

TO: Rachel Green, LAUC President  
FROM: I-Wei Wang, chair, Committee on Professional Governance  
RE: 2021-2022 Committee on Professional Governance Mid-Year Report

### **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 action** recommended at this time. No questions or items for review have been presented to CPG under its Standing Charge, outside the topics covered below pursuant to the Specific Charge for 2021-22.

#### Specific Charge for 2021-22 -

1. Standing Committees

- a. (term staggering): CPG recommends the President **modify term dates** for two RPD members to balance the staggering of terms on that committee for the next (and subsequent) terms; this is couched as a motion asking the President to consider and decide on the issue. Please see Discussion and Recommendations as to Specific Charge 2 for a **status report on proposed Standing Rules revisions** related to this charge.
  - b. (term of service): CPG recommends an **amendment to Bylaws**, Article VIII, Section 1 (Standing Committees), to allow Divisions to obtain an exception in order to nominate members for one-year terms on Standing Committees.
  - c. (appointments process): **No action** recommended at this time. Please see Discussion and Recommendations as to Specific Charge 2 for a **status report on proposed revisions to Standing Rules** related to this charge.
2. Review of Standing Rules and Bylaws
    - a. (Bylaws): CPG recommends an **amendment to Bylaws**, Article V, Section 1 (Executive Board), to remove out-of-date references to ex officio membership on Executive Board of LAUC representatives to Universitywide advisory groups and committees.
    - b. (Standing Rules): **No action** recommended at this time. Please see Discussion and Recommendations below for a **status report on proposed Standing Rules revisions**.
  3. (PI status survey): **No action** recommended at this time. Please see Discussion and Recommendations below for a **status report on the PI status survey project**.

### **Discussion and Recommendations.**

#### Standing Committees - term staggering (Special Charge 1a)

##### *Discussion*

- CPG recommends that the President deem the term of service for the members of the Committee on Research and Professional Development (RPD) sent by the LAUC-B and LAUC-SF Divisions as ending on September 30, 2022. Those Divisions each nominate a member for RPD with a term beginning October 1, 2022.
- Bylaws, Article VIII, Section 2.f (Standing Committees), and Standing Rules, Section 400.2 (Vacancies), allow for filling of vacancies by Divisional nomination. If representatives currently serving on RPD from Berkeley and UCSF are deemed as replacement members to complete the terms of those originally appointed in 2020-21, the RPD committee will have 5 new members and 5 returning members in 2022-23, and therefore to have terms ending September 2022, with new members to be nominated by these Divisions to start serving terms beginning October 2022.
  - CPG has consulted with the Divisions and individual committee members affected and confirmed they are amenable to this resolution to balance the composition of RPD as of the 2022-23 cycle.
  - In arriving at this recommendation, CPG considered and rejected, as impracticable and/or less timely, numerous possible scenarios for Standing Committee appointments and their results for composition and balance.

- The Committees on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) and on Professional Governance (CPG) are currently balanced as to incoming and returning members and therefore composition and schedule for appointment of new members should not be changed.
- As follow-up, CPG recommends the Executive Board consider revisions to Standing Rules, Section 400.1.B (Appointments). CPG's recommendations on this topic are incorporated in the proposed Standing Rules revisions, as summarized below as to Specific Charge 2. CPG does not recommend immediate action on these Standing Rules revisions because other potential changes to the Bylaws may impact Section 400 and it seems more efficient to address all revisions to this section at once.

#### Standing Committees - term of service (Special Charge 1b)

*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*

- CPG found that some Divisions may prefer one-year terms and others prefer two-year terms: At least one Division has faced persistent difficulties in locating volunteers for a two-year term but have been able to establish a mutually agreed rotation for one-year terms; while others have established a nomination cycle based on two-year terms that would be disrupted by a change.
- Possible disincentives to seek an exception will, in CPG's view, prevent Standing Committees from permanently turning towards extreme "imbalance": A Division that opts for one-year term appointments for one or more Standing Committees will have an additional burden to find nominees each year instead of every other year. They also will not be able to have their representative(s) serve as chairs for CPG or DEI.
- Fairness to committee volunteers and practical recruitment considerations should be balanced with the need for strictly staggered terms. Although procedures already exist for appointment of replacement committee members, it is unfair and impractical to ask for volunteers for two-year term with the knowledge that the Division will consistently need to replace the volunteer after one year, forcing the volunteer to ostensibly back out of a commitment that was not truly voluntary in the first place.
- CPG considered the pros and cons of including, as a condition for granting an exception, a requirement that nominees for one-year terms must be shown to have some experience relevant to the committee, rather than simply interest in serving. While it was suggested that RPD might be most in need of "experienced" members, CPG does not recommend incorporation of such requirements, based on consideration of the following:
  - Revolving door issues and the value of gaining perspectives from volunteers who are interested even if less experienced in matters relevant to the Standing Committee

- Difficulty in articulating what type of experience would be relevant suggests that the actual utility of experience is not well-defined
- For RPD in particular, service precludes applying for a LAUC grant, disincentivizing volunteers with research experience and interest
- Availability of volunteers is especially acute for small and shrinking Divisions, and adding an "experience" criterion for appointment only heightens this effect
- **CPG cannot propose Bylaws amendments** - this may be done by a member of the Assembly or via a petition signed by 50 voting members.
- The ideal timing for this amendment would allow for Divisions to seek an exception before committee nominations need to be made for the following appointment cycle. Approval of the above motion by the Assembly would be followed by a vote of the general membership, and would be subject to approval by UCOP, and is not likely to be formally in place and reflected in governing documentation for 2022-23.
- Assuming approval of the Bylaws amendment were obtained, CPG would need to propose further revisions (for consideration by the Executive Board) to the Standing Rules, Section 400, to establish the procedure for seeking an exception.

