

**Librarian Association of the University of California
Executive Board Conference Call
Thursday, April 9, 2015 1-3pm**

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

MINUTES

Matt Conner called the meeting to order at 1:03pm. He observed that we are in the middle of our LAUC marathon, with Special Assemblies (via conf. call) on April 7 and 14, today's Exec Bd meeting, a webinar tomorrow, and everything culminating in the annual Assembly on Friday, April 17, at UCSD. Today's meeting will not need to go on any longer than it needs to [NB: Today's meeting was adjourned at 2:52pm].

A. Roll Call (Christina Woo)

President:	Matt Conner
Vice-President/President-Elect:	Diane Mizrachi (outdoors at the Science Center at USC)
Past President:	Nick Robinson
Secretary:	Christina Woo
Parliamentarian:	Dean Rowan
SLASIAC representative:	Susan Koskinen
SAG 1 representative:	Diane Gurman
SAG 2 representative:	Susan Perry
SAG 3 representative:	Angela Riggio
Web Manager:	Julie Lefevre
Assembly Planning:	Roger Smith for Penny Coppernoll-Blach

LAUC-B:	Rita Evans
LAUC-D:	Bruce Abbott
LAUC-I:	Cynthia Johnson, Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, for Keith Powell, Chair
LAUC-LA:	Rikke Ogawa
LAUC-M:	Elizabeth McMunn-Tetangco
LAUC-R:	Rhonda Neugebauer
LAUC-SD:	Roger Smith for Penny Coppernoll-Blach
LAUC-SF:	Evans Whitaker
LAUC-SB:	Kristen LaBonte
LAUC-SC:	Deborah Murphy

Committee chairs:

Diversity	Carla Arbagey
R&PD/Research & Professional Development	Diane Mizrachi
CPG/Committee on Professional Governance	Matt Conner & Dean Rowan reporting

B. Announcements (Matt Conner)

UCLAS/UC Libraries Advisory Structure webinar on the UC Libraries Digital Collection (UCLDC) is tomorrow. Rosalie Lack, Chair of the UCLAS Coordinating Committee, has worked to make this comprehensible and engaging, and she will be at our Spring Assembly on April 17 at UCSD. The series, including links to webinar recordings: <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/cc/projects-groups/uclas-webinar-series>

C. Approval of minutes March 5, 2015 (Christina Woo)

Rhonda Neugebauer will send edits of her LAUC-R round robin. The minutes approved, pending those changes.

D. Review of action items from March minutes (Matt Conner)

1. Approved R&PD guidelines sent to Web Manager Julie Lefevre for posting to the website - **DONE**
2. APM/Academic Personnel Manual proposed revisions to be distributed when they become available – **DONE** (although most, if not all, of our revisions were not accepted)
3. Call for Assembly reports, of committee chairs, President, representatives to SLASAC and SAGs - **DONE** – due to Marlayna Christensen (mkchristensen@ucsd.edu) by 5 pm tomorrow for posting on the Assembly website
4. Delegate roster sent - **DONE**
5. Online discussion opened on the listserv for feedback on the CPG draft - **DONE**
6. March 6 deadline for system feedback on the CPG – **DONE**
7. Check on progress of UCLAS/UC Libraries Advisory Structure blog – Matt checked with Rosalie Lack, Chair of the UCLAS Coordinating Committee. After the departure of Marlo Young, Communications officer, this has been put on hold. No need for monthly blog postings. **DONE**
8. Discussion points for the Librarian series Assembly session were sent to presenters Brian Schottlaender (UCSD UL) and Tammy Dearie (UCSD AUL) and also to CoUL/Council of University Librarians – no response, not even from UCI UL Lorelei Tanji, who has been conscientious about responding. We'll see what happens at the Spring Assembly. **DONE**

ACTION: Matt will send these discussion points to the membership next week.

