

History of Review Processes on the Davis Campus for Librarians

1. July 1, 1962 - President Clark Kerr declared effective 7-1-62 that professional librarians would be classified as academic employees.

2. July 2, 1962 - Clark Kerr to Chief Campus Officers, "The establishment of campus procedures for appointments, salary increases, and promotions and the maintenance of necessary records shall be the responsibility of the Chief Campus Officer.

3. January 3, 1963 - University Librarian Blanchard to Vice Chancellor Carter. The President has permitted local option in developing review procedures. Blanchard recommended the following delegation of authority: Librarian I - II, University Librarian approves; Librarian III-IV Chancellor approves; and Librarian V, Chancellor approves and ad hoc review by three person committee (one librarian from another campus, Senate member, and a local librarian).

Blanchard - "The procedures are similar to those now in use" at other campuses. "Apparently no reviewing committees will be used....I advise that procedures for Davis be kept as simple as possible to prevent unnecessary administrative work load."

4. February 7, 1963 - Thomas Hanzo, Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate to Chancellor Mrak. The Library Committee of the Academic Senate approved personnel procedures for librarians. They adopted Blanchard's recommendations stated above.

"It is recommended that appointments, promotions, and merit increases under the new plan be cleared through the Davis Campus Academic Personnel Office...."

Librarians I-III. The Chancellor upon recommendation of the University Librarian.

Librarian IV-V & AUL - The Chancellor upon recommendation of the UL and a review committee. Review committee includes (1) tenured faculty, Davis campus (2) librarian of appropriate rank from another campus (3) local library staff member.

5. March 1, 1963 - Chapter II of the University Administrative Manual was amended by the addition of Section B2 -- Appointment and promotion in the librarian series.

B2-6 responsibility for review of librarians rested with the Chief Campus Officer. No mention of the above lines of authority as described in the Senate Library Committee's memo to Chancellor Mrak, February 7, 1963.

6. November 5, 1965 - Clark Kerr to Chancellors: "The change from nonacademic to academic status will not affect existing fringe benefits and working conditions."

7. November 11, 1964 - Blanchard to President Kerr, "On April 11, 1963 the Secretary of the Library Council sent a memorandum to Vice President Wollman recommending criteria for the librarian classes which would be published in the University's Administrative Manual."

8. Statement of Librarian's criteria (developed by the UC Davis librarians, before law librarians were hired)

II. VOICE

C. Procedure

1. The Librarian's Association of the University of California, Davis Division ... advises the University Librarian on matters of mutual concern.

9. Statement of Librarian's review procedures -

I>Appointment and Promotion

C. Promotion and review

4. The performance of each librarian who is eligible for a step increase is reviewed by his department chair. All recommendations for promotion, except for Librarian I to Librarian II, are reviewed by a Review Committee.

Review Committees - The University Librarian shall appoint the members of the Review Committee from a slate of 18 names submitted to him by the Chairman of LAUCD. After it reaches a decision, the Review Committee prepares a report and recommendation which it submits to the University Librarian. The University Librarian submits his/her recommendations to the Chief Campus Officer.

Advancement to the rank of Librarian V is possible in any specialty. Each librarian may expect promotion to this rank if he demonstrates the necessary ability, growth and development. For librarians in administrative positions, promotion usually involves position change; for others, promotion does not necessarily involve change.

10. May 22, 1967 - Report of the Special Committee on Non-Senate Academic Personnel (Spiess Committee). Committee comprised of representatives from most campuses, Blanchard from Davis.

"Ultimately the academic staff should have an opportunity to speak at a level above that of individual departments or University subdivisions. In this context it appears desirable that a single organization should exist to represent the entire academic staff."

The Spiess committee was formed after a recommendation by the

Academic Senate's Committee on Privilege and Tenure to look into the matter of non-senate academic staff.

11. January 15, 1968 - Letter from Eldred Smith, President, LAUC, to Angus Taylor, VP-Academic Affairs.

"...the librarians employed by the University of California have, for the past six months, been engaged in efforts to establish a UC-librarians organization which will provide formal channels for achieving a voice in University affairs (both statewide and local) and a role in University governance."

