



San Francisco

by Jacqueline Wilson and Nancy Whitten Zinn

The history of the San Francisco division of LAUC needs to be understood in the special context of its campus. In contrast to the general campuses of the University of California, San Francisco was and still is primarily a center for graduate health science professional education, research and direct patient care. Because of its specialized nature it is the smallest of the UC campuses.

The campus and its Library focus on the health sciences. The information needs on campus range from clinical to biochemical to sociological to general reference. A unique collection of materials is required to fill these needs, since no affiliated general library is available on campus or close by. In the 1960s the Library was developing one of the largest collections in the world of research and clinical health science publications, in a variety of languages from many countries. In-depth reference, cataloging and online searching were valuable services to patrons. San Francisco was also unique among the UC campuses in having through 1969 a physician as the head of its Library; in that year a member of the Librarian Series was appointed acting University Librarian.

The Beginnings

At the June 26, 1967 meeting to discuss the formation of a librarians' association in the University of California, Nancy Zinn, Special Collections Librarian, and Diane Populus, Reference Librarian, were selected as representatives from the San Francisco campus to serve on a steering committee to organize LAUC. In July Janet Phillips, Catalog Librarian, replaced Nancy Zinn.

In October of the same year the librarians at UCSF voted unanimously to support the establishment of a Universitywide association. In 1968 Justine Roberts, Systems Librarian, was elected the division's first Chair and Rene Wallace, Reference Librarian, served as Representative to LAUC. On November 1 of that year Chair Roberts wrote to Chancellor Willard C. Fleming asking that the Librarians Association, San Francisco Division be recognized as the official organizational representative of the professional librarians on the San Francisco campus.

In 1969 Marion Mueller, Serials Librarian, became the second LAUC-SF chair and Dorothy Gregor, Reference Librarian, Secretary/Treasurer. A meeting of the division was held in May to hear a report of delegate Gregor on the first systemwide LAUC Assembly, just held at San Diego on the 10th of the month.

In response to the expressed desire of members, efforts to gain official recognition of LAUC on a local level were resumed, and a plan developed which included:

1. Completing a position paper on professional responsibilities of San Francisco librarians requested by the University Librarian;
2. Submitting the position paper and a letter requesting LAUC recognition to the University Librarian; and
3. Requesting the University Librarian to forward the above documents to the Chancellor for final approval.

This was the first of what were to become monthly meetings of the entire membership. Prior to this time the only forum where all UCSF librarians met was a very formal monthly meeting conducted by the University Librarian, John Saunders. Dr. Saunders was a physician, chair of the History of Medicine Division of the campus, and a former Chancellor. He offered a lecture as part of most meetings, and then the Administrative Librarian, Jeannette Yeazell, would speak on operational matters. There was no sense of participation by librarians. LAUC-SF was to provide a unique and stimulating environment for the twenty or so librarians, mostly women, working on the San Francisco campus in the late 1960s. It provided the first real chance for them to get to know one another in a collegial setting.

It also became the first forum for professional issues and the first opportunity for many to learn and practice organizational skills. It allowed the members to express their concern that the transfer of librarians from the status of non-academic to academic employees, which had been approved in 1962, had been implemented on this campus in title only. Many of them still felt burdened with routine, clerical tasks which prevented them from fulfilling more professional responsibilities. Administrative reviews were the only means of advancement. San Francisco librarians recognized early on that LAUC was the first viable vehicle for moving toward true professional academic status.

A number of gatherings were held in June 1969 to prepare a position paper, and a meeting held with University Librarian Saunders in July to discuss it. By August Dr. Saunders had forwarded the request for recognition of LAUC-SF to the new Chancellor Philip Lee and had

seen the Chancellor on the division's behalf. A few months later, one year after the original request was made, Chancellor Lee granted LAUC official recognition at UCSF.

San Francisco librarians were eager to participate in the broader network of their colleagues in the UC system, and looked for opportunities to participate in systemwide LAUC activities. Nancy Zinn was elected to the office of systemwide Secretary. San Francisco offered to host the LAUC Assembly in December 1969, and Lee Mosley, Head of Cataloging, was appointed a delegate.

In August 1969 LAUC-SF discussed forming the first of many local committees, the Committee on Library Policy. Its purpose was to provide the opportunity to include more of the librarian staff in the Library's policy discussions. The committee was to have a diverse membership, with individuals from different Library units and levels in the librarian series. Topics to be discussed included budget preparation, rotational assignments, continuing education, peer review and a staff newsletter. The committee was conceived of as advisory, with issues to be identified and investigated by members of the division. The committee was formally established in February 1970.

The First Responsibilities

By December 1969 some of the first glow of excitement was wearing off, and members were getting their first sense of the burdens that came with expanded responsibility. They were having a hard time turning ideas into actions and products. It became evident that the San Francisco members did not completely support the concept of LAUC and our role as academic employees. Some of them were indifferent; other were openly negative. Some who had become officers were complaining of the burden of LAUC activities on their time. Others held unrealistic expectations about how quickly LAUC could effect change in the Library, on the Campus and in the University. After discussion the division decided to continue, but with more realistic expectations.