9. Campus chairs contacted regarding redesign session at the LAUC Assembly on April 17. Presenters at the afternoon session will be from Riverside, Berkeley, San Diego - **DONE**
10. UCI UL Lorelei Tanji's suggestions for webinar topics posted to bspace - **DONE** by Matt Conner

E. Systemwide Committee Reports

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

As reported in the last LAUC Exec Bd meeting, in the second call for presentation grants, R&PD received 26 applications for a total of \$17,493.00, but had less than \$5,000 remaining to distribute. The committee decided not to fund anyone who had received a statewide R&PG grant in 2013/2014 or who had received funding during this year's first call in January; that left 18 requests for about \$11,000. R&PD then came up a formula to award remaining applicants 42% of their request. That came to just \$21 over the remaining funds, which Matt Conner provided from the LAUC Presidential fund. All applicants have been notified.

R&PD committee sent to Matt Conner its recommendations for additional, more detailed guidelines, which he shared with the Executive Board--**see Appendix A**

Do we want to approve these to add to the existing guidelines? Discussion: The comments centered around whether the new text would discourage previous awardees from applying again—perhaps spending considerable time on their proposals—because having already received funding is a criterion that might be held against them. The problem, however, is we don't know from year to year how many people will apply, how strong/worthy the applications will be, nor the amount of funding. So, a proposal that would receive

funding one year might not during another year, depending on the funding available and the competition for it. Some cautioned that it was better to say less than more in explaining why a request was not funded.

Does the second sentence add enough to be meaningful? Dean Rowan said the existing language describes the criteria: <http://lauc.ucop.edu/committees/rpd/resguide-rev.html#criteria> This includes, "Proposals that do not meet the criteria specified by these guidelines will not be funded even if funds are available."

Bruce Abbott (D) pointed out that the R&PD owes the applicant feedback on why a proposal was not funded. There should be some level of objectivity in judging how well the criteria were met or not. Providing the information can help the applicant do a better job the next time. Letters to applicants who are not funded vary from year to year in describing the shortcomings of the proposals.

Returning to our question of whether to accept the new guidelines or not:

"The committee endeavors to award grant funds as fairly as possible. However, the annual pool of viable applications may vary in number, type of grant, and amount of support requested, exceeding the amount of available funding. Such instances recommends some flexibility in deciding the distribution of awards including, as needed, consideration of recent LAUC grants awarded to the applicants."

Dean Rowan reminded us that the current guidelines (see URL above) say "Proposals will be evaluated by the criteria identified in Section III of these guidelines." (- I. Purpose) That section lists the 6 "Criteria for Judging Proposals"—see <http://screencast.com/t/Ki4kutfp> -- and the hopeful applicant assumes s/he will succeed or fail, depending on how well his/her proposal meets each one. When there is insufficient funding for that year's applicants, s/he could get a letter saying "Your application was not funded this year, because you got an award last year." The existing language leads the applicant to believe s/he has some control, i.e., knows the criteria and can craft a proposal to meet or exceed them. Being told, because the R&PD arbitrarily drew a line, that the reason for denying funding was because of last year's award steps outside the existing guidelines. If we want to use other criteria, such as previous funding, these guidelines need to specify that they are not the sole criteria for judging proposals.

Rikke Ogawa (LA) asked about text in the Revision of presentation grant guidelines (Winter 2015) – slated to go into effect on September 1, 2015 (link to this Word doc at "Guidelines update" at <http://lauc.ucop.edu/committees/rpd/index.php>). Elizabeth McMunn-Tetangco also suggested some wording to give the R&PD more discretion, so the committee is tethered less tightly to the criteria as written. Rikke then asked if we as the Exec Bd need to vote on a committee's guidelines. Matt Conner said this has been our practice, and Dean Rowan confirmed that if the committee has been charged to create guidelines for LAUC, then the Exec Bd does need to approve them.

With so many different proposals for language, Matt Conner decided to continue this online and then come up with final wording to vote on. **ACTION: We will table this for now, discuss this revision and possible alternatives online, and then put it to a vote online.**

Discussion of second proposed text on specific funding caps:

- Limit Research Grants to \$5000. [current guidelines: no maximum]

- Keep the Mini research grants at the current \$500
- Cap Presentation grants at \$600. [current amount is \$750]
- Distribute any remaining funds evenly among applicants as relevant.
- Reserve at least \$10,000 for Presentation Grants awards in the second call.

