

**Minutes: LAUC Executive Board Meeting
Ramada Silicon Valley**

Friday, May 11, 2012 9:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.

LAUC President Mitchell Brown called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Present: President Mitchell Brown, Past President Michael Yonezawa, Vice-President Keri Botello, Secretary Lillian Castillo-Speed; Divisional Chairs 2011-12: LAUC-B Chair Nick Robinson, LAUC-D Chair Deanna Johnson, LAUC-I Chair Pauline Manaka, LAUC-LA Chair Louise Ratliff, LAUC-M Chair Sara Davidson, LAUC-R Chair Manuel Urrizola, LAUC-SD Chair Patrick McCarthy, LAUC-SF Chair Peggy Tahir, LAUC-SB Chair Chuck Huber, LAUC-SC Chair Annette Marines, SOPAG Representative Bob Heyer-Gray, Parliamentarian Dean Rowan.

A. Check-in (roll call) (L. Castillo-Speed)

B. Announcements (M. Brown)

- Information on reimbursement for LAUC travel was handed out.
- A conference call is scheduled for June. Possibly no call in July.
- M. Brown and K. Botello will start planning for transition meeting which will occur in late July or early August. They will send out a Doodle poll for scheduling.

C. Approval of minutes - March 1, 2012/Review of Action Items (L. Castillo-Speed)

Action: M. Brown will send the divisions the message that they can use whatever software they would like to conduct both the local and statewide balloting, sending statewide results to the LAUC Secretary; divisions are free to use BallotBin; they need not report on how they get their results. *Resolution: yet to be done.*

Action: M. Brown will form an ad hoc committee with the Past President as Chair plus up to 4 other members; it will continue to work for a year to implement the current charge, reporting back to the Executive Board after a year with a recommendation as to whether the ad hoc committee should be a standing committee. *Resolution: will form a committee next week; is creating a list of potential members.*

Action: M. Brown will follow up with 1) recommended times to log in [to Assembly through ReadyTalk]; 2) contact numbers for cell phones and chat. *Resolution: done.*

Other corrections were noted.

Minutes were approved by acclamation.

D. Assembly Recap

1. Overall assessment of the Assembly, program, speakers, etc.

Some comments: although timing off at beginning, the timing for the remainder of the day went smoothly; an attendee mentioned that the NGTS explanation was valuable since he/she never knew how the pieces all fit together; the speakers were good but since there was nothing to vote on, this could have been an entirely virtual assembly; perhaps there could be a separate in-person business meeting in the future when items such as bylaws are being voted on; on the other hand, the face-to-face discussion in the breakout session was valuable; no editing of documents should ever be done at the Assembly; planning was very well done; technical glitches were handled well; there were no breaks but that seemed to be okay; we will get reports from ReadyTalk on how the remote participation worked out, e.g. number of phone connections and number of minutes: the morning had 13 connections and the afternoon also had 13 connections.

The sound quality could have been improved for people with low voices--they may need their own headsets in the future. The interpreters were good at asking the speakers to speak louder. M. Brown has all the power point slides and videotapes of the speakers. It would be good to find out how many campus people logged in from their desktops and how many in group rooms. Idea for next time: have two group spaces set up--north campuses and south campuses. There were disadvantages and advantages to the long narrow shape of the room. One advantage was that it allowed people to leave as needed without disturbing others. M. Brown noted that most guest speakers remained to hear the other speakers. The topic of copyright law turned out to be fascinating. Discussion ensued on archiving these events, as well as training sessions, videos, etc. Points: some items can be posted quickly and without too much preparation; delays come up when speakers have to review their notes before they can be posted; entries from the blog can be posted; can all of this be archived at the LAUC archives at UCB? CDL's e-Scholarship can archive as well. All the speakers at the Assembly were asked to sign a release document. As far as IRB clearance for the survey, as long as it remained within the UC community, there was no problem.

Action: M. Brown will share all the documents with us, possibly through a wiki.

Action: M. Brown will send out an evaluation survey to all participants.

2. Future of Librarianship discussion session follow-up

Comments: overall the breakout sessions worked well; there was confusion at the beginning as to what people were supposed to do and where they were supposed to go; not all lists of persons in each group were turned in; we might be able to reconstruct the lists, but it's not clear that we really needed the lists anyway. Suggestion for future: ask each group to choose its own facilitator and give more instructions on how to proceed. Counter suggestion: let the groups be creative and figure out how to proceed. **Action: we will edit the note charts from the groups and put them on the blog and solicit input from the campuses, since this was supposed to be an ongoing discussion.**

E. NGTS Implementation Steps

Discussion on information that is being gathered in the process and who is receiving it, for example a POT report may be done but who gets it next? From what we understand, a list of steps is being created. Does a manager get an instruction to implement a certain step? Perhaps an interest group will be created on a particular tool, e.g. Archivist's ToolKit. Is this a new governing structure? Where does funding for training come from? Perhaps when new positions are being created, the ULs will look at the NGTS results and decide on what roles are included in that job description. The process is being opened up for discussion, which is new and more representative, e.g. the concept of "good enough" catalog records. If less technical services time is spent on mainstream materials, then there is more time for specialists to work on unique or difficult materials. If one bibliographer handles a subject area for more than one campus, what are the rules, e.g. how is that work evaluated in the person's merit review process? What is lost if there is no face time with faculty? Perhaps nothing if a statewide group sends out a uniform message to all the faculty persons interested in that subject. The highly esoteric question can be sent to an expert. However, wouldn't a campus representative still be necessary? Would large campuses be asked to do a lot of work? If books are in the RLFs, then they are available to all. It's good that we are asking these questions of the governing structure, including the ULs. Let's raise the issues that we can raise with them, while at the same time getting information from our colleagues and then move forward. Centralized models are being developed for

