

Librarians Association of the University of California

First Special Assembly (2014-15)

Tuesday, April 7, 2015

1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

ReadyTalk

phone: 866-740-1260

access code: 9181033#

MINUTES approved at the LAUC annual Assembly on April 17, 2015, at UCSD

A. Call to Order (President Matt Conner)

President Matt Conner called the meeting to order at 1:03pm. He reminded all attendees of the documents at “2014-15 First Special Assembly (virtual)” on the LAUC Assemblies website (<http://lauc.ucop.edu/assembly/>) as well as Article III of the Bylaws (<http://lauc.ucop.edu/about/bylaws/Bylaws-03-09.pdf>).

B. Announcements

This Friday, April 10, at 10-11am, is the first UCLAS spring webinar at 10-11am. [Sherri Berger of CDL will provide an overview of the UC Libraries Digital Collection (UCLDC) project and what we can expect to see when it launches this summer. UCLAS Webinar series: <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/cc/projects-groups/uclas-webinar-series>] LAUC had input on the webinar topics, so please attend. Matt Conner and Rosalie Lack, chair of the Coordinating Committee, have worked hard to make this engaging and informative. Let’s acknowledge this with a good turn-out.

C. Roll Call (Secretary Christina Woo)

Present: Matt Conner (President, 2014-2015), Diane Mizrachi (Vice President/President-Elect 2014-2015), Nick Robinson (Past President) Christina Woo (Secretary 2014-2015), Dean Rowan (Parliamentarian).

LAUC-B: Rita Evans (Chair), Elliott Smith (Secretary)

LAUC-D: Cory Craig (Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect), Bruce Abbott (Chair)

LAUC-I: Keith Powell (Chair), Cynthia Johnson (Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect), Annette Buckley (Member-at-Large)

LAUC-LA: Rikke Ogawa (Chair), Orchid Mazurkiewicz (Divisional Delegate)

LAUC-M: Elizabeth McMunn-Tetangco (Chair)

LAUC-R: Christina Cicchetti (Delegate), Rhonda Neugebauer (Chair)

LAUC-SD: Roger Smith (past Chair) for Penny Coppernoll-Blach (Chair), Heather Smedburg (Vice-Chair)

LAUC-SF:

LAUC-SB: Kristen LaBonte (Chair), Chrissy Rissmeyer (Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect), Gary Colmenar (Secretary)

LAUC-SC (1): Deborah Murphy (Chair)

Also present: Miki Goral (LA), Carla Arbagey (R), Adele Beyerstein (sp?) (SD)

Out of a possible 28, we need a quorum of 15, and we have 17.

D. Approval of the Minutes of Special Assembly (August 14, 2014) via conference call (Christina Woo) - no corrections or changes. Minutes Approved.

E. Discussion of CPG/Committee on Professional Governance Recommendations

President Matt Conner noted the numerous reports and other information that had been emailed and/or posted previously, which we'll not review in detail here. He stressed these points:

- Considering the revisions as a whole, there is nothing that requires a division to do anything differently. There are options, but divisions would not be forced to change, so there is a built-in safety valve or buffer.
- Today's objective is to get feedback. Article IV, sec. 4 of the Bylaws says "The Assembly represents the will of the general membership." We want to make sure we go over all of the recommendations today, so there will be time to reflect before the next Special Assembly on April 14.

Miki Goral (LA) led off by asking "What was the impetus for doing this?" Matt Conner responded that since 1999 the LAUC membership has been steadily shrinking. Many newly hired professionals doing high-level work in the UC libraries have job titles outside the Librarian series, such as into the Manager series, so this has been reducing our numbers and contracting our advisory influence. The CPG recommendations were designed to address those problems.

Miki Goral (LA) asked if a better approach would be first to expand the definition of librarianship instead of changing the Bylaws now, so they wouldn't have to be changed again. Matt Conner responded that LAUC has asked CoUL/Council of University Librarians about the status of doing that, and—informally—they are not too receptive, saying they have a plan to be more inclusive. For the April 17 Spring Assembly, we have scheduled a session with Brian Schottlaender (UCSD UL) to address the redefinition of the Librarian series in the future.

Our preliminary reaction has been to go outside the Librarian series for a variety of reasons, and we got a negative reaction there. Moving in another direction, we discussed revisions for the APM/Academic Personnel Manual when it became available in the Fall. Our recommendations to change the definition

in APM 360-4 were rejected completely on the second round. Then, when we inquired with UCOP, we were told the Vice-Provost is looking for consensus for change, so if LAUC and CoUL are not in agreement on the APM, UCOP won't support it. As a result, our suggestions for the APM will not go anywhere without the cooperation of CoUL to change the Librarian series. Membership is one way to approach this. Conversely, LAUC could suspend this effort, but the Librarian series isn't likely to change, either.

