

Librarians Association of the University of California
Executive Board Meeting
Friday, December 2, 2005, 9:00 – 12:00
University of California, Santa Cruz

Present: Jennifer Reiswig, President (SD), Lise Snyder, Vice-President/President-Elect (LA), Terence K. Huwe, Past President (B), Dean Rowan, Parliamentarian (B), Lillian Castillo-Speed (B), Karleen Darr (D), Kay Collins (I), Deborah Costa (LA), Emily Lin (M), Kenneth Furuta (R), Peter Brueggeman (SD), Anneliese Taylor (SF), Catherine Nelson (SB), Lucia Orlando (SC)

Guests: Janet Carter (LA), Eric Scott (M)

1. Call to order, welcome, announcements

T. Huwe must leave at 10:00am.

2. Agenda review

J. Reiswig added item 8, assembly program planning.

3. Secretary's report

a. Approve minutes: LAUC Board Conference Call 11/10/2005

K. Collins moved to accept the minutes with one minor correction, E. Lin seconded, and the Board approved the minutes.

4. Report from 11/16 meeting with University Librarians' Group

J. Reiswig and L. Snyder met with the UL group for about an hour, and discussed the possible changes to LAUC Bylaws and the instructional roles of librarians. The ULs recommended that LAUC not overstate the bylaws, and not get into anything that involves the APM. The ULs thought that standing rules made sense.

ULs see digital stewardship as a high priority for library planning and activities. They are looking at digital stewardship very broadly, including the role of the library in academic planning and the direction research will take. The ULs are talking about the curation of the university's digital assets of every kind.

SLASIAC has not met since the new representative, Diane Bisom (I), was appointed.

The findings of the E-Journal Task Force were discussed; specifically the need to provide a vehicle for research grants products to improve the visibility and accessibility of this work. The CDL was receptive to LAUC but concerned that LAUC have some kind of mechanism in place to vet what is submitted. LAUC would need to institute an editorial body, and CDL encouraged LAUC to do so.

The upcoming final report of the Bibliographic Services Task Force was discussed; LAUC membership should be aware that it is coming and look out for it.

Also discussed was the cost of travel; the ULS recommended looking at LTAG's report regarding alternative meeting technologies.

5. Discussion From Reports from LAUC Representatives

Heads of Technical Services:

The Bibliographic Services Task Force was discussed; particularly the idea of outsourcing. The Executive Board wants to pay especially close attention to this.

ACTION: J. Reiswig will ask HOTS representative Tony Harvell if LAUC can have a representative on the Bibliographic Services Task Force.

There was concern about the decision made regarding Documents Without Shelves, and discussion about the roles of Divisional representatives on committees. There is a great deal of variation as to how much representation a LAUC representative can have.

ACTION: J. Reiswig will express to T. Harvell that there seems to be a lack of communication and will ask him to give information about this issue.

Information Literacy Ad Hoc: Committee work is ongoing.

Library Privacy Liaisons: Amy Kautzman has been monitoring changes in the USA Patriot Act.

Library Technology Advisory Group:

The second page of LTAG's report includes a summary of web conferencing technologies for SOPAG, done by Gabriella Gray at J. Reiswig's request. The summary had some interesting findings that J. Reiswig and the Executive Board should be aware of and monitor in our quest for technological solutions to meeting costs. Some campuses already use web and video conferencing, and people do look at web casts -- statistics show over 500 downloads of the last SOPAG presentation.

Shared Library Facilities: Report reviewed, no comments.

Systemwide Operations and Planning Advisory Group:

Items of note include the proposed interlibrary loan of media and the RLF Persistent Procedures.

Bibliographic Systems Task Force: Report was discussed.

ACTION: To be discussed at the Spring Assembly. Divisions are requested to report feedback on the BSTF report.

Collection Development Council: Report reviewed, no comments.

Scholarly Communication: Discussion followed yesterday's verbal report by J. Carter.

ACTION: J. Carter will notify the Executive Board when Academic Senate White Papers are published.

6. Discussion From Planning Sessions

A. Enabling Technologies

Consensus is that the Assembly seemed to engage with the group discussion exercises well. For Enabling Technologies, the groups produced 35 different ideas. Here are the "top voted":

- 18 votes for orientation for new LAUC members
- 17 votes for content management systems
- 15 votes for an evaluation of the LAUC archives
- 12 votes for implementing D-Space
- 10 votes for optimizing face-to-face meetings
- some votes for having dark archives¹ somewhere

(For a full tally, see "Enabling Technologies for LAUC: Results of a Group Discussion, December 1, 2005.")

