

**Librarian Association of the University of California  
Assembly 2016  
Monday, March 21, 2016 10am-3pm  
University of California, Merced**

**Minutes**

**9:30 – 9:50:**

Registration and Refreshments

**9:50:** Welcome from UC Merced University Librarian Haipeng Li

Haipeng Li welcomed the assembly to campus, noting his arrival the previous summer, and the changes to come to campus. A tour is being offered after today's program. The UC Merced 2020 plan aims to double the physical size of the campus, along with more capital projects for facilities.

Business Meeting called to order at 9:57am.

A. Call to Order

B. Announcements

Diane thanked Jerrold and UC Merced librarians and staff who put local arrangements together, including facilitating lodging for those staying overnight. A group who arrived on Sunday were able to enjoy dinner together.

C. Preliminaries

1. Roll Call of Divisions and Delegates [L. Spagnolo]

President:	Diane Mizrachi
Vice-President/President-Elect:	Dana Peterman
Past President:	Matt Conner – not attending
Secretary:	Lisa Spagnolo
Parliamentarian:	Dean Rowan

Division Delegates:

Berkeley:	I-Wei Wang (chair), Jennifer Nelson; Emily Vigor; Barbara Bohl
Davis:	Jared Campbell; Ruth Gustafson, <i>ad hoc</i> delegate for LAUC-D Chair Cory Craig, who was unable to attend
Irvine:	Cynthia Johnson (chair), Colby Riggs; Christina Woo
Los Angeles:	Lynda Tolly (chair); Miki Goral; Valerie Bross; Danielle Salomon
Merced:	Jerrold Shiroma (chair); Elizabeth Salmon
Riverside:	Carla Arbagey (chair); Tiffany Moxham
San Diego:	Heather Smedberg (chair), Cristela Garcia-Spitz; Reid Otsuji
San Francisco:	Sarah McClung (chair); Peggy Tahir
Santa Barbara:	Chrissy Rissmeyer (chair), Richard Caldwell; Catherine Busselen
Santa Cruz:	Frank Gravier (chair); Nicholas Meriwether

2. Approval of Minutes from Spring Assembly 2015 [C. Woo & L. Spagnolo]

- Announcement: In the interest of expediency, the current board will approve minutes from today's meeting by May of 2016.

Approved as submitted.

**ACTION:** Lisa will complete minutes and approval by Exec Board by May.

### 10:15

D. Questions/Comments on Committee Reports (submitted and posted)

Diane will give highlights. Questions, comments, feedback.

#### 1. Research and Professional Development Committee Update [Dana Peterman]

In the fall round, three research grants, one mini-grant and 6 presentation grants were funded. The committee is also working on the efficiency of scoring using an evaluation chart. The recipients in the spring round will be announced soon.

#### 2. Committee on Diversity Update [Lia Friedman]

Diane is reporting for Lia, who is at a conference. The committee has been focusing on developing the new Meet the Members feature on the LAUC website. This section includes in-depth interviews and profiles with LAUC members, with four members being profiled so far.

#### 3. Committee on Professional Governance [Deanna Johnson]

Diane reported for Deanna, who was unable to attend. There will be substantial discussion on the position papers later in the agenda. The Exec Board voted to retire Position Papers 1-4 last year, but the status cannot be finalized until there is an assembly vote. Each campus has been holding discussions to send feedback.

#### 4. Nominating Committee [Matt Conner]

The committee's work has yielded one nomination for Vice-President/President Elect, Carla Arbagey, LAUC-R. Secretary, two nominations, Angela Horne, LAUC-LA; Roger Smith, LAUC-SD. Announcements of candidates will go out via the LAUC lists soon. The election calendar indicates Lisa will be asking for additional nominations in April and sending out the slate in May.