This year's ACRL (March 2015) in Portland OR and ALA Annual (June 2015) in San Francisco as attractive conference sites may have generated the unexpected increase in applications for R&PD funding. The previous year's requests were much less robust, and the year before, the committee ran out of funding. Maybe we should wait a year to see if these caps are really necessary. Are there any disadvantages of implementing these caps sooner than later? Nick Robinson noted that making these "hard caps" part of the guidelines might discourage applicants—especially those planning on international research—from submitting proposals, given the past practice of awarding larger sums to ambitious projects (this list shows a few awards of over \$5,000 <http://lauc.ucop.edu/committees/rpd/recipients/recipients.php>). But Nick Robinson—who's been through this before when he was Vice-Pres./Pres.-Elect—offered the possibility of making the second call open not only to Presentation Grants, if the hard caps for the first call had enough undistributed funding. This flexibility exists now; the 2013-14 Ad Hoc Committee on LAUC Research Grant Program (<http://lauc.ucop.edu/committees/ahrg/index.php>) said each R&PD can decide on how much money to reserve for the first and second call, and what kind of applications can be submitted at each call.

From the discussion, Matt summarized that it appeared that approving these funding changes now would potentially disadvantage at most the applicants hoping for funds larger than \$5,000 (very few). Also, if these guidelines don't work, they can be addressed again. Matt Conner entertained a motion to vote on item 2 to approve. Rita Evans (B) so moved. Debbie Murphy (SC) seconded it. Voice vote of ayes win. No nays. Item 2 is approved and adopted.

2. Website Revision Ad Hoc (Julie Lefevre)

Since the last Exec Bd meeting, the committee met last month and discussed the preliminary build (announced at the March Exec Bd meeting) and gathered feedback for the development team. Then Julie met with the developer to discuss how to implement the proposed revisions into the site; that work is ongoing. The end of the build-out phase is at hand—getting the architecture and structure in place. The next phases are content migration and display refinements, plus working on the Meet Our Members section, which Carla Arbagey will report on for the Diversity Committee (next agenda item). Julie had hoped to report more but has been away from work the last few weeks, which has limited progress. She had hoped to have a site to demo at today's meeting but does not. Now that she is feeling better, she hopes to make progress during the next few weeks. Roll out of the new site in May/June is still a possibility. The developers have been working hard and are turning things around for LAUC.

3. Diversity (Carla Arbagey)

Carla asked everyone to refer to a document on Meet Our Members she sent to the Exec Bd—*see Appendix B*—and would like feedback, especially on the selection criteria. No voting is required on this. Work is progressing well. A few members have already responded to the call to be featured on the new LAUC webpage. Matt Conner considered the questions thoughtful and full. Julie Lefevre added that the selection criteria are meant to provide transparency, so members who are featured know why they were chosen. Rita

Evans (B) observed that, given the last discussion on criteria for funding R&PD proposals, making selection criteria public is wise, and the criteria are appropriate. Carla was concerned that the “writing quality” criterion might work against librarians whose first language is not English. Specifically, Meet Our Members submissions that need little to no editing will be selected over those that do.

How does Meet Our Members address “diversity”? The focus of this feature on the LAUC website is not to highlight members who embody diversity, especially since the 2012 LAUC Diversity Committee report showed that the LAUC membership is not very diverse in the traditional sense (e.g., race/ethnicity, religion, language fluencies). So, to include everyone, Meet Our Members uses “Candidate’s involvement in professional activities that cover aspects of diversity” as one selection criterion.