J. Reiswig suggested putting out a call for an ad hoc committee to make recommendations for enabling technologies. The committee could establish a toolkit of technologies supporting meetings, a home for working documents, with central procedures and an orientation component. The committee will be charged to get division-wide input. A member of LTAG may be asked to serve on the committee.

ACTION: J. Reiswig will draft a charge and circulate it to the Executive Board.

There was discussion of what constitutes historical documentation for LAUC? Email? Phone conversations? No one knows what to do with this material (this issue might be addressed in the new standing rules). There was a consensus that another ad hoc committee needed to be formed for the archives. The committee may be asked to survey all the campuses as to how they handle LAUC documentation.

ACTION: J. Reiswig will draft a charge and circulate it to the Executive Board.

The Executive Board discussed the need for an orientation for new LAUC members, not just chairs and representatives. Is there an overview that can be shared for the entire group? Does the responsibility lie with each group? Do we want to form a working group amongst the Executive Board? At UCLA, new members used to receive a packet of materials including information about LAUC's history, committee structure, and general overview. The Divisional Secretary would send it out when notified by Human Resources. Another suggestion was to create a new web site, "Getting Started with LAUC." The LAUC mentoring program was also mentioned as a possible solution.

ACTION: The Executive Board will discuss creating a working group or ad-hoc committee regarding new LAUC member orientation at the next conference call.

B. Bylaws

There was much discussion as to how to proceed with the Bylaws; consensus was that revising the Bylaws is an issue that must be faced sooner or later and that LAUC should continue to pursue this. It was suggested to incorporate some of the very good changes put forward by CCRJ while not trying to tackle all the changes they recommended. The consensus was that separating procedural business into Standing Rules was a very good idea. Also, the Executive Board accepted the idea of turning some of the Standing Committees into Ad Hoc Committees. The Executive Board felt that it would be cumbersome

¹ Definition: n. ~ A collection of materials preserved for future use but with no current access. Notes: 'Dark archives' is principally associated with collections of online serial publications and databases that are held by an organization other than the publisher. These materials are kept in escrow for future use in case they are no longer available from the publisher.

to add or rewrite Bylaws regarding the purpose or the structure of LAUC, and that the focus of Bylaws revision should be on excising lines to reduce the number of standing committees, and to shift specifics from Bylaws to standing rules.

ACTION: J. Reiswig will draft another charge for CCRJ and distribute to the Executive Board for comment.

ACTION: J. Reiswig will act as a liaison to CCRJ.

7. Review final charges to Standing Committees

J. Reiswig noted that the timing of appointments is out of synch with the calendar stipulated by the Bylaws.

ACTION: Each committee needs to determine a way to coordinate appointments with the Bylaws.

Research & Professional Development:

The charge noted the R&PD is continuing to follow up with past grantees on projects and putting their reports up on the LAUC web site. There was further discussion about the desire for a LAUC committee to look into how LAUC might use e-scholarship.

Professional Governance: The charge was discussed; Irvine was unintentionally omitted.

ACTION: J. Reiswig will amend the charge to include Irvine.

There was some discussion about Step 7, and the fact that it has no year requirement attached to it. J. Reiswig noted that an additional charge could always be sent to the committee

ACTION: Executive Board members will go back and talk to their divisions and report back to J. Reiswig if an additional charge is needed.

Diversity: Charge was discussed. The committee needs to promote the LAUC Diversity Listserv.

ACTION: Committee should draft an announcement and put on the LAUC web site.

8. Assembly Program Planning

ACTION: JR will create a task force to plan Spring Assembly program. Asked LA especially for volunteers. E. Lin volunteered to be on the Spring Program Task Force.

Digital stewardship is an excellent idea for a spring assembly program. Some of the ULs might be asked to speak, since digital stewardship is their focal point. The program (about 2 hours long) should be balanced with one speaker at the national level, one at the UC level, and a panel of librarians from a spectrum of library backgrounds responding.

ACTION: Executive Board members should send ideas, names of speakers, and interesting papers on the topic to J. Reiswig.

Adjourned at 12:11pm