

LAUC-SD MEMBERSHIP MEETING

Minutes – April 26, 1994

Geisel Room, 2:30 p.m.

Present: L. Abrams, P. Brueggeman, K. Cargille, L. Claassen, R. Coates, K. Creely, J. Donovan, S. Galloway, J. Hanson, C. Haynes, C. Hightower, M. Horres, C. Jahns, E. Kanter, R. Lindemann, K. Lo, K. Lucas, A. Perez, A. Prussing (Chair), B. Renford, E. Robinson, C. Stave, T. Weintraub, B. Westbrook.

Report of LAUC-SD Nominating Committee

K. Lucas (committee chair) distributed a copy of the 1993/94 LAUC-SD roster and a copy of the Tentative Slate for 1994/95 elected and voluntary positions. K. Lucas proposed that, to stay within the calendar (June 1 election), rather than presenting the slate at a later membership meeting, that this tentative slate be presented today and the floor be opened for nominations, in keeping with the LAUC-SD Bylaws, and that a final slate be distributed to the membership prior to elections without holding another membership meeting. Those in attendance approved this proposal, and nominations were opened. There being none, and with no candidate for Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect yet on the slate, A. Prussing noted that lack of interest in running for that position is a serious problem. K. Lucas will continue to seek candidates for that position in hopes of filling it before elections are held.

Report of CAPA Progress to Date

B. Renford (chair) offered a statistical report of CAPA's progress this year. Twenty-six librarians' files were originally listed for review, of which two were mooted by resignations. Two of these remain under review, and three are with ad hoc committees. "Blue Letter Day" has been scheduled for May 16, at which time as many decision letters as are ready will be delivered. Keeping to one date for all decision letters being posted is a valued goal of CAPA this year since it is hoped that anxiety and confusion among those awaiting decisions will be reduced. J. Hanson indicated that funding for merit increases and salary restorations remain hoped for but is not yet assured.

Report of LAUC-SD Gopher Progress to Date

E. Kanter presented draft menus to show the proposed organization of the LAUC segment for InfoPath. This structure accommodates areas for local documents, such as minutes, bylaws and rosters, and statewide documents, such as bylaws, position papers, and committee reports. The first priority will be to load readily available online resources; loading other documents that are not yet machine-readable remains problematic and requires further study.

Follow-up Report on LAUC Recruitment Lunches with Interviewees

A. Prussing reiterated the general concepts and principles surrounding recruitment lunches. The focus for these should be general and conversation should concern librarian collegiality, professional development, and matters of local interest separate from specific departmental or duties-related matters. It is desirable that LAUC participants be disassociated from the recruiting department/unit, although departmental affiliation will sometimes be unavoidable and should not be ruled out absolutely.

Discussion for Division Response: Proposed revised Academic Personnel Manual Section 615

A. Prussing led a discussion concerning the document "Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual Section 615 -- Salary Increases" (February 16, 1994) in response to J. Wilson's call for comments on the proposal. Copies of the draft were distributed to those in attendance. The major change focuses on authorizing salary increases ONLY after approval of the UC budget by the Governor and the formal adoption of the UC budget by the Regents, even though the "normal" effective date shall be July 1.

- The term "normal" seems to have ambiguous meaning that might be clarified.
- Loss of reference to retroactive compensation is concerning, and there was clear consensus that language addressing retroactive possibilities be inserted.

Discussion for Division Response: Draft LAUC Position Paper No. 6

A. Prussing led a discussion concerning this Berkeley based draft, which highlights the need for flexibility at review time in response to increased reassignment of duties and responsibilities during the recent past.

- Is this paper responding too much to recent crises rather than to broad, ongoing concerns that position papers ought to address?
- Flexibility has always been a consideration. What specifically does this document contribute to help CAPA in interpreting or evaluating a review file? The language of this draft is too vague to provide much help.
- Could this draft ultimately be used as an argument against criteria 2-4? Could others argue that support for professional development should diminish if that facet of review lacks consequence?
- In summary, response to the draft reflected hesitancy and inadvisability--it seems to bring no added value to the review process.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Richard Lindemann, Secretary