

TO: Rachel Green, LAUC President
FROM: I-Wei Wang, chair, Committee on Professional Governance
RE: 2021-2022 Committee on Professional Governance Annual Report
DATE: September 21, 2022

Committee Charges

Standing Charge

1. Advise the President and the Executive Board on issues that affect librarians, peer review, and other professional governance issues.
2. Serve as a review body for Divisions who may request evaluation of local peer review procedures.
3. Serve as a Bylaws review committee for proposed changes to the LAUC Bylaws and Standing Rules. Be available to review the Divisions' Bylaws for consistency with the LAUC Bylaws and Standing Rules, and to consult with Divisions on request.
4. Address other subjects at the request of the President and consider and develop recommendations on matters of librarian professional governance.

Specific Charge for 2021-22

1. Investigate division compliance with appointment terms for statewide committee representatives. Some campuses have been sending representatives for one year instead of the two years mandated by the Bylaws (Article VIII, Section 1).
 - a. In the case of a committee that is now unbalanced (e.g. Research & Professional Development has only 3 returning members and 7 new members, instead of 5 returning and 5 new), recommend a path forward to bring balance to the committee composition over the next few years.
 - b. If applicable, in the case of a campus that feels unduly burdened, recommend a process for requesting an exception to the Bylaws requirement.
 - c. Recommend a process for ensuring compliance in the future. For example, identify responsible parties for communicating the rules and monitoring compliance.
2. Review the current Bylaws and Standing Rules and recommend any revisions necessary, both stylistically and substantively. For example, the Standing Rules mention committees that may no longer exist.
3. Coordinate with the Research & Professional Development Committee to research and report on LAUC members' experiences with PI status at the different campuses. Work will include a survey of all LAUC members and a written report/recommendation based on the results.

Summary of Action Items

Standing Charge - No outstanding action items to carry over to 2022-23.

Specific Charge for 2021-22 -

1. Standing Committees
 - a. (term staggering): No outstanding action items to carry over to 2022-23.
 - b. (term of service): CPG recommends a motion to **amend Bylaws**, Article VIII, Section 1 (Standing Committees).

- c. (appointments process): CPG recommends the Executive Board **revise Standing Rules**, Section 400.
2. Review of Bylaws and Standing Rules
 - a. (Bylaws): CPG recommends an **amendment to Bylaws**, Article V, Section 1 (Executive Board), to remove certain out-of-date references.
 - b. (Standing Rules): CPG recommends the Executive Board **revise the Standing Rules** to clarify, correct, update, and streamline certain matters and align the Standing Rules with the current Bylaws.
3. (PI status survey): No outstanding action items to carry over to 2022-23.

Discussion and Recommendations

Special Charge 1 - Standing Committees

1(a) - Short-term fix to term staggering

Discussion - Completed. CPG's recommended one-time adjustment to term dates for the members of the Committee on Research and Professional Development (RPD) from the LAUC-B and LAUC-SF Divisions was implemented to re-balance the staggering of terms. Those Divisions will each nominate a member for RPD with a term beginning October 1, 2022.

1(b) - Long-term structure for terms of committee service

Recommended motion - That an amendment to Bylaws, Article VIII, Section 1 (Standing Committees), be put before the general membership for approval, to add the following provision:

A Division may request an exception, per procedures set out in the Standing Rules, to the requirement that appointees serve two-year terms, as to any or all of the Standing Committees. If approved by a majority of the Executive Board, such exception shall apply to the Division's nominations to any Standing Committees approved in the exception, until such time as the Division seeks removal of the exception.

Discussion - Please see CPG's mid-year report for a discussion of CPG's considerations in suggesting this amendment to the Bylaws. Note: Assuming approval of an amendment were obtained, a future CPG could be charged with proposing revisions (for consideration and approval by the Executive Board) to the Standing Rules, Section 400, to establish the procedure for seeking an exception.

1(c) - Process for appointments

Discussion - CPG recommends the Executive Board revise the Standing Rules, Section 400.1.C (Appointments) to help Divisions anticipate and plan committee representation. CPG's recommendations on this topic are incorporated in the attached markup.

Special Charge 2 - Bylaws and Standing Rules Review

2 - Bylaws updates

Recommended motion - That an amendment to Bylaws, Article V, Section 1 (Executive Board), be put before the general membership for approval, to revise as marked below:

The Executive Board shall consist of the President, Vice President, Secretary, the immediate Past President, and the Chairs of the Divisions. LAUC representatives to any University-wide advisory group or committee appointed pursuant to these Bylaws, as detailed in the Standing Rules, for Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC), Strategic Action Group 1 (SAG1): Scholarly Research & Communication; Strategic Action Group 2 (SAG2): Access, Discovery & Infrastructure; and Strategic Action Group 3 (SAG3): Collection Building & Management are ex officio non-voting members of the Executive Board. Chairs of standing and ad hoc committees may be invited by the President to attend an Executive Board meeting as non-voting members.