Three meetings were held in late 1969 to discuss the Berkeley Task Force Report on the Librarian Series. In general the membership supported the document, but in view of its small size there was concern as to how peer review would work at the local level. There was also strong support of the concept of the M.L.S. as the minimum degree necessary for employment in the librarian series, but it was felt that the 5-year probationary period recommended for the series was too long. The division also proposed that Social Security coverage, unemployment benefits, disability benefits and the opportunity to use accumulated sick leave for maternity be made available to librarians.

By early 1970 official minutes from systemwide LAUC and other LAUC divisions were being circulated to San Francisco members, who reacted very negatively to the early 1970 UC policy statement on layoff for non-Senate academic personnel. They were particularly troubled that the policy was put into place in a work environment that did not provide for unemployment insurance or social security benefits. The division asked systemwide LAUC to place these questions on the agenda for the 1970 Spring Assembly.

In Spring 1970 the campus began a search for its first full-time University Librarian. LAUC-SF members were disheartened to learn that while faculty and students were named to the search

committee, librarians were not; and the entire membership requested that campus administrators permit the division to be represented on the committee. The request was denied by Executive Vice Chancellor Edwin Rosinski, but the members were not satisfied, and decided to respond. They also asked Justine Roberts and Nancy Zinn to prepare a list of potential UL candidates and a set of selection criteria for the position. Once there was consensus on the material prepared, Roberts and Zinn met with the chair of the search committee. The meeting was cordial, and there was consensus that the effort was valuable to both LAUC-SF and the committee. Librarians participated in the interviews with potential candidates, evaluated each one, and sent recommendations to the search committee.

The Library Policy Committee made four important recommendations in March 1970. The division adopted its proposal to make the divisional chair the liaison between LAUC-SF and the University Librarian. It was hoped that the move would open up new channels of communication between the two parties. The liaison participated in discussions involving staff utilization, budget planning and continuing education. The other recommendation adopted was for a manual to contain Library policies and be available to all Library employees. A third suggestion, recommending preparation of a Library procedure manual, was defeated, but there was consensus that individual Library departments should prepare their own compilations. The final proposal, for a LAUC newsletter, was withdrawn when the Library administration agreed to accept responsibility for issuing a Library newsletter.

In April 1970 Academic Vice Chancellor Leslie Bennett sent the division a copy of the new proposed Section 82 of the Academic Personnel Manual, marking the first time the campus administration had contacted LAUC-SF for an official opinion. San Francisco supported the systemwide LAUC position recommending against implementing the section until a workable version was agreed on. Members finally met with Chancellor Philip Lee to discuss this position in June of 1972.

1971-1975

In 1971, after much discussion, an *ad hoc* committee was appointed to write a Library Acquisitions Manual. Chaired by Jacqueline Wilson, Monographs Librarian, it was charged to determine ways of providing regular, long-term screening and selection of library materials based on a written acquisitions policy. It prepared a survey and sent it to all department chairs and deans, planning also to interview as many of the respondents as possible. In consultation with the chair of the San Francisco Academic Senate Committee on Library, 50 questionnaires were distributed, 43 were returned, and five more were answered by letter. The committee analyzed the surveys and prepared summaries of departmental plans and new areas of course development. The information was used by Wilson to prepare the Library's first collection development policy.

LAUC-SF continued to make recommendations on Library policy. In 1972 it voted by a large majority to ask Library administration to call department head meetings at least once each month, and to request that minutes of these meetings be recorded and routed to the rest of the Library staff.

It also carried on extensive negotiation with the Library and campus administration to ensure that the names of all librarians be included in the systemwide UC address directory. At about the

same time LAUC-SF members were invited to join the Faculty Club for the first time, and given access to campus "A" parking permits on the same basis as other academics.

The San Francisco division had learned that LAUC members on some other campuses had been appointed to various Academic Senate Committees on their campuses. LAUC-SF followed suit in spring 1973 with a request to participate on the Committee on Library of the UCSF Academic Senate. An agreement was also reached with University Librarian Jeannette Yeazell to circulate the minutes of this committee as well as of the systemwide Academic Senate Library Committee to divisional members. The proposal was approved, and the LAUC-SF chair appointed an ad hoc member of the Senate Committee on Library.

At the urging of Elisabeth Bell, Reference Librarian, the division began a journal club in 1973. Its goal was to meet monthly, with members taking turns presenting an article (or more than one) of professional interest, followed by discussion of its implications. At the suggestion of UL Yeazell, participation was extended to the rest of the Library staff. After a short flurry of activity the club dissolved. Several attempts were made to revive it, notably in 1978, but the small size of the division kept it from ever being truly viable.

