be no better legacy.

OFFICERS

1966

Steering Committee Chair:	William Treese
Secretary:	Marilyn Rittenhouse
Corresponding Committee:	Lucy Salvia
On-campus Committee:	Sandy Dorbin
By-laws & Constitution Committee:	Martha Eszes (Smith)
Southern Regional Steering C'tee representative:	Michael Costin
Representative to UC librarians' body:	Marilyn Rittenhouse
UC Librarians' Meeting Chair:	[selected by Bill Treese]
Secretary:	Fay Blake

1967

President:	Michael Costin
Secretary:	Martha Eszes (Smith)
Appeals and Grievance Committee:	William Treese

1968

President:	Martin Silver
Vice President:	Ann Pritchard
Secretary:	Gary Korn
Treasurer:	Louise Kane
LAUC Committee on Recognition:	Sherrill Mann

1969

President:	Sanford Dorbin (to July; Ann Pritchard (Kreyche)
Vice President:	Ann Pritchard (Kreyche)
Secretary:	David Briggs
Treasurer:	Mary Anne Epp
Liaison Committee:	Gary Korn
Program:	Ansie Preller
Review Committee:	Barbara Fox

1970

President:	Gary Korn
Secretary:	Sherrill Mann
Treasurer:	Grace Thomas

Committee on Committees:
 Personnel Committee:
 Travel:
 Program:
 Budget:

Bill Treese
 John Johnson
 Barbara Silver
 Mary Anne Epp
 David Briggs

1971

President:
 Vice President:
 Secretary:
 Treasurer:
 Liaison Committee:
 Budget:
 Personnel:
 Program:
 Travel:
 Committee on Committees:

Mary Anne Epp
 Robert Crittenden
 Laura Nanna
 Grace Thomas
 Mary Anne Epp
 David Briggs
 Susan Sonnet (Bower)
 Barbara Ciesler Silver
 Carol Gibbens
 Bill Treese

1972

President:
 Vice President:
 Secretary:
 Treasurer:
 Travel Committee:
 Committee on Committees:
 Personnel Committee:
 Budget:

Laura Nanna
 Carol Gibbens
 Linda Broderick
 Pat Pung
 Lieselotte Fajardo
 Robert Sivers
 Susan Sonnet (Bower)
 David Briggs

1973

President:
 Vice President:
 Secretary:
 Treasurer:
 Committee on Committees:

Carlos Najera
 Dennis Hamilton
 Lucy Salvia
 Pat Cronshaw
 Michael Randell

1974

President:
 Vice President:
 Secretary:
 Treasurer:

Robert Crittenden
 Gregg Procter
 Linda Broderick
 Dennis Hamilton

Committee on Committees:

Carol Gibbens

1975

President:	Keith Blean
Secretary:	Laura Nanna
Personnel Committee:	Barbara Ceisler Silver
Library Resources Committee:	Lieselotte Fajardo
Bibliographic Control:	Kwan-Lin Chen
Reference & Information Servs.:	Art Anthony
Professional Development:	Patricia Cronshaw

1976/77

President:	Susan Sonnet (Bower)
Secretary:	Herb Linville
Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP):	Judy Horn
Committee on Devt. of Lib. Resouces (CDLR):	Lieselotte Fajardo
C'tee on Control of Lib. Resources (CBCLR):	Laura Nanna
C'tee on Reference and Advisory Services and Specialized Information Systems (CRASSIS):	Gary Peete
Committee on Professional Devt. (CPD):	Gregg Proctor

1977/78

President:	Laura Nanna
Vice President/Pres Elect:	Judy Horn
Secretary:	Pat Pung
Committee on Academic Personnel:	Carol Gibbens
CDLR:	Pat Gebhard
CBCLR:	Susan Lentz
CRASSIS:	Sally Weimer
CPD:	Dennis Hamilton

1978/79

President:	Judy Horn
Vice President:	Donald Schippers
Secretary:	Linda Broderick
CAP:	Gary Peete
CDLR:	Virginia Weiser
CBCLR:	Grace Thomas
CRASSIS:	Pat Gebhard
CPD:	Bob Crittenden

1979/80

Chair:	Donald Schippers
Vice Chair/Chair elect:	Robert Sivers
Secretary:	Linda Borderic
CPD:	Laura Nanna
CRASSIS:	David Kiley
CAP:	George Lupone
CDLR:	Olga Ignon
CBCLR:	Patricia Pung

1980/81

Chair:	Robert Sivers
Vice Chair/Chair Elect:	Gary Peete
Secretary:	Robert Trujillo
C'tee on Advancement and Promotion (CAP):	Barbara Ceisler Silver
Committee on Appointments, Assignments, and Reassignments (CAAR):	Sally Weimer

1981/82

Chair:	Gary Peete
Vice Chair/Chair Elect:	David Kiley
Secretary:	Virginia Weiser
CAP:	Al Hodina
CAAR:	Laura Nanna

1982/83

Chair:	David Kiley
Vice Chair/Chair Elect:	Dennis Hamilton
Secretary:	Virginia Weiser
CAP:	Lucia Snowhill
CAAR:	Laura Nanna

1983/84

Chair:	Dennis Hamilton
Vice Chair/Chair Elect:	[none]
Secretary:	Sylvia Curtis
CAP:	Lucia Snowhill
CAAR:	Mildred Bongiorno
Program:	Sal Guerena

1984/85

Chair:	Lucia Snowhill
Vice Chair/Chair Elect:	Sylvia Curtis
Secretary:	Grace Thomas
CAP:	Allen Cohen
CAAR:	Martin Silver

1985/86

Chair:	Sylvia Curtis
Vice Chair/Chair Elect:	[none]
Secretary:	Andrew Shroyer
CAP:	Allen Cohen
CAAR:	Martin Silver

1986/87

Chair:	Barbara Ceisler Silver; Alex Gonzales
Vice Chair/Chair Elect:	Alex Gonzales
Secretary:	Carol Doyle
CAP:	Andrew Shroyer
CAAR:	Stephen Schulthesis

1987/88

Chair:	Alex Gonzales
Vice Chair/Chair Elect:	[none]
Secretary:	Carol Doyle
CAP:	Andrew Shroyer
CAAR:	Steve Schulthesis

1988/89

Chair:	Susan Sonnet Bower
Vice Chair/Chair Elect:	Janet Martorana
Secretary:	Chuck Huber
CAP:	Sylvia Curtis
CAAR:	Jim Markham

1989/90

Chair:	Janet Martorana
Vice Chair/Chair Elect:	Laura Nanna
Secretary:	Chuck Huber
CAP:	Carol Gibbens
CAAR:	Jim Markham

1990/91

Chair:	Laura Nanna
Vice Chair/Chair Elect:	Chuck Huber
Secretary:	Grace Thomas
CAP:	Mary Larsgaard
CAAR:	Andrew Shroyer
Committee on Professional Development (CPD):	Carol Gibbens

1991/92

Chair:	Chuck Huber
Vice Chair/Chair Elect:	Mary Larsgaard
Secretary:	Christine Oka
CAP:	Lucia Snowhill
CAAR:	Carol Gibbens
CPD:	Cheryl LaGuardia

1992/93

President:	Mary Larsgaard
Vice Chair/Chair Elect:	Michael Hopper; Cheryl LaGuardia
Secretary:	Lorna Lueck
CAP:	Carol Doyle
CAAR:	Susan Sonnet Bower
CPD:	Jim Markham