Miki Goral (LA) would like the membership to look at APM 360 Appendix B, which is the UC President's recognition of LAUC (<http://ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-360.pdf>) and defines membership in LAUC. In her view, the CPG recommendations are not heading in that direction. This is the governing document establishing our existence in the University. These recommendations are ignoring that. Matt Conner responded that if/when LAUC approves these recommendations, they will go to UCOP's Office of Academic Planning (headed by Vice-Provost Susan Carlson) for review. They will consult with legal counsel and with us, and then they'll recommend to accept this or not. Provost Aimee Dorr will make the final decision to approve it or not. So, ultimately, UCOP decides. If the LAUC membership votes not to accept the recommendations, they will not go to UCOP. Nothing will happen.

Matt Conner stressed that in proposing these recommendations, we are looking at all options. The Special Assembly can approve the recommendations or not. In turn, if we do, the Spring Assembly could choose not to accept them, so there are lots of checks. Parliamentarian Dean Rowan pointed out that even if the CPG recommendations are not approved, we need to clarify the existing Bylaws. The current definition of membership—the text in APM 360 Appendix B has largely been incorporated verbatim into the Bylaws—has become ambiguous. There is no clear instruction here that a LAUC member must be in the Librarian series. This needs to be made clear.

There followed some discussion of whether or not this was primarily an issue of new professionals hired outside the Librarian series because of salary issues. It was decided that the best thing to do was to ask Brian Schottlaender about it—in person or via chat—during his talk at the Spring Assembly on April 17.

Past President Nick Robinson asked if this was an “all or nothing” vote for the delegates. How can recommendations that merit support be moved forward, and those that don't be dropped? Matt Conner responded that when this vote comes before the membership, it must be all or nothing. The recommendations are so interdependent that line item voting by the membership is not practical, possibly leading to re-voting and re-voting into the summer. We are having these Special Assemblies to decide collectively what version of the recommendations we want to move forward.

Possible Suggested Change Option A: we could vote not to approve this, per Miki Goral (LA).

Matt will keep a list of suggested changes during this meeting. At our next Special Assembly (April 14) or no later than the Spring Assembly we'll vote on them as formal motions. Christina Woo as Secretary will keep track of them, too.

Cynthia Johnson (I) noted that at some campuses the AULs are members of LAUC, but not at others. If no changes are made, that will continue, right? Is that what we want to happen? This provided a specific example with which to analyze the individual recommendations by degree of change:

- Most fundamental: clarifying the existing language on the “definition of titles”
- Expanding the affiliate category of membership, which currently is mostly dormant and used as a way for retirees to stay on a division’s listserv. Why not expand the affiliate category to let these (often recently-hired) professionals not in the Librarian series attend meetings, participate, share their expertise, etc.? This expands and clarifies latent capacities that already exist in the affiliate category.
- Boldest step: introduce a new category of “exceptional” membership via standing rules (not bylaws). Individual divisions may petition statewide LAUC to let people in certain title codes become members of only their divisions. These new members would have full membership until the division changes its mind and changes its standing rules to rescind their membership.

Given Cynthia Johnson’s question about AULs, starting with “clarifying the existing language,” see Art. III, sec. 1, which spells out the titles/title codes. AULs with title codes that qualify are LAUC members; those with other titles do not. At this point, Miki Goral (LA) noted the UCOP Corporate Title Code System Look Up site that lists academic titles that could be more official than the APM:

<https://tcs.ucop.edu/tcs/jsp/academicTitlesSearch.htm>

Proposed change: Use this as a substitute website as the source of title codes in place of APM 112 and 113

Parliamentarian Dean Rowan noted that we currently anchor our titles in the APM, which does not refer to the UCOP Corporate Title Code database. The two could work together. Currently, Art. III sec. 1 does not address non-academic possible members of LAUC.

Cory Craig (D) expressed concern that tying ourselves to title codes as a basis for membership—other than the Librarian series—may not be useful or help us. Title codes can and probably should change. When Matt Conner spoke with Janet Lockwood (UCOP Manager, Academic Policy & Compensation), she made it clear that they interpret “titles” in the LAUC Bylaws to mean title codes—they recognize no other criteria for membership. UCOP does not recognize working titles, only payroll title codes. We could propose an alternative, which we would have to spell out as a new basis for membership. The CPG hasn’t been able to come up with anything better.

Next clarification: in Art. III, sec. 2a, UL and Deputy UL are struck out. Again, UCOP recognizes only title codes. There is no official recognition of Deputy UL (no payroll title code), so let’s omit it. ULs are placed in Art. III sec. 2b, because they are a separate animal with their own section in the APM; they are still members. Miki Goral (LA) noted ULs have their own, non-academic title code, 0118.

Parliamentarian Dean Rowan pointed out that the idea for Art. III sec. 1 was to anchor all of this in the APM and then enumerate exceptions. CPG does not consider title codes a satisfactory criterion, but could not think of anything better. UCOP appears to be wedded to title codes. If we’d like to use a different criterion, we have to come up with one and be convincing enough to UCOP.