The library manual, first begun in 1970, finally become a reality when LAUC-SF issued the first edition of the Librarian's Handbook in February 1974, compiled by Katalin Pavlath, Catalog Librarian, and Justine Roberts. Janet Phillips was invaluable in maintaining it. Its purpose was to help in orienting newly appointed UCSF librarians and to serve as a *vade mecum* for incumbents. Prepared in loose-leaf format for easy updating, it contained copies of all documents, including an introduction to the campus and LAUC, personnel policies and procedures, information on benefits and regulations, LAUC Bylaws, important sections of the Academic Personnel Manual, committee rosters, and other information thought to be of importance to a librarian at UCSF. A standing Handbook Committee was formed to ensure that the contents were kept current. For many years it was of great value to members of the division.

LAUC-SF continued to urge the Library administration, still headed by UL Yeazell, to improve communication channels. Requested on a regular basis were an annual Library report, periodic statistical reports from all units of the Library, and a variety of other public and internal reporting documents. Members still believed that the Library lacked many of the basic tools necessary to work in a truly professional manner, especially usable management information.

A major topic of discussion that extended over several meetings in the spring of 1974 was the report of the systemwide LAUC Ad Hoc Committee to Study Relationships of LAUC and Voluntary Organizations. At San Francisco it was felt that with collective bargaining laws being enacted, a Universitywide, Senate-like LAUC might be an advantage to the University. It was agreed that librarians constituted a well-established separate group within the University, and therefore ought also to constitute a separate unit for collective bargaining purposes. There was also a very strong feeling that LAUC should not be a voluntary organization, but should continue to seek a status comparable to the Senate.

Members carefully followed the debate and systemwide action on librarians' salaries in 1974 and 1975. Justine Roberts served as an able member of the systemwide Committee on Salaries. LAUC-SF agreed that much accommodation was needed in the proposed review schedule to prevent a real dollar loss for most UC librarians over a ten-year period. The success of the salary restructure seemed to members to depend on the University accepting the proposed tables for

accelerated reviews. The division voted in May 1975 not to support the McCoy Salary Committee recommendations for restructure, since they would raise the top and bottom salaries in the librarian series without much change in the middle range. Its members felt that because the salary range would look so much better, chances of achieving an inequity increase would diminish. They supported the proposal that LAUC press for restructuring the librarian series only when sufficient funds were available.

Extensive discussions were held in November 1975 on the Moscone bill assuring confidentiality of personnel files, particularly as it would effect peer review. Members were opposed to the files being considered public record and open to anyone. They emphasized that access to a librarian's personnel records should be limited to those directly concerned with that librarian and to others authorized to handle them.

1976-1978

In January 1976 University Librarian Yeazell asked LAUC-SF to review the draft of a position description for a serials librarian. This gave the division an excellent opportunity to express its collective opinion on a variety of professional issues, among them the number of hours worked by librarians. The administration wanted a phrase in the position description specifying a 40-hour work week. LAUC-SF felt that this was inappropriate for a professional opening, and that librarians were hired to carry out certain responsibilities rather than work a prescribed number of hours. The members also expressed concerns over the appropriateness of salary to experience and responsibility. They said that experience in the serials field was essential for the present position and knowledge of technical processing should be required, not just desirable as stated in the draft. Comment was also requested on a temporary position for a History Librarian.

Also in January 1976 LAUC-SF discussed the Master Plan for UC Libraries, known as the Salmon Report. Members generally approved the Plan and its priorities, but insisted that the implementation of any of the projects described be strongly supported with adequate funding, and that the impact on existing staff be fully considered. Stephen Salmon, UC Vice President and author of the Plan, was invited to discuss it with the division. As various drafts of the document were distributed, LAUC-SF members continued to discuss its implications and implementation.

The search for a new University Librarian was again a major issue in 1976. The division sent a letter to the Chancellor asking that LAUC-SF have a representative on the search committee. The Chancellor agreed, and Justine Roberts was appointed. After some heated debate a position statement was prepared on selection criteria for the position. Members supported the need for medical library experience as a desirable criterion, despite concern that the requirement might eliminate some exceptionally good applicants. Roberts distributed the document, "Selection Criteria for a University Librarian," to the campus search committee.

Division members recognized their progress from 1970, when they were not allowed to participate in the selection of the University Librarian at all. A formal request was made to the Chancellor for an opportunity to meet each of the final candidates and receive their curricula vitae in advance. LAUC-SF also developed a list of questions to ask the candidates, wrote detailed evaluative letters on each, and ranked them in order of preference in a letter sent to the Chancellor and to the chair of the Search Committee. In August 1977 it hosted a reception for

the Library staff, Academic Senate Committee on Library and a variety of other guests in honor of David Bishop, the newly appointed University Librarian.

In 1976 LAUC-SF was developing local guidelines for Academic Personnel Manual Section 83—review of Assistant and Associate University Librarians—and good relationships with the newly formed UCSF Library Staff Organization.