"It seems important that LAUC open discussions with the University administration regarding its place and role in the University and University affairs,...."

12. January 19, 1968 - Angus Taylor to Members of the Library Council. "I would appreciate any comments which the members of the Library Council would care to offer concerning the appropriate administrative response to the attached letter from Eldred Smith."

13. January 23, 1968 - Response by Blanchard to Taylor
"I believe the Association will provide a useful vehicle through which the library staffs ... can express opinions and advice about library development and staffing problems." As you know, the provision of methods by which non-senate academic personnel may have a voice in University affairs, particularly at the level of their administrative units, has been expressly recommended by the Spiess committee.

14. August 22, 1968 - Ad Hoc Organization Committee for ASD. Loren Owings and David Lundquist were committee members. "Each representative reported that his group favored proceeding to form an organization.

15. November 25, 1968 - Organizational meeting of academic non-senate UCD staff.

"The purpose of the proposed new organization at the University of California, Davis, would be to establish and secure for the non-senate academic appointees, recognition and voice, rights and privileges in university affairs and to advise and assist the administration in making the University of California, Davis, of maximum usefulness to the people of the state."

16. December 4, 1968 - Chancellor Mrak to VP Taylor.
In response to your request for information on developments of an organizational structure for non-senate academic staff, this is the progress to date.

a. a campus-wide ad hoc organization committee was formed.

b. the goal of the committee is to have an organizational plan in place by early 1969.

c. the academic non-senate organization proposed is the only academic structure presently emerging at Davis. Other than the staff of the Division of Agriculture Sciences, the Librarian's Association is the only existing body which represents a group of academic non-senate appointees. Thus far we have not recognized the Librarian's Association as a group to be consulted, or from which to seek advice, on matters which may affect its members.

d. An all encompassing organization of non-senate academic appointees is therefore to be encouraged in preference to the development of separate organizations (for Specialists, for Librarians, etc.) which might tend to be divisive elements within the total University community.

17. February 27, 1969 - LAUCD general meeting

Loren Dwings opened by stating that now that ASD is being formed the question once again surfaces about how people feel about being reviewed by their peers, or their colleagues. Birrell offered that the review committee for library promotions is the AdCom. Dwings suggested that AdCom was not a true peer group, being administrators. Peers should be non-administrative librarians and other non-senate academics.

Discussion followed about the advantages and disadvantages to pure peer review versus broader based peer review. Statements regarding both systems followed: review committees may know nothing of the situation involving library work, and it would be preferable to have librarians on the committee. Another commented that enough enumerative factors should be present so that a review committee would make a good judgment. Another comment suggested that examples of pure peer review in the library field have led to dissatisfaction.

18. April 15, 1969 - Oswald to Chancellor Mrak - Advise giving ASD provisional recognition. Queries:

a. How does this new organization relate to the Librarian's organization?

19. May 27, 1969 - Birrell to Chancellor Mrak: LAUCD is on record in a resolution passed on September 12, 1968, as favoring the establishment of ASD. Several of our members were active during the formative stages of ASD, and many of us hope to be active in the future. Several of our members were candidates for office in the recent ASD election, but as a group the librarians were singularly unsuccessful.

20. February 9, 1970 - VC Dukes to E.Conn and Milton Miller. Last year the librarians were all reviewed by a three-man

academic committee. This year I propose to use one person from each of the following groups: Agronomists (non-senate), Librarians, Professional Research (Non-senate), Specialists, Supervisors of Physical Education, and Supervisors of Teacher Education, plus some representative from the Library School at Berkeley.

21. February 26, 1970 - Blanchard to VC Dukes: A copy of Library Policy Statement C-8 explaining procedures used in recent years is enclosed. It is my understanding that you will also appoint a review committee for Librarians I-III.

