

**Librarian Association of the University of California
Executive Board Conference Call
Thursday, October 2, 2014 1-3pm**

ReadyTalk [Please use the toll-free number 866-740-1260 and the access code
9181033#]

MINUTES

A. Roll Call (Christina Woo)

President:	Matt Conner
Vice-President/President-Elect:	Diane Mizrachi
Past President:	Nick Robinson
Secretary:	Christina Woo
Parliamentarian:	Dean Rowan
SLASIAC representative:	[Susan Koskinen is attending the SLASIAC mtg. in Oakland today]
SAG 1 representative:	Diane Gurman
SAG 2 representative:	Susan Perry
SAG 3 representative:	Angela Riggio
Web Manager:	[Julie Lefevre is on vac.; see these Minutes for the Ad Hoc report]
Assembly Planning:	Penny Coppernoll-Blach

LAUC-B:	Rita Evans
LAUC-D:	Bruce Abbott
LAUC-I:	Keith Powell
LAUC-LA:	Rikke Ogawa
LAUC-M:	Elizabeth McMunn-Tetangco
LAUC-R:	Rhonda Neugebauer
LAUC-SD:	Penny Coppernoll-Blach
LAUC-SF:	Evans Whitaker
LAUC-SB:	Kristen La Bonte
LAUC-SC:	Deborah Murphy

B. Announcements (Matt Conner) -- none

C. Meeting Goals:

1. Discuss Position Paper 5 and prepare guidelines for the membership

D. Approval of minutes – September 11, 2014 (Christina Woo)

-- defer until a fuller copy is sent out; approve online –

E. Review of action items from September minutes (Matt Conner)

1. Statewide committee appointments - **DONE**

Evans Whitaker (SF) is the 2014-2015 CPG/Committee on Professional Governance chair; Diversity Committee chair is Carla Arbagey (R). She is also on the Website committee. [NB: in early November, Mitchell Brown (I) was made the chair of CPG; Evans remains on the committee.]

2. Statewide committee charges – **OPEN**
 - Not quite done yet but will be shortly
3. Details of LAUCD program October 16 – **DONE**

A dean at Berkeley who will be speaking on the Future of the UC Berkeley Library report would rather focus on LAUC-D and not broadcast the program to the LAUC divisions. Instead LAUC-D will issue a report. This brings up the issue of LAUC assemblies. Compared to the 2013/2014 Spring Assembly at UCD, the LAUC Southern Regional Meeting on LAUC Divisional Participation in Library Re-Organization at UCR on June 19, 2014 had much more discussion. The Spring Assembly agenda was packed and did not allow for much discussion. This raises the question of “alternative assemblies,” which are much more affordable than in-person. – **not done**

4. Position Papers read – **DONE**
5. APM/Academic Personnel Manual committee members chosen

The original plan from UCOP was that the entire LAUC membership would be able to review the draft in two stages, but now the initial draft of the APM will be available only to limited groups of people. For us, that would be the Exec Bd and to certain outside experts, but not the membership as a whole. As a result, there is no need for a “task force” per se. We could invite Adam Siegel and others, however, to be “experts” to the Exec Bd. We’ll also ask a few people from UCLA who are very well informed.

ACTION: Matt will release the APM draft soon to the Exec Bd for comments. UCOP wants our input by Nov. 21.

6. Google form to collect member profiles for the new LAUC website

Thanks to Rita Evans (B) and Diane Mizrachi (LA). Matt Conner will also fill it out. Web Manager Julie Lefevre was hoping for 3-5 profiles. Final call! These are test entries to discover the functionality of the form and will not go public.

ACTION: Final call to contribute your profile

7. Assembly dates sent - **DONE**
8. Membership report sent – **DONE**
 - Can this report be shared with non-members? No objections, so OK.
9. SAG 3 response sent – **DONE** by Angela Riggio

F. Systemwide Committees/Appointments

1. R&PD/Research and Professional Development (Diane Mizrachi)

On Sept. 16 a reminder was sent to local R&PD chairs to request submissions. Web Manager Julie Lefevre is working on making the pdf form interactive. A final reminder will be sent this coming Monday, Oct. 6; deadline for proposals to the local committees will be Friday, Oct. 17. Local committees will review them before sending them to the statewide committee. This year more money is being made available earlier. How much interest we'll get is a matter of concern. LAUC-D, for example, has gotten no inquiries. One question at Berkeley; 2-3 at UCLA. The second call in January will be only for presentation grants.