E. Questions/Comments on LAUC Representative Reports (submitted and posted)

1. Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC) [Susan Koskinen]  
The group has been concentrating on copyright policies from CDL work and open access policies.
2. Shared Content Leadership Group (SCLG) [Becky Imamoto]  
SCLG has been focusing on Tier 1 licensing, transfer titles, cost share models, and the resolution of the ebrary DDA pilot.
3. Shared Libraries Facilities Group (SLFG) [Kristine Ferry]  
The group has been discussing systemwide storage, and will be looking at coordination between the RLFs.
4. Direction and Oversight Committee (DOC) [Catherine Nelson; no report]  
Catherine Nelson has been newly appointed to DOC, which has been forming its operations in the new UCLAS structure. After lunch Donald Barclay will update us on DOC.

F. President's Report

#### 1. LAUC theme and initiatives

Diane developed the theme of celebrating librarians during her term as Vice-President, in particular serving as chair of Research & Professional Development, and learning about the amazing projects,

books, and research across LAUC. Our achievements are not prominent on library or LAUC websites. Changing this could aid in communicating with academic departments, library administrators, and the public. Being recognized helps with morale, and could also help with donors when we have interesting projects to catch their attention. As a result three task forces were created to work on aspects of this theme during 2015-16, with details included below.

## 2. Questions/Comments on Task Force Reports:

### a. Archives Task Force [Kate Tasker]

The Archives Task Force was asked to review policies and come up with recommendations to make things more findable and user-friendly, as well as addressing the increasingly digital nature of LAUC's output. One example is the set of photographs from last night's dinner; there are not many photographs overall in our archives. Next year is the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of LAUC, and this group's work will be important in assembling items for that milestone.

### b. Journal Task Force [Laura Smart/Dave Schmitt]

Ten years ago there was an ad hoc LAUC committee that investigated whether to start a LAUC journal (<https://lauc.ucop.edu/sites/default/files/attached-files/report-spring-2005.pdf>). At the time, the consensus was that due to the time and money involved it was not worth pursuing. A task force was convened to revisit this topic given the changes in publishing, and investigate our own open access behaviors. Dave Schmitt will go into the task force's report and survey of membership later in the agenda, and the report will be passed on to CoUL. The results are consistent with literature on faculty and scholarship in general. With the UC-wide initiative for faculty to publish in open access venues, librarians are often asked how the model works. If we are adopting OA practices as well, we are in a better position to assist faculty. In addition, some of our output may not be appropriate for journal publishing.

### c. Web Content Committee [Cody Hennesy]

### d. Web Manager [Julie Lefevre]

Julie has been serving as LAUC Web Manager, and the new LAUC site on Drupal was rolled out in August. The new site provides a lot more options for content. Julie worked with Cody and the WCC to develop workflows and policies for sharing achievements and activities. The WCC has made recommendations for social media venues particularly Twitter and LinkedIn.

## 3. Other Items

a. The LAUC communications budget from UCOP was assessed. The Executive Board has changed its means of conducting conference calls from ReadyTalk to Zoom effective in December, and using UCLA's subscription. The webcam feature of Zoom has not been used much. The general account has a twenty minute limit, so the subscription is recommended for Executive Board calls. To reflect impact on the budget, the January ReadyTalk bill was \$1.24. Padona Yeung at UCOP transferred the remaining funds to the President's discretionary fund, which was able to support amenities for the assembly, including Sunday's dinner.

b. Wikipedia: Diane worked with Julie to reincorporate LAUC content on Wikipedia. The standalone entry referred to the LAUC brochure, which was also included in the LAUC-Davis entry, and was flagged as a result. LAUC is now represented in the UC Libraries Wikipedia page.

c. Working with CoUL: The LAUC Exec Board prepared focused items for CoUL's meeting Janet Napolitano in February. Items included the crisis date of the RLFs, which is a big issue of concern with the CoULs as well. It was conveyed that President Napolitano was receptive to the CoUL group in general and tentatively interested in meeting twice a year with CoUL. Those meetings may be used as an avenue of communication to convey concerns at that high level.