The division strongly supported the LAUC systemwide Ad Hoc Committee on Library and Bibliographic Instruction, whose San Francisco representative was James Mackie, Reference Librarian. The idea of libraries organized as academic departments able to offer courses in bibliography and issue grades was widely supported.

LAUC-SF gained a major supporter when Shirley Chater, Professor of Social and Behavior Science in the School of Nursing, became UCSF Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in 1976. Dr. Chater was invited to address the members on her interest and role in library affairs.

The small number of librarians at San Francisco and the growing number of LAUC and LAUC-SF committees and issues again became issues in 1976. A major debate took place on the difficulty of finding members willing to hold office. One perceived barrier was the amount of work involved. There was general agreement that because of the heavy regular work loads LAUC activities often had to be done in the evening or on weekends. Possible solutions were discussed, such as clerical support and released time from other duties. One proposal was that each librarian rotate through each divisional office, but after lively debate it failed, and the problem was not resolved. Members did come forward to volunteer for office, but single-slate elections became the norm on the annual ballot.

In 1977 LAUC-SF held its first discussion of the Horowitz Report, on access to personnel records—which, though it did not deal with library employees, aroused great interest because the University was considering a similar policy for its librarians. Reversing its earlier adamant stand, the division now supported the systemwide LAUC position in favor of minimum confidentiality. UCSF Assistant Vice Chancellor Chater wanted to probe LAUC-SF's position and invited it to send representatives to discuss the matter. The topic came up again in 1978 when the Roberti Bill on UC employee records became law. Local peer review guidelines were revised to bring UCSF into line with the new regulations.

In November 1977 University Librarian David Bishop invited LAUC-SF to name *representatives to serve on a new administrative committee on library planning*. He also invited comment on proposed revisions to the UC Library Assistant Series; LAUC-SF supported rewriting the proposals.

On the fifth anniversary (1978) of the Handbook, the Librarian's Handbook Committee asked for guidance on its future, since its maintenance was very labor-intensive. Options suggested were suspending publication, widening coverage and publishing jointly with the Library Staff Organization. In the end it was decided to continue issuing the Handbook as it was. The members of the committee (Katalin Pavlath, Justine Roberts, Janet Phillips, Jacqueline Wilson and Glenda Vandegrift) were praised for their five years of service to the division.

Members held their first major discussions on options for collective bargaining in November 1978. They questioned how management employees would be defined, whether union

membership would be mandatory, what group would be selected to represent librarians if collective bargaining were implemented, and, of major importance, what would become of LAUC. They agreed that they would favor LAUC staying as it was, apart from giving up certain activities in the area defined by collective bargaining legislation.

A new standing Committee on Professional Development was formed in 1978. LAUC-SF felt that its members needed additional access to professional development opportunities, and set out to identify speakers and programs to meet those needs. The first program was held in January 1979 and featured UC-Berkeley Special Services librarian Anne Lipow. She gave an overview of the Special Services program at Berkeley which included a faculty document delivery system, a faculty seminar series and a variety of cooperative programs with other libraries. A second program was held in 1980, when Michael Brewer of CLASS spoke on the need for preserving library materials.

1979-81

Several important conversations were held with University Librarian Bishop in 1979 on librarian concerns. Members expressed a need for management and supervisory training. They also believed that individual librarians' strengths and talents were not being recognized and utilized by the Library, and that communication needed to be improved at all levels. They felt that LAUC-SF was not being consulted by the Library administration on policy making and problem-solving issues. For his part, UL Bishop said that in his opinion the relationship between LAUC-SF and the administration was becoming adversarial. In a letter he said that such tension could be healthy and constructive, even though LAUC's interests and the requirements of Library Administration were not necessarily synonymous.

LAUC-SF appointed a new committee in 1979 to deal with a perceived need for the Library to provide patron education. Under its chair Jacqueline Wilson, now the Collection Development Officer, the Library User Education Committee began by gathering as much information as possible from the library literature and the campus. Lists of relevant groups who might benefit from patron education were prepared first. Then a questionnaire was developed and sent out to 350 faculty members to gauge the need for library instruction on campus; the return rate was 45%.

Members believed that the Library should make a greater outreach effort toward other health science librarians in the community. To that end, in January 1980 LAUC-SF sponsored a UCSF Library Open House. Two days of meetings for Bay Area hospital librarians were planned to explain the Library's services and materials, and to find out what kinds of problems the hospital librarians were having in dealing with them. The division negotiated with University Librarian Bishop for time and space to provide the program; fifty people attended. After the session members met with UL David Bishop and recommended that similar meetings be held in the future.

Compensation time off for librarians was the subject of a number of divisional meetings, and of meetings with the University Librarian. LAUC-SF supported the idea that since librarians were academic appointees, they should be exempt from overtime reporting. UL Bishop wanted to see all time over 40 hours reported on time sheets. He felt he needed the record to help him

draw the line between what the institution would support and what remained one's own personal responsibility. The matter was finally resolved by the campus administration when it decided that since librarians are academic employees, not hourly employees, reporting of overtime was not appropriate.