4. Assembly Planning (Roger Smith for Penny Coppernoll-Blach)

Planning is moving ahead well. Roger Smith is most involved with recording technology, such as making sure the recording goes smoothly and is made available afterward on the Assembly website and perhaps Youtube as well. Afternoon sessions will be video-recorded, and remote participants will be able to communicate via chat. We then discussed the nuts and bolts of the afternoon campus redesign panel session: have questions after each presentation, or wait until all have spoken? How much Q/A time? How do we want to structure this? Recalling how separate the presentations were on last year’s reorganization panel (featuring Berkeley, David, and San Diego) Rita Evans (B), who moderated it, hoped this year the talks would be more integrated and provide more time for questions. How to integrate the chat questions? Questions from in-person attendees? It’s important to leave enough time—30 min.--for these. We want to make sure our presenters do not run too long. Roger is making sure there is a separate person designated to monitor the chat line, not the in-person moderator.

We have 80 registrants, and Matt Conner has nearly depleted the President’s budget. Everyone is on his/her own for travel to/from the airport. He commended LAUC-SD for their diligent work on quality local arrangements and support, including technology.

ACTION: Matt will send out a series of announcements next week to encourage remote attendees.

5. CPG/Committee on Professional Governance (Matt Conner and Dean Rowan reporting)

Done! The deadlines on the ambitious timeline to distribute details to the divisions, collect input from them, analyze and digest it, etc., has culminated in text that is now ready for the annual Assembly in a few days, on April 17 at UCSD.

6. Election Committee (Matt Conner, Diane Mizrachi)

Committee is President Matt Conner, Vice-Pres./Pres.-Elect Diane Mizrachi, and CPG member Mitchell Brown. All state issues, including the Bylaws revisions approved at the August 2014 Special Assembly for a vote and the revisions to Article III of the Bylaws that are currently under discussion (if they are approved at the April 17 Statewide Assembly to go to membership for a vote), and the LAUC Vice-Pres./Pres.-Elect and Secretary candidates will be on a separate, state ballot. Divisional elections will go on as usual but will include only division candidates and issues.

One of the tasks for the statewide Election Committee is to determine who is eligible to vote. The original plan was for divisions to decide on which of their members could vote, and bylaws changes would become effective after the election. But UCOP told us early on that the title codes are the criterion. Therefore, librarians who do not currently have a title code in the Librarian series—including those who used to have one but have been reclassified into another series—cannot vote in the statewide election. Matt Conner will send each division a list with an explanation. He will ask that the division not send the state ballot to those not eligible to vote. The divisions can still do as they please with their local elections. Matt Conner will compose a message describing this change to the divisions for distribution. Ideally, those not eligible will not even learn of the state ballot on the Survey Monkey website.

ACTION: Matt will email the divisions with the rationale for those not in the Librarian series not voting on the state ballot. The divisions will share this information on their campuses.

Following up on the email she sent to division chairs and secretaries at the end of March, Christina Woo reminded everyone that the Systemwide Election calendar calls for nominations from the floor—the general membership—be sent to her by Friday, April 17. They need to include the written consent and biographies of the nominees. They may be a straightforward as the attachments she sent to the division chairs and secretaries of the candidates gathered by the Nominating Committee.

ACTION: Email nominations to Christina at cjwoo@uci.edu by April 17.

F. Advisory Groups

1. SLASIAC (Susan Koskinen)

<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/slasiac/>

Next meeting is May 18. Susan will send a report for the Spring Assembly

2. SAG 1/Scholarly Research & Communication (Diane Gurman)

<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sag1>

SAG1 has had several conference calls since the last LAUC Executive Board meeting. Discussion topics have included

- the UCLAS/UC Libraries Advisory Structure assessment report and proposed reorganization;
- work by the ORCID (Open Researcher and Contributor ID; more at <http://orcid.org/>) Project Team: membership is drawn from SAG1 and non-SAG1 experts at various campuses—they are putting together a pricing model and discussing a plan for outreach for a UC-wide ORCID project;
- implementation of the Symplectic (<http://symplectic.co.uk/>) harvester (in connection with the UC open access mandate);
- the Data Curation Common Knowledge Group's plan to produce instructional videos for students on various aspects of data curation.