### d. Items from Last Year:

The Second General Review of APM 360; 210-4. At last year's assembly the group voted on wording, specifically on 360-4, the definition of an academic librarian in UC series. This decision was passed

onto CoUL and a joint LAUC/CoUL task force was assembled (<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/content/coullauc-apm-360-4-joint-task-force>). That revised language was presented by the Joint Task Force to membership for feedback and submitted to UCOP. Now the entire APM 360 is up for review. LAUC is collecting comments to send to UCOP, via Diane Mizrachi/Matt Conner/Dean Rowan. Themes will be grouped and highlighted, but no sentiment will be excluded. All feedback will make its way to UCOP

The change in by-laws has been approved, with official notification coming shortly from UCOP. Local divisions should check by-laws to ensure no inconsistencies. The issue considered was “who is a member of LAUC,” with discussions occurring at campuses regarding local ramifications.

11:00

#### G. Other business

##### 1. Discussion on status of Position Papers 1-4.

The Assembly discussed the Committee on Professional Governance’s recommendations regarding Position Papers 1-4, and voted on each paper separately.

There was a suggestion that Position Paper 1 be replaced rather than retired, since there has been an issue on a campus regarding application of criteria upon which librarians are evaluated, with recommendation for “no action” based on that criteria. It is important that LAUC establish its position on reviews. There is some sentiment that the review process is adequately addressed in other documentation, but having a position paper may be helpful in certain situations.

Diane reviewed the position paper again, noting that in the 2<sup>nd</sup> position paper criteria for appointment to ranks of librarian series are established in APM in 210 4e3, and 360-10b-c. These are the APM sections that we are reviewing now. The wording in the APM may be sufficient. It was countered that having a statement from LAUC would emphasize the position for both represented and non-represented librarians. Diane advised that position papers reflect the principle of a particular issue rather than procedural specifics, and a paper on this topic may state that administration and LAUC processes regarding peer review would follow the APM or MOU as the document indicates.

Campuses came to different conclusions regarding replacing vs. retiring a particular paper depending on local issues. Position papers are often seen as an advocacy tool when appropriate rather than direct application on a regular basis. The possibility of proposing new position papers is there as well, and may be a route for these issues regardless of what happens to papers 1-4. Diane reminded that Position Paper 5 is not being considered until the APM review is complete; it will be assessed in the 2016-17 LAUC year.

The process for revising any of the papers following this vote was clarified. Diane would call for a separate ad hoc task force to draft new language, based on input from the Assembly and from divisions. Dean articulated the procedural steps for voting on the four motions in the CPG report. The motions are amendable, but not to the extent that they substantially revise the recommendations. It would be a series of up or down votes. There may be discussion of each motion. There may also be a motion to the Exec Board to develop a new position paper on related topics. If a motion to replace is voted down, the paper would remain as it is. The review process is for every five years. If the vote is to replace, then the process starts to develop a new document and route through the approval process.

Chairs and delegates for each division are eligible to vote.

**Position Paper 1 (Criteria for Appointment, Promotion and Advancement of the Librarian Series):**  
CPG recommends retiring this paper.

**24 ayes; 1 opposed; 2 abstentions. Position Paper 1 will be retired.**

**Position Paper 2 (Development of Effective Communication between Statewide LAUC and Library Council):** CPG recommends replacing Position Paper 2. Diane added context wherein the paper was written during an earlier advisory structure. In principle, a paper would ensure some kind of structured communication between LAUC and the ULs. There was some discussion regarding whether there was any distinction between revision and replacement; essentially there is not, and the replaced version would keep the same numbering. The guidelines are not strictly binding if it is only a clerical revision. The consensus from membership is that the position papers should be more reflective of principles and not be specific regarding names of current structures. The paper should affirm two-way communication between LAUC and university structure.