Discussion - Please see CPG's mid-year report for a discussion of CPG's considerations in suggesting this amendment to the Bylaws. The recommended revision is a "housekeeping" measure to make this Bylaws provision less prone to becoming outdated as the library advisory structure changes (compare to Bylaws, Article VIII, Section 3, which accommodates changes by referring to Standing Rules for details).

2 - Standing Rules updates

Discussion - CPG's mid-year report provided a summary and status report on suggested Standing Rules revisions. The attached markup shows all suggested revisions:

- Sections 100-1000 - revised for style and consistency with Bylaws and current practices.
- Sections 100-300 (General, Executive Board, Assembly) - added clarifying provisions regarding terms "member," "affiliate member," or alternative nomenclature.
- Section 400 (Standing Committees) - added schedule for nomination of new Division representatives; revised timeline and responsibility for identifying new appointments to be filled; clarification of effect of lack of Division representation due to unfilled vacancy.
- Section 500 (LAUC Representatives to advisory bodies) - updated to reflect current library advisory structure (DOC, SCLG, SLASIAC, and SLFB).
 - CPG identified two additional advisory groups (the Digital Preservation Leadership Group and the SILS Leadership Group) on which LAUC currently does not have representatives. In the event the Executive Board pursues and obtains such representation, further updating of Section 500 may be needed.
- Section 600 (Elections) - revised to align with Bylaws.
- Section 700-1000 (Web, Parliamentarian, Awards, Archives) - stylistic and clarifying revisions for gender inclusivity and regarding alternate Parliamentarian.

Special Charge 3 - PI Status

3 - PI Status Survey and Analysis of Results

Discussion - Completed. As noted in CPG's Mid-Year Report, the committee reviewed the survey instrument and provided comments to RPD. In addition, the committee reviewed and analyzed results from the survey used to (a) provide input on President Rachel Green's May 20 presentation to UCOLASC and (b) present to the Executive Board (June 13, 2022) with recommendation to form a working group or task force to do further analysis and determine next steps. Consequently, the Task Force on Academic Status created by LAUC President Green (2021-2022) and renewed by LAUC President Moore (2022-2023) will continue this work.

Procedures for Recommended Motions & Revisions

The suggested motions for amending Bylaws may be made by a member of the Assembly, or via a petition signed by 50 voting members, at the next meeting of the Assembly. Because the Bylaws state (Art. V, section 3) the Executive Board performs the functions of the Assembly between meetings of that body (which have been held, under current practice, only in spring), the Board arguably could decide (independent of the Assembly) to put the amendments to a vote of membership. However, (1) amending Bylaws is not an enumerated function of the Assembly (Bylaws Art. VII, section 4) and therefore arguably is not one of the functions that the Board may undertake; and (2) Board actions on behalf of the Assembly subject to “review” by the Assembly at its next meeting (Bylaws Art. V, section 4), so it is not clear if the Board can unilaterally call for a membership vote on Bylaws amendments. In either case, approval by the Assembly would be followed by a vote of the general membership, and if passed would be subject to approval by UCOP.

If possible, the two recommended motions for amendments to Bylaws should be undertaken, if at all, in tandem, in order to combine the balloting and UCOP approval steps. One is a more “substantive” change (Special Charge 1(b)) and the other is a housekeeping change (Special Charge 2), so if the motion to put the substantive change is not approved, it may not be worth the trouble to pursue the housekeeping change independently.

The suggested changes to Standing Rules are *largely* independent of the above recommended Bylaws changes; the only exception is that (as noted in comments in the markup) the suggested table showing the “schedule” for campus appointments to Standing Committees assumes that the Bylaws amendment would be approved and that UCSF would apply for and be given exceptional status - the comments in the markup indicate what the table should show if those assumptions were not valid. Moreover, the suggested revisions are independent of each other. Thus, the Executive Board may consider and accept or decline each suggested revision standing alone without regard to decisions on the other revisions.

Respectfully submitted,
I-Wei Wang (chair 2021-22)

Committee Members

Berkeley: I-Wei Wang (2nd year, 2020-2022) iwang@law.berkeley.edu

Davis: Adam Siegel (2nd year, 2020-2022) apsiegel@ucdavis.edu

Irvine: Audra Eagle Yun (2nd year, 2020-2022) audra.yun@uci.edu

Los Angeles: Sanghun Cho (2nd year, 2020-2022) sanghuncho@library.ucla.edu

Merced: Jim Dooley (4th year, 2018-2023) jdooley@ucmerced.edu

Riverside: Michele Potter (1st year, 2021-2023) michele.potter@ucr.edu

San Diego: Sarah Buck Kachaluba (1st year, 2021-2023) sbuckkachaluba@ucsd.edu

San Francisco: Jill Barr-Walker (1st Year, 2021-2022) Jill.Barr-Walker@ucsf.edu

Santa Barbara: Yao Chen (1st year, 2021-2023) ychen2020@ucsb.edu

Santa Cruz: Jessica Pigza (1st year, 2021-2023) jpigza@ucsc.edu

Attachment - Markup of Standing Rules