The third professional development program was held in April 1980, when Neal Kaske of OCLC was invited to lecture on developments at that organization in online cataloging.

The so-called "laboratory period" for collective bargaining began in May of the same year. During this period the Library administration was permitted to meet with LAUC-SF on professional concerns only. They were not to "meet and confer" with existing advisory groups, including LAUC-SF, on the topics of wages, hours of work or other conditions of employment.

In June 1981, after working for two years, the LAUC-SF User Education Committee presented a "Report and Recommendations on UCSF Library User Education," which emphasized the need for establishing a permanent formal program with staff and budget. This extensive 98-page report contained an overview of the need for user education, a critique of demonstration instruction activities tested by the Committee, and numerous exhibits and appendixes. An educational program was seen as a logical extension of public services, but going beyond the capability of the existing Reference Department.

Recommendations included the establishment of a budgeted program as a part of regular Library services, the appointment of a Coordinator of Instructional Services in Public Services, and the development of a detailed written plan of operation. The membership accepted the report, calling for 50% of one librarian FTE to be assigned as "Coordinator of Instructional Services." The University Librarian demurred, saying that while the program was important it was not financially feasible at that time. The work of the committee did however lay the groundwork for an extensive instruction program developed later in the decade.

The Program (formerly Professional Development) Committee's activities waxed and waned, depending on the energy of the committee members and the importance of the issues facing LAUC at the time. For the most part, colleagues from other UC campuses were invited to make presentations in their areas of expertise, and occasionally we heard from other UC personnel, particularly from the Division of Library Automation.

With the advent and availability of word processors, the appearance of the Librarian's Handbook changed dramatically. Eventually however, from a general compendium of campus and professional information the Handbook dwindled literally to a "Who's Who" listing of the librarians' professional responsibilities.

The Last Decade

Several Library policy issues of the last decade have been addressed by LAUC-SF in one way or another. Several times the question of required Sunday reference work was raised. (Reference librarians worked Saturdays; all others worked two or three Sundays a year in rotation.) Some members felt it caused undue hardship on those who accepted the obligation, and the position of the Sunday worker was felt to be ambiguous. Members requested more training for those with Sunday reference duties, but there was little support for it from the Library administration.

The effectiveness of intra-Library communication was a major concern. Although this transcended LAUC-SF as an organizational issue, the division was involved and the question discussed at its meetings. Communications between the librarians and the staff, and between the librarians and the UL, were perceived as disingenuous at worst and faulty at best. The University Librarian attended LAUC meetings and participated in its discussions, but there was some feeling that his presence, and that of the Associate UL, inhibited some members from candid expressions of opinion on sensitive issues. A number of LAUC-SF meetings focused on relations between the professional staff and the library assistants.

Communication with other UC librarians appeared on the agenda in 1983. The division hosted a reception in February of that year, inviting librarians from other northern UC campuses.

In 1985 LAUC-SF sponsored a second open house for San Francisco Bay Area hospital librarians. The goals of the event were to introduce UCSF Library's staff and services, answer questions, and explore problem areas raised. The meeting was deemed a success, and repeated in 1986.

In the 1980s, needing expansion space, UCSF acquired an additional off-campus site in San Francisco for offices and laboratories. It soon became apparent that faculty and staff would need library support at these sites. At a 1985 LAUC-SF meeting, University Librarian Bishop discussed the ramifications of duplicating the UCSF Library collection at other sites. It was clear that the Library could not reproduce collections and services within its existing budget. This was the first of many efforts to resolve the issue of providing library service to the many UCSF faculty, staff and students located some distance from the Library.

The most engrossing event of the 1980s was the planning for a new building. The Library was then housed on three floors in two structures: the Medical Sciences section and the Health Sciences East section, which had opened in 1958 and 1966 respectively. By the 1980s major parts of the collection were not readily available to users. Journals published before 1950 were in closed stacks; all books published before 1975 were located in a campus storage area. For most users, materials in both locations were available only by daily paging. In order to accommodate new shelving for the growing collections, patron seating was eliminated. The Library had clearly outgrown its quarters.

In February 1982, the consultants who did the initial library planning met with the Executive Board. The Board discussed the need for office space, seminar and classroom space for user education, a graphics production area and staff amenities. Glennda Vandegrift represented the division on the New Library Planning Committee.

Because the move to new quarters was to coincide with several other changes, notably the closing of the card catalog, the installation of an online catalog and a change in the manner of shelving journals—from alphabetical order by title to call number—LAUC-SF convened monthly to discuss its impact, and members addressed a wide variety of activities projected for the new building. These meetings were some of the most productive ever held, in both their candor and their inter-personal and inter-departmental communication.