**27 ayes. Position Paper 2 will be replaced.**

**Position Paper 3 (Documentation Guidelines for the Review of Librarians):** CPG recommends retiring Position Paper 3.

**25 ayes; 2 opposed. Position Paper 3 will be retired.**

**Position Paper 4 (Review Procedures for Librarians Outside the Normal Campus Peer Review Process):** CPG recommends replacing Position Paper 4. Diane provided more context regarding this position paper, as there are campuses with this circumstance, whether affiliated libraries or units, or librarians having review initiators who are not librarians. There was additional group discussion affirming the benefit of having LAUC documentation for the librarian to refer to a review initiator who may not be familiar with LAUC practices for the review process.

There was a question about the status of the paper if the vote to replace carried, with the confirmation that the paper would stand until replaced.

**27 ayes. Position Paper 4 will be replaced.**

**ACTION:** Diane will call for a committee to work on replacements for Position Papers 2 and 4.

2. Review findings from survey on LAUC members publishing & OA practices

Dave Schmitt, representing the LAUC Journal Task Force, presented findings from the Task Force's final report (<https://lauc.ucop.edu/sites/default/files/attached-files/journal-task-force-interim-report-2016-02-29.pdf>). The survey had a 28.5% response rate, with 126 responses out of 442 members.

The survey had questions in four areas: publication habits, how members select a publishing venue, input on creating a space to deposit publications, and input on what a potential LAUC journal could be. The Task Force concluded that it would not be recommending starting a new journal. The other areas yielded useful information about members' practices. Over 90% of respondents do create research or other creative works; the types of output include journal articles as well as blog posts, videos, reviews, etc. Other creative work includes conference presentations, non-peer reviewed output, and poster presentations. Members are not limiting themselves to peer-reviewed journal articles for their publishing or other creative output, so the creation of a LAUC journal would not encapsulate all of LAUC members' work.

The questions related to choosing a publishing venue indicated that the subject matter and prestige of a journal were important factors. 86% of respondents were favorable to the idea of publishing in an Open Access journal. Readership size and likelihood of acceptance of the submission were also key factors.

Questions related to eScholarship yielded input regarding the focus of the venue.

*Only 6% of respondents have submitted all of their work to eScholarship, 31.7% have submitted*

*“only some of it,” and the remaining 63.5% have either “had nothing to submit” or “have chosen not to.” This means that over 95% of respondents have some amount of content that has not been submitted. It is of note that there are 29 respondents who claim they have had nothing to submit, although only 11 claimed that they do not publish research.*

The input from those who indicated they have nothing to submit points to the disparity in the perception of what eScholarship could be for. The Task Force asks whether the venue could broaden its scope. The Task Force recommends working with the membership to address barriers that came up in submitting to eScholarship, including making it easier to submit, and expanding members’ ideas of what is appropriate to submit. With the UC policy on OA, it is timely to develop this practice among librarians, thereby assisting librarians in working with faculty on their submissions as well. Other reasons for not submitting included copyright limitations, which may be a concern if librarians are signing author agreements that limit access, and the work’s already being in an OA venue, which may point to the possibility of linking to that work from a LAUC venue to capture that in a search for LAUC members’ output.

After the presentation of the survey results, the Assembly discussed the reasons that the Task Force was not recommending starting a LAUC journal. The main reasons included sustainability, and the effort and time to keep a journal going, especially in the formative years. Other journals have sprung up in the library field with the rise of OA, so there are more venues. There may not be enough content for just LAUC material.

The Task Force recommends creating a subsequent group that creates a web presence for capturing and linking to the content of LAUC members, in as streamlined and sustainable way as possible. Diane discussed the recommendation with the Executive Board and accepted the Task Force’s recommendation. Given the current structure of the LAUC web site management, this will likely involve the Web Content Committee. Julie Lefevre indicated that the LAUC web site has that potential in the People pages.