We are still behind in posting minutes, but hope to be caught up soon. When they are ready, the minutes will be available for viewing at <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sag1/meetings>. The next meeting via conference call is Friday, April 17.

3. SAG 2/Access, Discovery & Infrastructure (Sue Perry)

<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sag2>

The Shared Metadata Policy, which was charged to SAG2 by CoUL/Council of University Librarians in their Plans and Priorities document last year has been finished by the project team and accepted by CoUL, which is great. What was particularly successful

was that the project team included members of LAUC, through a solicitation via the Exec Bd. Some of the volunteers made it onto this project, so that was a productive way to get more members involved.

The SAG2 subgroup focusing on a long-term strategy for digital asset management continues to work on their scope of work and has been communicating regularly with the UCLDC/UC Libraries Digital Collection project team to take into account the functions in development for this summer's release of the new Calisphere. I encourage anyone interested to attend the webinar tomorrow, which will focus on this project.

The SAG2 discovery subgroup also continues work. The feedback we've received from CoUL/Council of University Librarians is that discovery is complex, and we should break the topic into smaller chunks, so the subgroup is starting with a "state of the system" focusing on Melvyl and the discovery tools it provides for licensed resources in A&I databases.

We're also discussing the recent UCLAS/UC Libraries Advisory Structure assessment report and the Coordinating Committee's recommendations.

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

Angela encourages everyone to read the minutes online. Only yesterday's meeting notes are not posted yet. SAG 3 has been busy, reevaluating priorities in light of the pending recommendations about the UCLAS/UC Libraries Advisory Structure assessment report. The CLS/Collection Licensing Subgroup (<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/cls>), which reports to SAG 3, is analyzing the disposition of campus cost shares for the shared e-resources. The background document they've prepared will be discussed by CoUL/Council of University Librarians this month. The AV Preservation task force was thanked and discharged. Any followup to their report is on hold for now.

The Collection Librarian Group prepared a document that SAG 3 would like to distribute despite CoUL's preference that it be put on hold, pending changes in UCLAS/UC Libraries Advisory Structure. A 3-person, internal group is looking at how to assess the effectiveness of Portico as a journal archiving service. The SAG 3 chair is talking with the Preservation CKG/Common Knowledge Group about it. The Collaborative Digitization Group original team will be thanked and discharged. A new group, consisting of most of the original group plus Special Collections people from some of the other campuses will be carrying out the CoUL-approved vendor proposal for the digitization project on food and drink collections. Myra Appel (Davis) is chairing this group. The Federal Documents Archive update: the work of the oversight team is ongoing. The shared housing agreement CoUL signed was sent to the California State University libraries and to the Government Printing Office. The team is also working on the workflows and disposition of copies to the RLFs.

Matt Conner reminded us that the assessment of the UCLAS/UC Libraries Advisory Structure was sent out. It's been one of our persistent possible Assembly topics, and now it's done. The plan for revisions and possible changes is ongoing and public. Maybe this whole system will change.

G. Old/Ongoing Business

1. Webinar Series

First webinar in the series is tomorrow. It was designed to touch on important issues for everyone. Next one may be on May 12 on the HathiTrust. Late May will feature CDL's Catherine Mitchell on OA/Open Access policy and success of the harvester. June and later topics are not yet firm—stay tuned. We/LAUC were

successful in recommending topics and were well-received by Rosalie Lack, Chair of the UCLAS Coordinating Committee (<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/cc>). The series, including links to webinar recordings: <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/cc/projects-groups/uclas-webinar-series>

H. New Business

1. APM/Academic Personnel Manual - http://ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/_files/apm/apm-360.pdf

We are into the second round of the APM. Divisions now have time to collect input from the membership. Division chairs can decide how they want to collect and collate those ideas. Members may also communicate directly with Matt Conner, who will forward that input to the Exec Bd.. Division reports are due to the Exec Bd the week before June 1, so we can synthesize everything into one coherent document for our June 1 (Mon.) deadline to Janet Lockwood, UCOP Academic Personnel and Programs (<http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/staff/index.html>). Our proposals to widen the criteria for LAUC membership must get approval from CoUL/Council of University Librarians before UCOP will consider it.