2. Website Revision Ad Hoc (submitted by Julie Lefevre, who is not present)

- We've had two conference calls with Five Paths (<https://fivepaths.com/>), and intend to continue weekly calls for the duration of the project.
- The "Content review" part of the process is now underway, and we are focusing at first on documents and people.
- We've shared our sample Meet our Members content with Five Paths and had preliminary discussions about that workflow.
- We will be using the UC Branding site to align the design with UC guidelines.

I'll have a more detailed status report on the Content Review to share with the Exec Board in a couple weeks.

3. Assembly Planning (Penny Coppernoll-Blach)

Kymberly Goodson (Local Arrangements chair) and I toured the "Village at 15," the venue we're hoping to use. It will cost about \$936 for the venue (larger conference room and a smaller one for registration and catering), so we'll try to save money on catering. There is no alternative location under consideration. Wide balcony has a view of the ocean. Good parking. Need to decide on a date. April 1, 8, and 15 are in play. March 25 is the first day of ACRL and no longer an option for us. Between Passover (Fri, April 3 evening to Saturday, April 11 evening) and the distraction of Tax Day (April 15), we set the April dates aside, as well. **ACTION: Matt will poll for April 16 (Th) and 17 (F).** This will be a one-day assembly. Note: LAUC will not be able to pay for a Thursday or Friday night hotel for Exec Bd members who want to avoid the scramble of an evening flight back and instead return the next day.

We still need to think about program topics. Maybe something about the advisory structure, now that it's been in place for a year? What would we like to ask CoUL to speak about? Matrix reporting (how's it working for you, Matt)? We could send a poll

to the divisions, which worked well last year. **ACTION: We'll discuss this again at our next meeting.**

G. Advisory Groups

1. SLASAC / Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory committee (Susan Koskinen is attending the SLASAC mtg. today in Oakland, so no report today)
<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/slasac/>

For the other SAGs, we need to change how we address the reports from the advisory groups. We have a lot to do, and going over everything the SAGs are doing in detail during our conference calls is not feasible. We should still hear the reports but--for our feedback--focus on the most important priority of the SAG, or something of interest to us.

2. SAG 1/Scholarly Research & Communication (Diane Gurman)
<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sag1>

The last SAG 1 call was cancelled, so I have nothing to add to what I sent before. The next SAG 1 call is the day after today's LAUC call. Matt Conner would like to hear more about Knowledge Unlatched, which has appeared in the SAG 1 reports. What is its connection to scholarly communication? KU wants a bunch of universities to become members (at a price) to pay for books that we unlatch. Those books will be available via OA throughout the world. The pilot, which took place last year, raised some questions, which are being resolved; some involve metadata. This effort is to spread OA. The titles are not necessarily the work of faculty. About 12 publishers are participating; I can send the list to the Exec Bd. UCLA is not on the steering committee and will not be going forward with this project. Renewed membership for a second year.

Why is SAG 1 and not SAG 3 working on this? The aspect of scholarly communication the KU project is about is supporting OA.

3. SAG 2/Scholarly Research Communication (Susan Perry)
<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sag2>

Met last week, and a coordinating committee member's update said there will be a series of webinars for all library staff for everyone to learn about the collaborative projects coming out of the libraries from the SAGs. This series grew out of a conversation last year between the SAG reps and LAUC Chair 2013-2014 Nick Robinson talking to the coordinating committee to increase communication and define roles. The first one will be on the CoUL plans and priorities for 2014-2018 that will be released very soon. After this initial

webinar, there will be 3-4 more webinars, so please send ideas to Susan Perry or Matt Conner.

Update submitted by Susan Perry immediately after the LAUC Exec Board meeting: SAG 2 met last week and received an update from our coordinating committee member, Robin Chandler. She noted that CoUL has approved the CC's proposal for a webinar series designed to keep UC librarians and staff informed on library collaborative projects. The proposal came from conversations that took place with members of the LAUC Executive Board and the CC. The first webinar will be on CoUL priorities for the upcoming year. If anyone has suggestions for the topics of future webinars, please contact a LAUC SAG rep or LAUC President, Matt Conner.