#### Process for appointments (Special Charge 1.c)

*Discussion* - CPG recommends the Executive Board consider revisions to Standing Rules, Section 400.1.C (Appointments). CPG's recommendations on this topic are incorporated in the proposed Standing Rules revisions, as summarized below as to Specific Charge 2.

#### Standing Rule and Bylaws review for updates (Special Charge 2)

*Motion* - That an amendment to Bylaws, Article V, Section 1 (Executive Board), be put before the general membership for approval, to replace the current provision, as marked up in the following (added text underscored, ~~deleted text stricken out~~):

*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 Universitywide 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*

- The Executive Board provision of the Bylaws - unlike the provision that creates the LAUC representative positions to various advisory groups (Bylaws, Article VIII, Section 3) - specifically names several entities that no longer exist, and thus is prone to becoming outdated as the library advisory structure changes. The Article VIII provision, while vague, is broadly stated, allowing for changes in the advisory structure to be

accommodated by adjustments to the Standing Rules (Section 500), via the more flexible and agile revision process applicable.

- In the event any other Bylaws amendments are moved, and approved, by the Assembly to be put to a membership vote, CPG recommends that this technical amendment be placed on the same ballot for the sake of efficiency.
- **CPG cannot propose Bylaws amendments** - this may be done by a member of the Assembly or via a petition signed by 50 voting members.
- CPG has prepared corresponding revisions to the Standing Rules, Section 500, for the Executive Board's consideration.

*Status report on proposed Standing Rules revisions -*

- Sections 100-1000 - CPG completed its overall review for consistency with Bylaws and current practices/circumstances, as well as for stylistic improvements. CPG's proposed revisions in this regard are ready for the Executive Board's consideration, but are mixed with proposed revisions on substantive matters, as summarized below.
- Sections 100-300 (General, Executive Board, Assembly) - CPG explored the implications of addressing confusion about "affiliate membership" via clarifying language.
  - Limited clarifying provisions - regarding use of the terms "member," "affiliate member," or any alternative nomenclature - are substantially ready for the Executive Board's discussion.
  - Other possible clarifications - regarding the status and role of affiliate membership "extended" by way of Divisional bylaws - require further examination to determine if CPG can or should develop proposals for consideration. CPG requests guidance as to whether to undertake this, and can provide background on the issue.
- Section 400 (Standing Committees) - CPG recommends revisions (premised on the approval of CPG's recommendations as to Specific Charge 1) to the following:
  - Section 400.1.B, laying out the annual pattern for each Division's nomination of new representatives to each standing committee; and
  - Section 400.1.C, adjusting the timeline and responsibility for identifying and communicating to Divisions the standing committee vacancies to be filled each year.
  - CPG's proposed revisions in regard to the above are ready for the Executive Board's consideration. Additionally, if CPG's recommended Bylaws amendment is proposed, placed on the ballot, and approved by members, CPG can develop a proposal for the exceptions process.
- Section 500 (LAUC Representatives to advisory bodies) - CPG reviewed updates to the library advisory structure and the current practice of appointing representatives to DOC, SCLG, SLASIAC, and SLFB.
  - CPG's proposed revisions are ready for the Executive Board's consideration. Additionally, CPG identified two additional advisory groups (the Digital Preservation Leadership Group and the SILS Leadership Group - both Leadership Groups under DOC and thus parallel in some ways to SCLG) to which LAUC currently does not have representatives. CPG takes no position as to whether LAUC representation should be sought, but in the event the Executive Board pursues and obtains such representation, further updating of Section 500 may be needed.

- Section 600 (Elections) - CPG recommends revisions to procedures for elections to align with Bylaws, and its proposed revisions in this regard are ready for the Executive Board's consideration:
  - Section 600.1.B, eliminating requirement that no candidate be from the same Division as the incumbent from the current or previous terms (not required by any current Bylaw), and adding provision to ensure officers other than Immediate Past President are from different Divisions (required by current Bylaws); and
  - Section 600.1.J, eliminating an implied requirement (nowhere found in current Bylaws) that Divisions appoint an election committee; adding language to operationalize a May 1 timetable (as authorized by current Bylaws) for Divisions to establish a mechanism for conducting elections.
- Section 700-1000 (Web, Parliamentarian, Awards, Archives) - CPG recommends stylistic revisions (mostly for gender inclusive language), and a revision clarifying appointment of an alternate Parliamentarian. CPG's proposed revisions in this regard are ready for the Executive Board's consideration.

PI Status Survey (Special Charge 3)

*Status report* - CPG provided input to RPD regarding survey design and questions used in the instrument. CPG awaits return of responses (expected April 1) for analysis and reporting.

Respectfully submitted,

I-Wei Wang (chair 2021-22)

**Committee Members**

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

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

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

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

Merced: Jim Dooley (4th year, 2018-2022) [jdooley@ucmerced.edu](mailto:jdooley@ucmerced.edu)

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

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

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

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

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

**Attachments** - none