22. February 27, 1970 - Birrell to VC Dukes: I have been asked by LAUCD to make two suggestions to you regarding the ASO committee which will review librarians: We suggest that two committees be appointed: one to review librarians I-III and one to review librarians IV and above and promotions to Librarian IV and that each committee include one member who is a librarian or a member of the library school faculty on another UC campus.

23. March 25, 1970 - McCoy to VC Dukes: I should like to recommend that the review procedures for Librarians, Specialists, etc. be revised next year to provide that it will be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Academic Staff Organization, with the proviso that the ASO can nominate Senate members to serve on such committees"

Note: Dr. Conn, chair of the Senate Budget Committee, stated that he believed the Senate would eventually be willing to have exclusive ASO review of persons with titles in the Librarian, Specialist, Supervisor of Physical Education, and Supervisor of Teacher Education series. However, Senate members could serve on the ASO review committees.

24. July 1, 1971 to April 20, 1972 - Annual report of the Budget and Personnel Affairs Committee ASO

Procedural guidelines for Librarians are: "All merit and promotional matters are received by the ASO Budget Committee. All promotional recommendations and all recommendations for merit increases that are greater or less than one-step are sent to the Standing Review Committee for Librarians. The Standing Committee shall consist of three persons holding an appointment in the Librarian series and two members of the Academic Senate."

25. March 21, 1972 - Bill McCoy, Chr, ASO Budget Committee to ASO chair, Bob Pearl.

"One of the most beneficial results of the creation of the ASO has been the recognition that ASD members should have their recommended salary actions reviewed by their peers as well as by members of the Senate. After prolonged negotiations with the Senate Budget Committee and Vice Chancellor Dukes in 1969-70, a

Joint Senate/ASO Budget Committee was established to review salary recommendations for persons holding appointments in the Agronomists, Professional Research, and Specialist series. The Joint Committee has six members, three from the Senate and three from the ASO."

from 87/88
new files

Rosenthal -
Assoc Comm

LAUC FORMATION DOCUMENTS

May 24, 1967 Formation meeting notice.

June 26, 1967 Minutes of meeting. Steering Committee formed.

July 14, 1967 Prelim notes on membership and structure.

August 4, 1967 Working paper #1 dealing with the matter of restructuring the UC classification and salary administration program for librarians.

Nov 6, 1967 Minutes of first meeting (LAUC-D).

Nov 14, 1967 Library Advisory Board (UCB?) Minutes of meeting.

Jan 15, 1968 Eldred Smith (President, Librarians Assoc of UC) Letter to Angus Taylor re: LAUC role. Enclosure: Proposed structure (by-laws)

Jan 19, 1968 Angus Taylor memo to Library Council re: LAUC. Invitation for comments.

Jan 23, 1968 J.R. Blanchard reply to A. Taylor. Express support.

Jan 23, 1968 Robert Vosper (UCLA) Reply. Does not support the concept. Prefers local power with little or no statewide organization. Warns about losing good people and/or unionization.

Jan 23, 1968 J.E. Smith (Irvine) Positive response to Taylor.

Jan 24, 1968 D.C. Davidson (SB) Response to Taylor

Jan 26, 1968 Donald Clark (SC) Response to Taylor

Jan 31, 1968 Donald Coney (UCB) Response to Taylor. Would welcome a disinterested appraisal. Group would have broader interests than union.

Feb 5, 1968 Donald Davidson letter to ULs. Differs with Bob Vospers desire for absolute and complete decentralization of LAUC.

May 18, 1968 Eldred Smith to ? Describes purpose of LAUC... "I believe strongly that each Academic group within the University--faculty,

researchers, specialists, librarians-- is concerned with many matters which are of particular interest to its own members and which they alone among all academic personnel are competent to deal....We librarians hoped to establish a pattern for participation which would be most effective for ourselves and which perhaps could be followed by other academic groups. We believe that truly effective participation demands not two groups, but several groups--one representing the faculty, another the researchers, another the specialists, another the librarians, and so forth."