CoUL has contracted with Katherine Kott to survey and evaluate the UCLAS/UC Libraries Advisory Structure and activities during the first year. This should take place during October with the results delivered to CoUL in November.

SAG 2 is also preparing to address the CoUL Plans and Priorities document along with other projects in a face-to-face meeting some time in the next few months.

4. SAG 3/Collection Building & Management (Angela Riggio)
<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sag3>

SAG 3 is pretty good at getting its minutes out 1-2 weeks after each meeting (see <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sag3/meetings>). It would be valuable for us to read those minutes and have questions for LAUC Exec Bd meetings. Meets every other Wed.; last met on Sept. 24; will meet again on Oct. 8.

Highlights: The CLS/Collection Licensing Subgroup has made a lot of decisions, and they're outlined in the Sept. 24 minutes. Shared ILS and the Bibliographers Groups have been the most talked about. LAUC Exec Bd turned in the substantial comments collected from the membership on the Bib Groups. SAG 3 is drafting a letter to the Bib Groups for an update on what they're doing. They need to step back and take a look at the proposal again. This will be an ongoing conversation, and Angela doesn't know how long it will take to get the revisions done.

Angela is on the Shared ILS subgroup, and it wrote a final report to respond to Marshall Breeding's substantial ILS feasibility report and sent it to SAG 3 for comment. It has just been revised and is waiting for a cover letter from chair Diane Bisom. Then it will go to the Coordinating Committee and then to CoUL. The report is objective, and Angela does not know how much of it, if any, CoUL will share.

SAG 3 is also busy with other projects and recently received the AV preservation task force report. They've also been asked to weigh in on the shared metadata policy, which originated in SAG 2. All in all, especially given CoUL's priorities, SAG 3 is still deciding on what its priorities should be for this year.

Matt Conner asked about the Shared Print roadmap, which is a project that keeps coming up. Angela responded that Emily Stambaugh, who runs Shared Print reports to SAG 3 and joins the call every 4-6 weeks. Emily and her two subcommittees have very ambitious plans for the next few years. They now have a revised roadmap that SAG 3 has approved; not sure of its status with CoUL. Shared Print includes de-duping print monograph collections and may take a lifetime. What should be done first? Widespread release of the document should be soon, because it is done.

Matt also asked about a report about a federal documents digital archive, but not one asking for responses. Is there a plan to go forward? Angela Riggio asked for time to review it again (the last two weeks of documents has become a blur) and will provide a summary later. Other questions for Angela? None.

H. Old/Ongoing Business

1. Position papers (<http://lauc.ucop.edu/about/> -- scroll down to "Position Papers and statements")
 - a. Report choices for updating

Matt sent out the poll results. Results were sufficiently mixed, with no majority to retire any of the papers. We won't make a decision now. We'll hold off on all but Position Paper 5 --"The Academic Librarian in the University of California"--until the Spring, when we have time after our membership issue has been concluded. Matt's opinion—and he did not take the survey--is that all the papers could be retired except No. 5, and we can talk about that later.

Position Paper 2--"Development of Effective Communication between Statewide LAUC and Library Council"--is technically obsolete, because Library Council no longer exists. Looking at the LAUC history, that body consisted of CoUL and deans on the various campuses. Nick Robinson pointed out that in 2004 a task force reviewed the Position Papers and recommended that No. 2 be retired. Given the current advisory structure, however, this paper could be revised to include the SAGs, UCLAS, and others as part of LAUC's advisory role. We can address this in the Spring.

- b. Discuss Paper 5 ("The Academic Librarian in the University of California" at <http://lauc.ucop.edu/about/paper05.htm>) and formulate guidelines for membership discussion

From the poll, there was a clear call for revising this paper. It seeks to define academic librarianship and then to prove it. Was this successful, or how can this argumentation be improved? Rikke Ogawa (LA) found the definition of an academic librarian to be lacking, and this goes back to the revisions in the APM that need to be implemented. There are many librarian activities not included in the APM, such as instruction, data curation and metadata. If the APM doesn't change, this position paper should include them. Rita Evans (B) doesn't think listing every librarian "activity" is necessary; it's better to address the skills and what's needed at a higher level.