Matt Connor recounted that last Fall our recommended revisions for APM 360-4 were not accepted. He followed up with Janet Lockwood and shared a summary of that information with the Exec Bd. There were more exchanges later, and the gist of it all was that Vice Provost Susan Carlson (<http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/staff/bios/susan-carlson.html>) values everyone's opinion, but she's looking for consensus and also for coordination between the APM and the recently negotiated contract, the MOU. Apparently our attempts to expand the definition of librarianship were too different for her to include. She's looking for agreement from CoUL/Council of University Librarians to revise the language before she does anything. Without agreement from CoUL, we can't go anywhere; we need to get our library house in order before approaching her again.

This brings us to our annual Assembly next week. We look forward to hearing the ideas from UCSD UL Brian Schottlaender and UCSD AUL Tammy Dearie at the Spring Assembly on April 17 to address this. In addition, we have a plan. We assembled a working group on revising the APM 360-4 language: Rikke Ogawa (current LAUC-LA Chair), David Cappoli (Rikke's predecessor), and Matt Conner. Rikke will be the plant in the audience to ask, "What do you think about revising the APM?", if that question doesn't get answered in the course of Brian and Tammy's presentation. One way or another, we'll get an answer to that question. Based on their response, Matt Conner will ask UCI UL Lorelei Tanji to see if CoUL/Council of University Librarians is interested in any kind of revision of the APM language. Given how slowly CoUL moves, and their general lack of receptiveness toward this, Matt Conner doubts anything significant will happen before the June 1 deadline. The working group has also been invited by Vice Provost Susan Carlson to talk about this (by phone), and Matt Conner will take her up on this.

Rita Evans (B) said LAUC-B had received comments from a member that she will forward to him. They refer to APM 360 that have to do with discipline and termination after an unsatisfactory review.

ACTION: Matt will check on where we stand with the previous revisions of the APM.

Rikke Ogawa (LA) will bring to the Spring Assembly a resolution of what they discussed recently at a LAUC-LA Spring meeting on the APM 360-4 "definition" wording. UCLA UL Ginny Steel was at that meeting and said

that CoUL had not seen LAUC's revisions, and she felt CoUL was in favor of new language, because she felt the current definitions do not represent what librarians do.

Rita Evans (B) said that Berkeley's UCOLASC/University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (statewide: <http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ucolasc/>) very much wants to know what LAUC would like them to say at her campus. We have some other opportunities to work on this, not solely via CoUL. LAUC, via Matt Conner, will be less shy about contacting CoUL directly this time around.

2. Post-election (June 1) membership policies

There are many different scenarios. If the CPG/Committee on Professional Governance membership revisions are not passed, we will stick with the text of our current Bylaws, but "titles" will refer to "title codes." Reclassified administrators and other librarians without an eligible title code are not members. This affects the LAUC census and requires that non-members be removed from committees and offices. If the revisions are accepted, that sets changes in motion. UCOP is cagey about how long it will take to respond to them—it could be immediate (saying "no" or "yes") or protracted, going through various bureaucratic levels, possibly including Legal Counsel. What do we do while the bureaucratic wheels grind? We want to be ready after the June 1 election. We'll continue on this next month.

3. Future reimbursement

Next year, all of the travel details for Spring Assembly reimbursement will be handled through LAUC, not UCOP. This will involve the Exec Bd. transition meeting and 2016 Spring Assembly. This is a huge logistical undertaking for LAUC.

I. Round Robin of Divisions

LAUC-B (Rita Evans)

Recruitments under way:

- Classics and Germanic Studies Librarian/Research Specialist
- Japanese Cataloging Librarian
- National Writing Project Processing Archivist (temporary position)
- Optometry/Health Sciences Librarian
- Scholarly Communications Officer – this will require a JD but not the MLIS

Current UL Tom Leonard will retire effective June 30. Recruiting process for a new University Librarian continues.