In the 1980s San Francisco members took part in the discussions and debates on collective bargaining; the selection of a new Assistant Vice President for Library Plans and Policies; the design, construction and governance of the Northern Regional Library Facility in Richmond; development of Academic Personnel Manual Section 140; and countless systemwide LAUC

standing and ad hoc committees. The untimely illness and death of David Bishop and the appointment of Richard Cooper as Acting University Librarian changed the relationship of LAUC-SF to the administration. The arrival of Richard Lucier as UL in 1991 also resulted in a new administrative philosophy and the need to begin once again establishing the relationship between the division and the Library administration.

Almost half of the division's membership took advantage of an early retirement program between 1991 and 1992. This left nine librarians to share the responsibility for all systemwide and local LAUC activities in addition to handling their other job responsibilities. Multiple committee assignments were common and some things were left undone. By Fall 1992 five librarians had been hired, and LAUC-SF was looking forward to meeting the challenges to come with renewed vigor and enthusiasm.

PEER REVIEW

The first local proposals for implementing APM Section 82 were prepared in 1973. Four LAUC-SF members (Mary Barr, Justine Roberts, Stephen Tarczy and Marion Mueller), working with Dr. Anthony Trevor of the faculty, agreed to prepare local guidelines for implementation of the peer review system and serve on the first peer review committee. They received input from Acting University Librarian Jeannette Yeazell.

The division held many discussions on the philosophy and content of the newly named "Guidelines for Appointment and Performance Review of Academic Library Personnel." Early in its deliberations it decided that because of the small number of librarians at San Francisco, ad hoc committees would not be used in the peer review process; the review committee would also serve as the oversight body and be called the Standing Review Committee (later CAPA) to distinguish it from more conventional arrangements.

A first draft of the guidelines was sent to Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Dallas Tuck. Dr. Tuck addressed several initial areas of concern: a need for formal reviews at each step of the librarian series, procedures for termination, and the composition of the committee: how members were to be selected, the participation of a faculty member, and his desire to have only the most experienced librarians serve. It was understood that LAUC divisions on other campuses were delegated the authority to select members of the review committee, but at San Francisco Dr. Tuck reserved that right for the Academic Vice Chancellor, though nominations would come from LAUC-SF's Executive Board. Dr. Tuck approved the guidelines after these revisions were made.

The guidelines were sent to UC Vice President Angus Taylor, who recommended a number of changes. Only four were substantial:

1. Appointees without the graduate library degree would be advised to undertake appropriate alternative education;
2. The Standing Review Committee would not be allowed to interview applicants personally, but would have to depend on documentation;

3. The Standing Review Committee would not be permitted to send a copy of its recommendations to the candidate for promotion;
4. The Standing Review Committee would have no direct contact with a librarian who was being considered for dismissal.

The changes were accepted by Leslie Bennett, the new UCSF Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and sent back to Dr. Taylor for final approval in 1974. In the meanwhile, the first peer reviews had taken place in the spring of the previous year.

A set of major revisions to the guidelines was prepared in the Fall of 1977 by a committee chaired by Jacqueline Wilson. Its report provoked debate about appointment criteria, some members wanting them to be more stringent, others less. San Francisco brought itself into line with some of the other divisions by changing the name of its review committee to the Committee for Appointment, Promotion and Advancement of Librarians (CAPA). A discussion on the advantages and disadvantages of having a faculty member on CAPA resulted in a decision to keep the status quo for the time being. The draft guidelines were submitted to Assistant Vice Chancellor Chater and quickly approved.

In 1979 University Librarian David Bishop wanted to increase the rigor of the peer review system, believing that evaluations should be humanely critical. He recommended that San Francisco begin issuing detailed statistics on peer review; up to this point only gross figures had been given out, in order to preserve the confidentiality of reviews in the light of the small number of librarians at UCSF. These matters were never fully resolved.

Members' concerns on the subject resulted in further evaluation of policies and procedures in 1979. Issues included the quality and quantity of documentation provided by the candidates; lack of organization of review packet materials; lack of adequate critical review of performance; lack of criteria for accelerated reviews; and the difficulty of keeping personal bias out of the process with such a small group of people. Another major concern was ensuring confidentiality in the process at all levels. A meeting with Assistant Vice Chancellor Chater was requested in the hope that her experience with the faculty review system might enable her to offer suggestions for improvement in the librarian process. An ad hoc committee chaired by Kenneth Weeks worked on revisions to the guidelines for several years.

A special LAUC-SF meeting was called in November 1980 to discuss some of the proposed revisions. UL Bishop was concerned about the lack of a defined role for the UL in the appointment and review process as suggested. On the advice of Assistant Vice Chancellor Chater, the CAPA guidelines had mentioned no specific delegation of authority for appointment, merit or promotion decisions; the draft did not specifically affirm that a copy of CAPA's recommendations should go to the University Librarian, because the proper routing of these documents would depend on the Chancellor's delegation of authority.