Collections, Technical Services, and Public Services: some exist already, e.g. Digital Reference. There seems to be an assembly line model for most items or services and also a model for high-end customized work, but no middle. In Reference, "good enough" will be harder to accept, but perhaps it will just be different. Let's give input and questions to the ULs instead of resisting. LAUC should say "yes," we get it. Suggestion from M. Yonezawa: an opinion paper or letter to the ULs. In this paper we can suggest, endorse or ask questions about the direction librarians are going in NGTS and other actions taken. For example, how will librarians be reviewed if they do Digital Reference for more than one campus? Does this lead to a systemwide review process--or do librarians just need to be better at presenting their accomplishments during the review process? NGTS needs to spread out beyond the 87 people currently involved, perhaps add another set of people, otherwise many may become alienated from the process. M. Brown: the idea of a paper is timely--we might point to the work of B. Heyer-Grey since he has been involved both locally and systemwide, is SOPAG representative and also POT member. We should show that we appreciate his path. The paper could be a formal statement or presentation on what our colleagues do, e.g. catalogers. The ULs want to know what we do and we in turn want to know what is being planned. We need to say that we support NGTS. However, there are differences among the campuses, e.g. in what will be gained and what will be given up. The divisions will differ on what to support. We need to put together what is beneficial overall and yet acknowledge that each campus has its own needs. The collaborative nature, across systems, disciplines and functions is a challenge and it needs to focus on a common need. This hasn't been done before. LAUC only advises--want to be positive because we want to continue to give input. Should be said as succinctly as possible. Message is: we want to help. It may be useful to note in the paper that because we got together at an assembly and heard the speakers talk about the process, we came up with this discussion and our thoughts for the paper.

F. Follow up on LAUC Ad Hoc Awards Committee recommendation for a LAUC Outstanding Service Award

M. Yonezawa will chair the committee and will get names from other campuses. Ask people on your campuses if they are interested. The membership will be the chair plus four other members. Questions as to eligibility for the award: are recently retired persons eligible?; are only senior librarians eligible? Answer: the committee will decide on the scope.

G. Follow up on Position Paper Review Task Force Recommendations

It is time to go back and review Position Paper #5 and additional documents.

H. Diversity Committee--follow up

M. Brown received a report just before the Assembly. Committee needs help with statistical analysis of the survey. Perhaps Joanne Miller can help. The data can be pulled out of Survey Monkey and with the help of a tech person from UCI can be evaluated. Discussion ensued on value of new librarians taking the survey and whether everyone should take it again for the sake of consistent data. Next year's Committee will do the evaluation of this new survey. If anyone asks why we are re-doing the survey: "We know that there is change and turnover, so we want to compare the previous results to new results." Suggestion: wait until June (after people retire) to re-do the survey.

ACTION: M. Brown will update the charge of the Committee and recommend that they turn the survey back on.

I. Campus reports: Oral / select date for written reports.

ACTION: Divisional reports are due to M. Brown by mid-July; exact date will be confirmed. Elements of report can include: planning, transitions, results of re-organizations. No need to list names of all retirees. Include items on how libraries are dealing with change. Links to websites for some data is acceptable. Discussion ensued on how to share some information beyond the formal reports. **ACTION: M. Brown will explore with webmaster Phoebe Ayers the setting up of a "LAUC Leadership Wiki" or the use of BSpace for the purpose of sharing working documents.**

J. New Business

•S. Davidson asked if there could be a way to share information on mentoring. The use of the LAUC listserv was suggested and perhaps the new wiki suggested above. Another suggestion was to have a LAUC Statewide mentor for a new librarian.

A. Marines recommends that the incoming LAUC Statewide Vice Chair be supported in taking part in the UC Management Skills Assessment Program. The skills would help the VC acquire management and leadership skills prior to taking on the role of chair.

•K. Botello asked 1) if librarians on campus are invited to attend presentations of applicants; 2 are the qualifications and background attached to the invitation?

UCB: Yes/Yes

UCI: Yes/on website

UCSF: yes/on website

UCSD: yes/not sure or not always

UCD: Yes/available but not attached

UCSC: Yes/available but not attached

UCR: Yes/not always attached

UCSB: Yes/at presentation there is some introductory material

UCM: Yes/Yes, did have a biographical paragraph. CVs are not always available, but on a shared drive.

Discussion ensued on recruitment practices on the campuses.

K. Round Robin: none.

M. Urrizola motioned to adjourn; M. Yonezawa seconded. Motion carried.

Adjourned at 12:12 p.m.

Next Executive Board Meeting: June 7, 2012, 2:00-4:00 p.m.