LAUC-B continues to struggle with budget issues which will affect professional development funding. We also anticipate a negative impact on the biannual Distinguished Librarian Award and LAUC-B Conference.

LAUC-D (Bruce Abbott)

Peter Brantley, Director of Online Search Strategies, has been hired. He used to work at UCSF. This position is equivalent to an AUL. Six or seven positions will be posted in the next few months. They will include a head of

Teaching and Learning Services, several line librarians, and Electronic Resources librarian. Libraries are negotiating with other non-library departments on use of space in the libraries.

LAUC-I (Cynthia Johnson for Keith Powell)

The UCI Libraries are pausing on many recruitments until we have a firmer sense of what UC's and UCI's overall budget picture will be in 2015/16. This moratorium may be lifted as early as May (when the Governor's revised budget proposal is released), or July (when the Libraries anticipate receiving our 2015/2016 planning budget), or early fall (when Library Administration allocates funds to the divisions and departments).

We are moving forward on the recruitments that were already advertised:

1. Research Librarian for Teaching, Learning, and Education
2. Electronic Resources Acquisitions Librarian

The Libraries are also beginning Strategic Planning, starting with scenario planning for different possible budget scenarios. We will also begin our second annual discussion about the UCI Libraries' Areas of Strategic Focus. Finally, as the campus' strategic plan takes shape (this process is also just beginning), the UCI Libraries will initiate a parallel process to align our strategic plan with the campus' strategic plan.

Library Administration is also piloting brown-bag lunches with the AULs and UL. Each has scheduled one brown-bag lunch, and everyone in the Libraries are invited to these casual get-togethers to share their thoughts and meet and talk with fellow colleagues.

LAUC-LA (Rikke Ogawa)

LAUC-LA is having challenging time forming a slate for the next LAUC-LA elections. In the libraries over all, there are seven open librarian positions. Interviews for the director of Special Collections, a non-librarian position, have concluded. Bright Spot has been hired as the consulting firm to facilitate the strategic planning. A group of eight people across the libraries will help with that process. Rosenfeld Library (business) has removed most of its books to create a more flexible, "accelerator" work space to launch student entrepreneurial projects. The books that could go to an RLF went to one, and dups were removed. The rest went elsewhere on campus. The Anderson School of Management has separated itself from state funding, so its public-private status is being hotly debated in UCLA's COLASC/Committee on Libraries and Scholarly Communication.

LAUC-M (Elizabeth McMunn-Tetangco)

No recruitments; not much going on.

LAUC-R (Rhonda Neugebauer)

UCR Libraries just hired a Communications and Stewardship director in administration. We have a director of Distinctive Collections Research Center. A Medical librarian position has also been announced. Rhonda has

lost track of how many positions the library has lost. The library is handing over space to other entities, such as a gaming center.

LAUC-SD (Roger Smith for Penny Coppernoll-Blach)

University Archivist position has been posted. Newest hires on board are for Data Services, Reference & Research Services, Rights Clearance Analyst (one-year temporary position in the Digital Library program). Sybil Schaeffer began as the Digital Preservation analyst.

LAUC-SF (Evans Whitaker)

Very quiet. No recruitments.

LAUC-SB (Kristen LaBonte)

Things are not quiet at UCSB, with library construction ongoing. They are looking forward to opening the new library renovation and addition in the Fall. Campus received a \$5 million gift from Sara Miller McCune, and half will go to a new innovation fund for the library. New head of Special Research Collections, Danelle Moon, begins on July 1, leaving a position at SJSU.

LAUC-SC (Debbie Murphy)

No recruitments. The UCSC library is sponsoring a talk by ARL Director Elliott Shore (<http://www.arl.org/about/staff#.VUbB6iFVhBc>) on “19th Century Origins Collide with the 21st Century: the Research Library Conundrum” on Friday, April 24 at 11-noon in the Library.

J. Adjournment

Matt Conner entertained a motion to adjourn: Debbie Murphy so moved; seconded by Rhonda Neugebauer. Ayes win. No naves.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:52pm.