Matt found the definitions to be porous. The present paper describes activities that plenty of non-LAUC members—including library assistants--perform. The current description does not distinguish LAUC members and the Librarian series from other library employees. Dean Rowan (Parliamentarian) has noted the legal details of professionalism, but those don't define us from other library workers.

Diane Mizrachi noted that our roles will evolve, and the skills needed for them will also change. Matt observed that this paper sets out to define but also to assert/imply (without stating) the value of an academic librarian. Does this mean the value of the Librarian series? The current LAUC membership? The various kinds of work we do?

Angela Riggio noted that the first two paragraphs clearly look like librarian tasks to her—very specific to LAUC. Matt said that at UCD, UL MacKenzie Smith wants to hire the best possible people for the UCD libraries, whether they are part of the Librarian series or not. She is in favor of the LAUC principles, but she won't let them prevent her from hiring someone outside of Librarian series. Do we have a response to that? Is there more we can say about the real-world value of the Librarian series? Diane Mizrachi said at CoUL other ULs have expressed the same sentiment; this is a trend we can't ignore. Matt added our definitions are fine for the paper, but can we do better?

Debbie Murphy (SC) noted that at her campus, the strategic planning group questioned why LAUC is spending a year or more on a concept that doesn't appear to be all that critical. Why not be more outward-looking? Like MacKenzie Smith, why not simply focus on the best person for the job, not just because that person is a librarian. Debbie doesn't necessarily agree with that, but these are the people LAUC advises, and the ULs consider this a non-issue. Matt responded that we care about being designated academic employees, but do the administrators? They are very practical and are focused on tangible results. We can use the position paper to provide arguments we can use when faced with these kinds of questions outside. Just coming up with a definition won't do the job.

Rikke Ogawa (LA) noted that part of being an academic is knowing the theory, process, and structure of the area of study, and how they apply in a philosophical and practical

way. As librarians we're trying to say we see value to academic preparedness (and not address the MLIS specifically), for the field you've chosen to go into, and that theory and process should inform the structure and practicalities of what MacKenzie has described. Maybe this looks like having someone with a PhD to lead an education program or someone with a MLS to lead a cataloging group. And for both to provide leadership on a national level. Matt summarized this by saying about the MLS or academic librarian identity is a comprehensive quality that is missing from some of these others. We may have specialists for a wide variety of tasks that library employees perform, but none have the comprehensive view of the profession that the MLS provides. This comprehensive quality to the librarian field may be unique to us; it gives us the ability to see the big picture in a library context/framework. We should explore this further, including the notion of independence, independent thinking, and meeting/maintaining standards. We also may want to address history and tradition (library foundations?) in addition to the new types of work we do. Also ethics and service. Rikke Ogawa: current and future practices should be grounded in the context and theory of librarianship (or info studies, or whatever we want to call it). Do our non-MLIS colleagues make decisions based in the principles of our field?

Matt wondered if there is an analogy here between libraries no longer being the sole keepers of information repositories; the Internet, Google and other entities are players in this field. Libraries are now guides to/for information. Correspondingly, librarians are no longer the only experts on library activities; we have library assistants, IT experts, PhD-holders, and others at our side. Although we are no longer the only ones with library knowledge, maybe we are now the ones to maintain standards or the context against which to judge the innovations. Debbie Murphy (SC) noted that it's one thing to have access and another to maintain and preserve access.

ACTION: Matt will summarize the details and put information on the wiki. Then the divisions will respond to them.

Question: What do we as librarians spend our time doing? CoUL and others have urged LAUC to pursue this. The membership issue is so abstract and difficult to approach directly, let's think about what LAUC does and what it would like to do. Matt read from the LAUC history (<http://lauc.ucop.edu/history/25yrs.html>), referring to one of the earliest assemblies in the 1960s, listing—in priority order--what our founders considered to be the most important issues to LAUC:

- Voice in the development of library policy ("first and most important")
- Recognition by university administration of LAUC and its local divisions
- (variety of related concerns) Security of employment, sabbaticals, access to research and continuing education
- (also important) Salaries, classification criteria for the new, 3-rank Librarian series, need to increase the professionalism of the university's librarians

- Necessity to establish goals and begin to work toward improving library services.