Some members felt the proposal would foster an adversarial relationship between the division and the University Librarian. Others believed that this was not the case, but that there were two separate reviews and recommendations involved, one administrative and one by peers. By a close vote the revisions were approved without the specific requirement that a copy of each review be passed through the University Librarian, and were sent to Assistant Vice Chancellor Chater in

December 1980. Dr. Chater requested additional revisions and finally approved the new guidelines in 1982.

Experience on CAPA through the first years of its existence led many members to request more specific guidance for its deliberations. After reviewing the peer evaluation guidelines of several other UC campuses, LAUC-SF endorsed and adopted UC-Irvine's "Criteria for Librarian Personnel Action" for use on the San Francisco campus.

At the meeting of March 1982 the CAPA Guidelines Review Committee opened the question of "special" reviews for those librarians not at the top of the scale but who had not received merit increases or promotions. This raised the further question of whether or not a separate committee had to be convened to perform the reviews. UL Bishop argued strongly for a specially appointed committee. LAUC-SF however decided that CAPA would be the body to carry out special reviews, there being no compelling reason to appoint a separate committee, particularly since there were so few division members.

Ongoing discussions of the effectiveness of the peer review process led to an agreement that CAPA needed more consensual standards for its use. An Ad Hoc Committee on CAPA Standards, chaired by Paul Wakeford, was appointed in November 1985 to prepare a document to be used in CAPA reviews, and its deliberations continued until 1987. The resulting guidelines adapted many of the concepts then in force on other UC campuses, addressing expectations for performance at Assistant, Associate and Librarian levels, and the relevance and application of the four criteria in the Academic Personnel Manual.

University Librarian Bishop questioned the "relevance" of Academic Personnel Manual Section 360-10b, Criteria 2-4 (Professional activity outside the Library; University and public service; and Research and other creative activity), but LAUC-SF members agreed that CAPA, as the official review body, could decide the criteria application. The LAUC-SF position was upheld several years later by Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs David Ramsay. However, LAUC-SF members voted (11-8) to reject the standards document as finally presented in September 1987, on the ground that they placed too much emphasis on Criteria 2-4 and did not give sufficient prominence to the first criterion, the successful fulfillment of primary position responsibilities.

The peer review guidelines were again examined and revised by a committee appointed in January 1987, submitted to Vice Chancellor Ramsay in September 1988, and finally approved in February 1990.

Peer review statistics were again an issue at several points in the 1980s. There was continuing concern that librarians were given little access to information on the results of the San Francisco peer review process. Combined statistics had been published by systemwide LAUC in the *LAUC Newsletter* for several years. Some San Francisco members expressed concern about the confidentiality of review results if local statistics were published separately. Again, the issue was never completely resolved.

The method of selecting CAPA members became an issue in 1987. Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Karl Hittleman met with the Executive Board to discuss selection procedures. He suggested that the process be changed to ensure that all members of the librarian series had the opportunity to serve on a peer review committee. At a later meeting the members discussed several selection methods—lottery, roster, election, appointment, exchange—and voted

to institute a combination of roster and appointment. All members were placed on a roster; the Board selected two new members annually from the top of the list. Under the revised guidelines, members who sat on review committees could not be from the same unit as the candidate; names were therefore chosen in order from the roster to temporarily replace any CAPA member who would otherwise be in conflict of interest.

Through the 1980s CAPA members frequently expressed concern over the poor quality of some of the review documentation, but no satisfactory solution was found. Senior Vice Chancellor Ramsay asked the division to name the officer they preferred to make the final decisions on future librarian reviews; the members voted to keep the responsibility in the hands of the Senior Vice Chancellor.

The lack of continuity between CAPAs was another issue. In January 1988 members agreed to try several possible ways of solving the problem, among them a joint meeting of old and new CAPAs, a joint meeting with the Academic Vice Chancellor, and an annual meeting of the newly constituted CAPA with the University Librarian. CAPA was also directed to develop a procedure manual to ensure the continuity necessary for review equity from one year to the next.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Travel Committee, the second committee appointed by the division, came into being in Spring 1970, charged with developing guidelines for the use of travel funds and monitoring their distribution. Concerns of members were the lack of funds and lack of equitable distribution methods. The committee developed a policy establishing a rotating roster of members, and giving funding preference to those who were officers of a sponsoring association or presenting a paper. New staff members were placed at the top of the roster. The top two people could receive up to half of the available funds if they chose to attend a major conference.

Several different distribution formulas for both travel and research funds were tried through the 1980s. The procedures in place at the beginning of the decade, based on meeting participation, were changed for several different reasons. One was the affiliation of UCSF librarians with several different libraries, such as the Langley Porter Psychiatric Institute located at UCSF's Parnassus site and the Area Health Education Center in Fresno. Division members not located in the San Francisco Library were eligible for LAUC funds, but were urged to first seek support from their own departments.