- Aug 30, 1968 J.R. Blanchard memo to Vernon Lust reformation meeting of ASO
- Dec 20, 1968 LAUC-D Minutes for CUD. Recognized at local level
- Feb 24, 1969 Meeting notice. Agenda item. LAUC should adopt a formal policy on the criteria for the appointment and promotion of librarians.
- Feb 24, 1969 Liaison Committee reports that "Guides for Professional Librarian Classes is only existing formal policy for promotion criteria
- Feb 27, 1969 Minutes of the General Meeting. Peer review discussed. "Since ASO is being formed, how do people feel about being reviewed by peers?" It was suggested we study how well the peer review committee works in the library so that we could judge for ASO how a similar committee might work." "No one knows what ASO will do concerning a peer review committee."
- April 16, 1969 LAUC General meeting minutes "A review committee composed of peers to pass on appointments and promotions is one of the major aims of the Librarians Association; such involvement in library activity is not a matter of being dissatisfied with the present structure, nor a matter of joining the "involvement band wagon" but is an outgrowth of our becoming mature and demanding more responsibility in deciding our professional affairs."
- May 27, 1969 A.T. Birrell letter to Emil Mrak. Regarding attitude of LAUC to ASO. Librarians were

active information and ran for office but were singularly unsuccessful. In general support concept of ASD

- Oct 30, 1969 General membership meeting minutes "The University recognizes ASD, provides office space and secretarial help; the very fact that the establishment is behind ASD may be a stumbling block to LAUC's getting ahead. There is no conflict in the aims and objectives of the two groups" Request for official recognition discussed
- Nov 12, 1969 Report of the Task Force on Academic Library Personnel. Discusses in the Davis response the desirability of all librarians being part of LAUC, not just those in the general library.
- Nov 12, 1969 Contains the whole report, above mainly UCD response. p.5 gives promotion and review procedures; including peer review.
- Dec 30, 1969 UCD Liaison Committee report re: review committees
- April 2, 1970 A consensus of the views of the nine campuses on the statewide issues contained in the report of the Berkeley task force on academic library personnel. (title page only)
- Oct 15, 1970 Robert Lewis (President) to Angus Taylor requesting financial support and recognition
- Autumn 1971 LAUC D Liaison Committee Special report on criteria for merit increases and promotions
- April 3, 1972 C.D. McCorkle memo re: restructure of librarian series and changes in sections 51 4 and 82 of APM
- July 1972 Proposed 1972/73 salary scales
- Nov 10, 1972 Angus Taylor memo regarding proposed special increases in librarian salaries
- March 8, 1973 Executive Board Meeting. Discussed establishment of Assistant Law Librarians without any consultation with LAUC. How to reprimand Vice President Taylor a mystery
- March 14, 1973? LAUCD Program Committee announcement on ASD Budget Committee and you

April 6, 1973	Ted Gould letter to Angus Taylor Reestablishment of Assistant Law Librarian series Cites objective of LAUC to have a voice and play an advisory role in University affairs
May 10, 1973	Spring Assembly development as reported by Dora Biblarz "Startling fact came to light during the deliberations of the Schippers Committee: Since LAUC has never obtained approval of the Regents for status as a "University Unit" (such as Academic Senate it evidently cannot impose involuntary membership on "all persons employed as librarians" ... discovery of fact has grave implications for the status and for all further actions of LAUC, ASO, and University Staff Assembly"
July 1973	Evaluation for merit increase and promotion: criteria, guidelines, and procedures; report to the LAUC by its ad hoc committee. Title page only
Oct 8, 1973	Donald Swain letter to J.R. Blanchard: review procedures for Librarians. "The Budget Committee of the ASO reviews all appointments in the Associate Librarian and Librarian titles; and all merit increases and promotions for the series. A confidential review committee composed largely of professional librarians, assists the ASO Budget Committee in the review of these actions
October 3, 1974	Special Committee to study librarian salaries university of California Rept no 3.(Statewide report) Title page only
October 14, 1974	Notes on program meeting of LAUC with Joan Skinner, 1973 Chair of ASO Budget Review Committee.
October 1974	Report of the peer evaluation committee, librarians association, UCLA. Also copy of library position paper no 1 criteria for appointment or promotion to the rank of librarian
November 1974	Report of the ad hoc committee on promotion review to the executive committee of the librarians assembly, UC Berkeley (Kaske report) page 1 only
December 1976	Procedures for review of librarian

appointments, promotions, and advancement and administrative review procedures for librarians requesting a reconsideration of a salary or promotion decision. UCB Office of the Chancellor.