If we use this as a rubric, how do these priorities line up with our divisions' current concerns and activities? Matt noted that at UCD, for the last two years, the conversations were about salaries and technical things that are way down this list. In very few cases did library policy come up, which is at the top of the LAUC list. Diane Mizrachi said LA has spent a lot of time on safety issues, emergency preparedness, but did some advising through brown bags and meetings with (then-) UL Gary Strong. He objected to these ideas at first, but over time LAUC saw some of these ideas implemented, whether or not Gary credited LAUC with raising them. Strong's successor, Ginny Steel, has continued this.

At UCLA, the issue of professionalism has also been brought up, specifically whether the MLIS degree is required in job postings in the Librarian series. Given that LAUC-D has spent so little time on library policy, Matt wonders to what extent other divisions are addressing policy. Diane Mizrachi suggested that looking at division chairs' annual reports would tell us what each is trying to accomplish and how they work with their library administration. Matt suggested a survey, asking to what extent do the LAUC divisions advise on library policies?

ACTION: Matt and Diane will create discussion guidelines for Position Paper 5 and send it to the Exec Board, including the original LAUC priorities (in bullets above). It may lead to a survey to see how today's divisions' activities match up with them. Matt will put this up on the Wiki right away.

2. Membership Update

Local responses to LAUC Exec Bd's report on the membership issue? Keith Powell (LAUC-I) has gotten some questions on whether there will be some wider, guided discussions. And, yes, there will be.

Updates: How do we spend our time as LAUC members? From Matt's observation, we spend at least half our time on procedures in the Librarian series, such the review process, professional development, research funding, etc. At least half of that is specific to the Librarian series. If we were to consider the "big tent" option (make LAUC membership open to those outside the Librarian series who do librarian work, thereby enlarging membership), giving new members full privileges, including voting, doesn't make sense, because they are not subject to this system. Conversely, if we remove voting privileges, the core membership functions are thrown out. In terms of fairness, the "big tent" option isn't workable. So, revisions to membership would be minimal. Matt asked for Exec Bd reactions to this line of reasoning. This still leaves issues for us to address, such as remaining relevant.

Rikke Ogawa (LA) asked Matt to restate it. He expanded by saying a lot of LAUC is based on an infrastructure based on the Librarian series, so if we introduced new members with voting rights, they'd be able to vote on review procedures, research funding, and other rules and criteria that don't apply to them but to others. She noted that at UCLA this is true for the AULs and the Assistant Law Librarians. Matt countered that at UCD the law librarians observe the same review procedures as the other librarians; at UCLA there are law librarians in the Librarian series, but there is a separate Law Librarian series, too. In what Matt contends is an unfair situation, at UCLA those in the Law Librarian series may vote on issues that apply to those in the Librarian series and not to them. Rikke noted that those in the Law Librarian series are mostly department heads. Matt responded that if LAUC opened its doors to others, such as library assistants with the MLIS degree—represented by a different collective bargaining unit—this could lead to problems.

Bruce Abbott (D) asked if excluding groups would lead to organizations parallel to LAUC? Matt noted that groups like Library Assistants are already excluded. It was noted that “affiliate” (second class) members with less than full privileges will have less incentive to participate fully. We could devise a system in which some members are recused in certain situations, but it could get really complicated and unwieldy. Matt doesn't think it's a good option systemically. We don't have to resolve this now. CPG/Committee on Professional Governance will be working on this.

Looking again at the LAUC history, the inclusion of AULs was an issue from the beginning. In the original proposal, all ULs and AULs were excluded from membership, and it was rejected by UCOP for that reason. UCOP's stance was if the rationale was to model LAUC on the Academic Senate, excluding the leadership/management “vitiates the analogy” and makes LAUC look more like a trade union.