Next conference call date/time: [May 7, 1-3pm](#)

Appendix A

Hi. Below, Diane M. on behalf of R&PD/Research & Professional Development committee is submitting proposals to revise the guidelines for research applications. We will discuss and vote on these at our upcoming meeting on April 9. Please have these available.

Matt

1. Adding the following to the end of the online guidelines for applications for mini and presentation grants. This was requested by an applicant this past call who did not get funded.

"The committee endeavors to award grant funds as fairly as possible. However, the annual pool of viable applications may vary in number, type of grant, and amount of support requested, exceeding the amount of available funding. Such instances recommends some flexibility in deciding the distribution of awards including, as needed, consideration of recent LAUC grants awarded to the applicants."

2. The committee would also like to make the following recommendations. If approved, we will update the guidelines and other documentation.

- Limit Research Grants to \$5000.
- Keep the Mini research grants at the current \$500
- Cap Presentation grants at \$600.
- Distribute any remaining funds evenly among applicants as relevant.
- Reserve at least \$10,000 for Presentation Grants awards in the second call.

Thank you,

Diane

Diane Mizrahi, PhD
Social Sciences and Undergraduate Instruction Librarian
Charles E. Young Research Library
UCLA

Appendix B

Meet our Members report from Carla Arbagey and the Diversity Committee to the LAUC Exec Bd on April 8, 2015:

LAUC System-wide Diversity Committee – Information on Meet our Members Project

Introduction: The LAUC System-wide Diversity Committee is creating a Meet Our Members section on our site to highlight the diversity of our members and to illustrate the excellent work LAUC members are doing both on- and off-campus. Fill out our simple questionnaire (please note, not all questions are required) and you may be featured on the LAUC website!

☑ The Diversity Committee will review all submissions and recommend which should be featured (see Selection Criteria). The Chair of the Diversity Committee will be in charge of accessing/posting content to the LAUC website in conjunction with the LAUC web manager.

☑ None of the following questions will be required. Guidelines will be to answer at least four of the questions.

☑ A photos of the individual is required. Two photos are preferable – one of a regular headshot, and one of the applicant's choosing (a "fun" photo, or a photo of something mentioned in their answers) which will be the "mouse-over" photo.

○ Perhaps we could wait on submitting a photo – e-mail the librarian to request photos once their application is selected?

☑ Initially, the website should have two profiles when it goes live. Another two profiles will be swapped in after two months (see Schedule of Featured Campuses).

☑ Google Form is at: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1Kb_0vpOMkjmGs19TF8OI35x76nk-sknfHUvIwXeCII/viewform

Questions:

1. Name, e-mail address, job title, campus (*required)
2. Current LAUC position with year
3. How many years have you been a LAUC member?
4. When did you start in your current position? (*required, this should be a text-paragraph rather than single line answer, as some of us have more complicated UC stories to share)
5. How did you become interested in librarianship?
6. What is your current or recent role in LAUC, either locally or system-wide?
7. What do you like best about being a UC librarian?
8. Describe a recent or current project on which you are working.
9. Describe your current or recent professional work outside of work, such as association work, writing, research projects, or anything else you would like to share.
10. Describe the first time you worked in a library.
11. What would you like the next big thing in libraries to be?
12. Complete this statement: "One surprising fact about me is..."
13. Can you recommend a book or movie or tell us your favorite book or movie, and why?
14. Please note your website or social media site, if you would like to share.

Selection criteria:

- Candidate's involvement in professional activities that cover aspects of diversity
- ☑ LAUC involvement: is the candidate currently or have they recently been involved in LAUC as an officer or committee leader?
- ☑ Number of questions answered; the more information the better chance for selection
- ☑ Quality of writing in response to the questions
- ☑ Contribution to the profession through teaching, research, or involvement with statewide or national professional organizations
- ☑ Willingness to provide a photo

Schedule of Featured Campuses:

1. Santa Barbara, Irvine
2. Berkeley, Riverside
3. Santa Cruz, San Diego
4. Merced, Los Angeles
5. Davis, San Francisco