April 11, 1977 Report of the LAUC ad hoc committee on the top step of the librarian rank. (title page only)

May 18, 1977 Letter from K. Garosi to LAUC Division Chairs. Committee on professional standards for academic librarians. Requests that draft document be read and commented upon.

August 10, 1977 Archie Kleingartner letter to Chancellors regarding advancement to step V of librarian

Aug 19, 1977 Letter of David Saxon to Chancellors regarding librarians not under the direct geographical or administrative jurisdiction of a university librarian. Agrees with LAUC request for guidelines and indicates that Sec 82 will be modified to incorporate these changes at a later date.

Nov 7, 1977 LAUC/ASD study committee report on proposed revision of the supervisor's evaluation form for evaluating librarians. (title page only)

January 1978 APARB communication to LAUC-D Executive Board. Appointments and merit salary increases in the assistant law librarian series

August 30, 1978 Kate Mawdsley letter to LAUC chairs re: ad hoc committee on comparative standards for peer review.

October 6, 1978 Report of ad hoc committee to prepare a statement regarding guidelines for accelerated increases to LAUC Exec Board. (page one only).

Jan 30, 1979 Minutes of general meeting, where Mr. Kreissman emphasized he wished to speed the process and save time....He also felt the whole process was suspect if the review boards opinion is as vital as people feel it is. (page 3 and 4 only).

March 13, 1979 Leon Mayhew communication to administrators re: guidelines for use by the Joint ASD/Senate personnel committee and in the review and classification of specialists and related classifications. Of interest is statement that specialists in charge of documentation centers should be classified as librarians for an appropriate percentage of time.

March 30, 1979 Linda Hoffmann communication to Kate Cifra, Chair of Rev Board regarding C-9. Board will not review normal one-step salary actions.

March 30, 1979 General membership minutes. Peer review discussed. One step salary actions. Argument for not seeing one step is that Review Board has not supplied more substantive comments to the ASD Personnel Committee as it was asked to do.

April 16, 1979 Linda Hoffmann letter to Kate Cifra. Membership decision of March 30 meeting not rescinded. Board will not review one steps.

May 2, 1979 Report on Review Procedures for Librarian Series Davis campus. Approved by VP Blakely." Delegation of authority for this title series has been given to the vice chancellor academic affairs who has assigned review authority to the personnel committee of ASD

May 14, 1979 Ad hoc committee on reporting statistics of peer review report to Virginia Sherwood. Page one only.

May 30, 1979 Report on the statewide executive board meeting . Comments on the May 14 report on peer review statistics.

Aug 4, 1979 Letter of Reve and Hans Rocke to Linda Hoffmann expressing opinion that the review board should read all one step cases. To save time they need not comment unless discrepancies discovered.

Aug 7, 1979 Letter of Margaret Capron to Executive Board regarding Minority report of LAUC-D Review Board.

Aug 8, 1979 General Meeting minutes. Review board annual report (Kate Cifra) discussed. Criteria used was absolute standard not comparative standards.

Aug 28, 1979 LAUC-ASO Study Committee. Report to the membership. "ASO, through its ASO Personnel Committee conducts peer review of its members, and is advisory to the Vice-Chancellor, Academic Affairs. LAUC-D through its review board, has conducted peer review of members of the librarian series in the general library, and is advisory to the university librarian. Peer review at the ASO level, because it reviews all ASO members, processes all the reviews previously seen by the review board, and also reviews other librarians outside the general library as well as appointees in the AUL series and assistant law librarian series....It has been the experience of librarian members of the ASO personnel committee that some of the most perceptive observations about a librarian's performance have come from some of the non-librarian members of the committee and that sometimes the "outsider's" view is the most perceptive."