#### **12:00 – 1:00:**

Lunch and Poster Sessions – Diane highlighted the new tradition of supporting new LAUC librarians for travel to the Assembly. We are celebrating the work of LAUC members through poster sessions of the travel grant recipients.

New UC Librarian Poster Presenters:

- Celia Emmelhainz (UCB): Library Ethnology 101: Using Focus Groups to Better Understand the Library Workforce
- Naomi Shiraishi (UCB): The Manga Cataloging Project
- Katharine Lawrie (UCLA): Transforming UCLA University Archives
- Alix Norton (UCSC): The Lick Observatory Records
- Sibyl Schaefer (UCSD): Expanding the Network: Sustainable Digital Preservation with Chronopolis and the Digital Preservation Network.

#### **1:00 – 1:30:**

H. Discussion of new UCLAS Structure with Donald Barclay (Deputy University Librarian at UC Merced and Director of DOC); Direction and Oversight Page: <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/doc>

Donald discussed the Direction and Oversight Committee and the new advisory structure under UCLAS. Under the former structure under SOPAG/Systemwide Operations and Planning Advisory Group, advisory items passed up to the ULs via SOPAG, and it was a workable structure for a long time. In a constrained budgetary environment, the SOPAG structure was deemed too top-heavy, with several committees having representatives from each campus and any ex officio members. The reports came up to the UL level and represented multiple priorities. Another concern was librarians’ sentiment of too much systemwide work.

DOC is an attempt to streamline the structure, assisting the CoULs in focusing on strategic matters.

Actual operational production results should fall to other groups to make sure those happens. DOC's role is to take various threads from across the system and coordinate them to achieve strategic directions.

The new advisory structure will have phases of implementation. DOC is in start-up mode now while it pulls together existing processes. The transition will not be as much work as going from SOPAG to UCLAS 1. Shared collective leadership with full representation from each campus will not be the only model in systemwide groups. DOC will explore how to keep the systemwide workload as low as possible while keeping priorities in motion.

On the upswing from the start-up to the second "Growth" phase, DOC's approach will be to create a lightweight organizational structure that incorporates project management principles. The growth phase will entail carrying out systemwide and priorities. When a project is proposed, DOC will look at how beneficial it is, how much it is going to cost, and how long it is going to take. The third phase is the "Maturity" phase where the structure will have a sustainable and efficient culture.

DOC has done a number of things so far. A number of CKGs or Common Knowledge Groups have been charged, using a light process with a one-page guidelines document for the scope of the CKG. There is a lightweight project proposal form; for example, if two to three librarians have an idea, it can be proposed and sent forward. Part of DOC's vision is to improve systemwide communication, which was not fully in place at DOC's start, but will be developed for a better infrastructure across the system. A technical solution is being explored to support this. A decision matrix for determining which projects should move forward is being developed, to include factors of assessment as well as the extent to which it benefits the entire system.

The meeting of CoUL with Janet Napolitano covered a variety of issues and pointed a way forward. It was affirming of our work as UC librarians. We are in a better place as a library system than we were in 2008 when we were struggling with the state economy, and DOC and the new structure should be contributing to that.

**1:30 – 3:00:**

I. Session with Dan Russell of Google: "What Do You Need to Know? Learning and Knowing in the Age of the Internet."

Dan Russell's presentation addressed the growing and changing nature of information formats, and the ways librarians must be willing to continuously refine the ways information is sought online. Topics explored included working in multiple formats; cataloging and indexing of multimedia objects; and how to provide context for searching in a global online environment.

The presentation was followed by group brainstorming on the question: If you could create Google today, what would you include or change? The discussion groups their thoughts and had additional interaction with Dan Russell.

See slides from an earlier presentation with the same title on Dan Russell's site here:  
<https://drive.google.com/a/ucdavis.edu/file/d/0BxlpTzK9iG-2OWJvUGs1N1VOT0U/view>

**Assembly adjourned at 3:25pm.**