The advent of collective bargaining brought about the separation of professional development funds into two separate classifications: unit and non-unit, the latter denoting librarians in the supervisory categories selected by Library Administration. For the better part of the 1980s a revised policy was in effect which divided these funds into three separate categories.

Fund A, which received 60% of the available monies, was reserved for two librarians at the top of a roster of all LAUC-SF members. The purpose was to make access to travel funds more equitable, and to encourage librarians new to the profession to attend at least one national meeting. Fund B, 30%, was set aside for members participating in meetings, whether as chairs or members of committees, or as presenters or speakers. Fund C, 10%, was mostly used for attendance at local meetings. Excess money left over from Fund A or B would revert to Fund C. After about ten years all librarians had benefited from Fund A. The policy was then changed

to one of open access to funds, with the available money divided equally among all applicants each year.

Travel funds were administered by an appointed Travel Committee. In January 1987 the Executive Board combined it with the Research Committee, to form the Research and Professional Development Committee. Its four members divided the responsibilities for travel funds; all participated in reviews of research proposals.

RESEARCH

The first local research committee, the Committee on Research Funds, was established in July 1973. Its first charge was to investigate funds available to librarians on the San Francisco campus.

An Ad Hoc Committee to Prepare Local Research Grant Guidelines was appointed in August 1980 to establish procedures for handling the new LAUC program on research grants. A set of guidelines was approved in December.

A number of librarians have taken advantage of the availability of LAUC research funds over the last ten years. The amount of funding available was a primary determinant of the number of applicants. LAUC-SF received \$2,000 from the Vice Chancellor in 1982/83, and \$3,000 in each of the two following years. When systemwide funding for campus research was eliminated, the Executive Board asked the Academic Vice Chancellor to fund both research and educational activities. In the following years LAUC-SF received a lump sum from the Vice Chancellor to cover both travel and research.

Most years any remaining research funds transferred to the travel budget. In 1987, however, research funds—and a one-time contribution from the University Librarian—were also used to purchase two computers for the use of members. One, a laptop, could be checked out and taken home; the other was to be used for research in the Library. Basic software—WordPerfect, Lotus 1-2-3, etc.—was also purchased. Justine Roberts installed programs, did the trouble-shooting, and generally advised neophyte users and introduced them to the wonders of computers.

OFFICERS

1968/69

Chair: Marion Mueller
Secretary: Dorothy Gregor; Marilyn Jensen

1969/70

Chair: Stephen Tarczy
Secretary: Jacqueline Wilson

1970/71

Chair: Robert Clark
Secretary: Justine Roberts

1971/72

Chair: Nancy Zinn
Secretary: Marilyn Jensen

1972/73

Chair: Jacqueline Wilson
Secretary: Glennda Vendegrift

1973/74

Chair: Justine Roberts
Secretary: Janet Phillips

1974/75

Chair: James Mackie
Secretary: Glennda Vandegrift

1975/76

Chair: Kenneth Weeks
Secretary: Katalin Pavlath

1976/77

Chair: Stephen Tarczy
Secretary: Glennda Vendegrift

1977/78

Chair: James Mackie
Secretary: Vellena Harris; Robert Clark

1978/79

Chair: Jacqueline Wilson
Secretary: Janet Phillips

1979/80

Chair: Kenneth Weeks
Secretary: Katalin Pavlath

1980/81

Chair: Nancy Zinn
Secretary: Justine Roberts

1981/82

Chair: Jacqueline Wilson
Secretary: Janet Phillips

1982/83

Chair: James Mackie
Secretary: Nancy Zinn

1983/84

Chair: Kenneth Weeks
Secretary: Katalin Pavlath

1984/85

Chair: Glenda Vandegrift
Secretary: Janet Phillips

1985/86

Chair: Justine Roberts
Secretary: Kenneth Weeks

1986/87

Chair: Paul Wakeford
Secretary: Janet Phillips

1987/88

Chair: Jacqueline Wilson
Secretary: Janet Phillips

1988/89

Chair: Glenda Vandegrift
Secretary: Katalin Pavlath

1989/90

Chair: Kenneth Weeks
Secretary: Katalin Pavlath

1990/91

Chair: Justine Roberts; Lisa Dunkel
Secretary: Katalin Pavlath; Glenda Vandegrift

1991/92

Chair: Lisa Dunkel
Secretary: Nancy Zinn

RESEARCH PROJECTS APPROVED BY LAUC-SAN FRANCISCO

1982/83

Roberts, Justine. "Stack Capacity Survey."

Zinn, Nancy. "Hospital Archives Survey."

1984/85

Zinn, Nancy. "Archival/manuscript Information Storage and Retrieval Project."

1985/86

Roberts, Justine & Lydia Jensen. "End-user Searching: Comparison of Three End-user Systems."

Wilson, Jacqueline. "Survey of Library Publications Programs in California Academic Libraries."