September 28, 1979 General Membership meeting minutes. Report of Ad hoc LAUC/ASO Study Committee discussed.

Aug 8, 1980 Peattie Committee response to LAUC D Chair Roberta Stevenson re: their final report. Clarifies some points raised.

Aug 19, 1980 Committee II to Review Criteria for merit increase and promotion memo to LAUCD Chair Roberta Stevenson re Ms. Mawdsley's revised statement dated May 27, 1980.

Oct 1, 1980 Leon Mayhew address to LAUC D on peer review. (Page 1 only)

December 1980 Packet containing: 1. B. Kreissman letter to Leon Mayhew re: merit reviews for Assistant and Associate University Librarians 2. ASO Personnel committee memo to Leon Mayhew re: peer review of assistant and associate university librarians 3. Leon Mayhew memo to LAUC Chair Vernon Lust re: review of AULs.

May 11, 1981 Ad hoc committee to comparative standards for peer review (statewide) report to LAUC assembly. Charged to determine whether separate personnel review procedures established on the nine campuses since intro of section 82 have resulted in differing

standards of advancement. No conclusions made.

- Aug 26, 1981 LAUCD General meeting minutes. Baker committee points to be considered listed. 1. importance of Bd in review process 2. time spent in review process 3. Mayhew's comments on lock step 4. ASD and campus conflict on necessity of notification of less than satisfactory performance before negative action taken
- ?? ASD Newsletter vol 6 # 4. Comments on lack of minimal level of peer participation in uncontested one step merit increases...no peer review in law library.
- Oct 22, 1981 LAUC-D Exec Bd minutes. Discusses report of the ad hoc committee to investigate the role of the APARB in the appointment process report.
- Nov 12, 1981 General Membership meeting minutes. AD Hoc committee to review librarians evaluations procedures discussed. ... ASD personnel committee has already raised questions about the librarian review process in its latest report. (May refer to ASD newsletter item above).
- Jan 22, 1982 Judy Ganson (LAUC Pres) letter to Edward Blakely re reclassification vs appointment of assistant law librarian and procedures followed.
- March 25, 1982 LAUC-D Ad hoc committee to review librarian evaluation procedures. Report. (In full)
- April 9, 1982 APARB memo to LAUC-D re: Ad hoc APARB Committee report (Baker report). Disagrees with recommendations in report. Requests 1. Five member board be maintained 2. Board should see all salary actions including 1 step merit 3. Use of ad hoc committees should be optional.
- May 1982 Report of the Academic Personnel Action Review Board Sept 1981-May 1982. Gives recommendations including retention of five member APARB.
- June 15, 1982 General membership meeting. Discussed Baker report recommendations. Action postponed.

Oct 14, 1982

Memo from Jane Kimball, LAUC Chair re: appointment of committee to review LAUC position paper no 1. Appoints committee.

Nov 2, 1982

Memo of Judy Moomaw to Greg Preston. "Review Board unanimously supports the LAUC D vote of July 15 that 1. Review Board be retained 2. See all salary actions for comparative purposes, with the option to comment and make its own recommendations 3. That ad hoc committees be optional at the discretion of the Board.

Nov 4, 1982

General membership meeting minutes. LAUC-D ballot on the review board/administrative response. Membership voted to retain the board and restoring its function to review all recommendations for salary action, including uncontested one step increases. Also voted in favor of making ad hoc committees optional at the discretion of the Review Board. Adm Comm responded that while it favored the Baker report, it would agree to the retention of the Review Board acting on exceptional cases only. Also abolish ad hoc committees.

???

Last page of unidentified report. Discusses LAUC nominating members for ASO personnel board. Did not know how this would be received. Concept was voted on by membership and passed. Committee does not think this is desirable. Situation needs clarification and committee recommends the vote of approval of June 15 be rescinded.