There are people being hired in the UC libraries in professional positions—in librarianship—but when they are hired outside these title codes, they are not members of LAUC. They may have useful and valid ideas and perspectives, which we can incorporate in our advisory role, but making them members is not the only or best way to include them. We can still reach out to them.

Moving on: Sec. 1 and 2 are mostly clarifications of what exists now—membership based on title codes. More clarification: in the new sec. 4 (what is Art. III sec. 3 in the current Bylaws), the member privileges are now in a list to rearrange what was already there and to make the list of what a member can do more complete. This list was carefully chosen to reflect legislative functions. Is creating this a worthwhile thing to do? Miki Goral (LA) considers the existing sec. 3 to be fine and notes that listing the statewide bylaws *and* divisional member privileges doesn't make sense—why include divisional privileges here?

*Another proposed change: **do not make any revisions.***

*Another proposed change: **do not create a new sec. 4 with an enumerated list. Stick with the existing language.***

*Another: **Drop the whole division level, and retain only the state level.***

Eligibility for professional/research funding details are very complicated, with some campus variations.

Proposed change: strike any reference to “existing funding guidelines” from professional/research funding language

Affiliate membership in Art. III sec. 5: Include more types of library professionals without changing our membership per se. One option: eliminate the old affiliate category and allow divisions to do whatever they want, including creating or expanding a new affiliate category. Other option: retain the old affiliate category and expand it, so individual divisions could choose whom to admit; CPG chose the latter to recommend. Cory Craig said LAUC-D liked this the best. In this way, peers without titles in the Librarian series could participate but not receive professional/research funding.

Miki Goral (LA) didn't think that the statewide bylaws should direct the divisions on what they can do, referring to the last line of sec. 5, “... or vote at the division or state level.” Past President Nick Robinson prefers to stick with the original language about affiliates, **since divisions already have the option to invite participation from non-members. He also sees a value in keeping the affiliate member category for people who would otherwise be members but work less than 50%, and for retired members.**

Last major initiative in the recommendations: Article III, sec. 2c. Is it enough to incorporate non-members and other professionals through an expanded affiliate or some other non-member participation? CPG said no and wanted to give divisions the option to petition to invite new classes of people to become full-fledged members, not just affiliate members. This would apply only to specific divisions who choose this, and they define it through their standing rules. This gives librarians some control over whom they consider to be a “librarian.” Specifically, new members would not be invited as individuals; divisions could choose new title codes to expand eligibility to become full members of LAUC.

Sec. 2c: It is up to the division to define “...who provide professional services...” such as the AULs at Davis who currently have title codes outside the Librarian series. “Full members” means voting, serving on statewide committees, holding statewide office, receiving research funds, etc. Sec. 2c also requires that the division successfully petition LAUC for this. It would be up to the divisions to require these new members to undergo the same peer review as librarians. At present, not all members of LAUC are subject to peer review. Through the standing rules, these new members could be petitioned in and later petitioned out, which is not true for librarians. How a division decides to take this option, such as how many members are needed to agree on it in order to petition LAUC, is up to the division.

Proposed change: Do not include any of this.

Proposed change: include “affiliated units”

Cory Craig (D) noted that Sec. 2c and sec. 5 are different. ***Propose to vote for these separately.*** Would that disrupt the internal coherency of the recommendations? Parliamentarian Dean Rowan recommends we vote this way—separately--since it would not necessarily incorporate contradictions, instead of all or nothing. We then would have these options:

- Sec. 1 and 2a and b changes: yes or no
- Sec. 2c change: yes or no
- Sec 3 – no change
- Sec. 4 – might not need to vote, if we stick with the original language
- Sec. 5: yes or no

If 2c is approved, we might also want to expand the affiliate membership.

Past President Nick Robinson’s big picture concern is that discussions at the division level will consume a lot of time and energy and rule-making for sec. 2c among a membership that is already stretched thin. This could detract from our advisory activities. Since pursuing sec. 2c is optional, a division could decide not to undertake it if it is too much work.

In summary:

Sec. 1 – clarifying what we already have

Sec. 4 lists out membership functions in existing sec. 3

Sec. 5 proposes expansion of the affiliates category

Sec. 2 proposes a mechanism for a division to include new, full-fledged members for only itself

President Matt Conner and Secretary Christina Woo will send out the proposed changes for consideration before the April 14 Special Assembly, and Christina will send out the draft minutes. At our next Special Assembly we’ll discuss and perhaps start voting on the changes to the recommendations. After we have a final text, we’ll have a total vote on whether we want to put it forward to the general membership or not. One of the proposed changes will be a revised text of sec. 2c.

F. Adjournment Motion to adjourn made by Rikke Ogawa (LA), seconded by Heather Smedberg (SD).
Voice vote of ayes to adjourn. No nays. Special Assembly adjourned at 2:40pm.