A new proposal has come up to resolve this. Instead of handling this through membership changes, we handle it through policy. We create a new standing committee at the division level—a consultative committee for all non-members of LAUC. (library assistants with MLIS degrees, IT people, etc.). They cannot vote but can confer with LAUC, cooperate with LAUC on policy questions not related to Librarian series issues, share information, report on issues, participate in discussions, take LAUC information to their home groups, etc. They would not be considered LAUC members. “Membership” in this group would be fairly open. At least at UCLA, there are already plenty of committees like this with members within and without the Librarian series. Would this consultative committee be redundant in such an environment? The consultative committee would be analogous to other standing committee and would be charged by the division chair. This is an option for us to have the CPG to explore.

I. New Business

1. APM review update – We have received the new draft of the APM will make it available to only the Exec Bd and our designated specialists.
2. **ACTION: Matt will send it out to the Exec Bd. And our experts. We will reflect on it and discuss it online and during our next conference call. Our first review is due on November 21.**

J. Round Robin of Divisions

Berkeley (Rita Evans)

The Provost's decision to not fund LAUC-B after 2014-2015 continues to be a matter of intense discussion. We will be soliciting member input regarding their priorities for the division's functions. The UL has stepped in to fund this year.

ExComm/Executive Committee will vote on approving the revised Berkeley review procedures at the October meeting, so they will be in alignment with the MOU.

Open positions (new announcements):

- Digital Project Archivist (2)
- Processing Archivist

Davis (Bruce Abbott)

This July everything from the 2-yr-long reorganization was made operational. They are adjusting to changes and still trying to figure out whom to report to and what portion of their responsibilities go to which functions. Currently advertising for several positions, with more to be posted. Libraries recently got some Mellon and other grants for metadata and scholarly communication.

Irvine (Keith Powell)

LAUC-I has presented the membership issue to the full division and will be scheduling discussion in the near future

Los Angeles (Rikke Ogawa)

The results of the Ithaka S+R survey of the faculty were presented to the library as a whole; comment received. Upper administration from several campuses were also in the room. [Secretary's note – see <http://blogs.library.ucla.edu/sel/2014/04/25/faculty-survey-ithaka-sr/>]

Merced (Elizabeth McMunn-Tetangco)

New website will go online in Winter.

Riverside (Rhonda Neugebauer)

No new hires, except for a Wikipedian-in-residence. He will work off-site.

San Diego (Penny Coppernoll-Blach)

Have 10 academic recruitments in progress. Hired 9 in 2013-14, so the reorganization—now in its second year--has been productive. Newest on board is Amanda Axel, the Salk archivist

San Francisco (Evans Whitaker)

Nothing to report of interest to LAUC.

Santa Barbara (Kristen LaBonte)

Interviewing for a 2-yr appointment for Assistant Music librarian. Also searching for a head of special research collections and will be hiring a head-hunter firm this time, because the last search for this position failed.

Santa Cruz (Deborah Murphy)

The library management group is involved in strategic planning for the next one or more years. Invited D. Murphy as LAUC-SC chair to participate. Recently posted the position of AUL for Planning & Resource Management.

Matt called for last remarks/comments/questions. Rhonda Neugebauer (R) responded, noting that when a library reorganizes, we can confer with the union about changing work conditions and terms of employment. When the entire advisory structure reorganized on us (e.g., CoUL, SAGs), did we see this as a workload change? At UCR, this change made some work more time-consuming, with little or no time to give to LAUC systemwide projects. Matt noted this is a valid concern, but unions operate on a local level, not so much across the entire system, and the revision of the consultative structure was for all campuses. Workload is being addressed by the matrix organization, in which people will be repurposed for different tasks, making the organization more efficient without additional people, but individuals may end up with more work.

Rita Evans (B) asked about the APM revision, which Matt will send out in a day or two. How we want to formulate our response is up to us. We can discuss this further at our next conference call. Rita urges all of us take the revision very seriously and to read it carefully. We have our experts, such as Adam Siegel, and the revisions highlight changes from the previous version, so they are easy to see.

J. Adjournment

Rikke Ogawa (LA) moved to adjourn, Penny Coppennoll-Blach (SD) seconded it. The meeting was adjourned at 2:52pm

Next conference call date/time: [November 6, 2014](#) 1-3pm

