

LAUC-SD Membership Meeting
June 16, 1998
Seuss Room

Attending: L. Abrams, D. Ambrose, A. Butros, K. Cargille, L. Claassen (chair), T. Cruse, B. Culbertson, B. Deahl, J. Donovan, S. Dunlap, J. Hansen, M. Harden, C. Hightower, K. Lucas, B. Miller, P. Mirsky, A. Perez, A. Prussing, B. Renford, B. Slater, L. Smart, R. Sonnenberg, D. Talbot, D. Tweedy

Meeting called to order at 3:00 p.m.

1. Election Results:
 - Vice-Chair/Chair Elect: Richard Lindemann
 - Secretary: Sam Dunlap
 - Member-at-Large: V. Williamson
 - Delegate: Craig Haynes
 - CAPA: Anne Prussing, Linda Barnhart
2. Outcome of the Resolutions brought before the LAUC Spring Assembly
 1. LAUC should officially request the the University administration add three more steps to the Librarian Rank (steps VI, VII, and VIII)
 - Passed unanimously
 2. LAUC shall develop criteria for the above named steps, such that the top step would be kept for those librarians whose achievements are regarded as distinguished.
 - Passed, 19 yes, 8 no
 3. LAUC will charge a committee to prepare a report providing recommendations for restructuring the Librarian salary scale
 - Passed, 25 yes, 2 no, 1 abstain
 4. LAUC (until steps are added to the Librarian Rank) will consider Librarian V as a normal merit step
 5. Not passed, 8 yes, 19 no.
3. Results of this year's Librarian reviews
 - 23 files (1 Assistant Lib, 10 Associate Lib, and 12 Librarian) files were reviewed. There were 4 promotions, 17 merit increases, and 3 librarians were accorded career status.
4. Review of CAPA Issues for 1997/1998 Review Cycle
 - D. Talbot distributed a 3 page background document.
 - A. Review Calendar. New review cycle dates have worked well but CAPA suggests revision for more realizable deadlines.
 - B. Notification to Ad Hoc Committees from CAPA. The membership agreed that CAPA notify the Ad Hoc committee chairs twice during the review process--once when CAPA forwards its recommendation to the UL and again when the

- final outcome has been decided. Both times, it was recommended, the notification will be on email.
- C. Additional Documentation. CAPA recommended that LHR should add wording to the section pertaining to Additional Documentation. The question was asked--where does the name come up. It was pointed out that either the Review Initiator and the candidate can be asked or informed. The candidate gets to see the redacted text of the additional documentation if they desire.
 - D. Redacted Letters. Presented as an FYI. Only 15-20% ask for letters. The checklist can be used as a reminder that the candidate can request the letters at any time during the review process.
 - E. Evidence of Management Competency. There was a discussion of how the candidate's supervisory skills should be addressed. K. Lucas pointed out that there is a difference between supervision and management. The supervisor has a different perspective than those being managed. The question for the membership was whether letters from staff/librarians supervised should be included if this is a major segment of the candidate's responsibilities. There was general agreement that either staff or librarians could contribute, although so far this has not been done evenly throughout the files. D. Talbot said that CAPA wants to make sure the candidate's file is well rounded. A. Prussing noted that stipends are based on position, not competency.
 - F. Librarian IV to V. Past practice is providing documentation in this case was for the candidate to review only the past 3 years, leaving it up to the Review Initiator to make the case for the "distinguished career history." The question before the membership is whether the candidate should be more involved rather than just proving what has been accomplished between Levels 4 and 5. It was agreed that the candidate should do a career review as appropriate. Also, should the entire career history (encompassing service outside of UCSD) be included in the documentation, or just service at UCSD. P. Mirsky said yes, but it does also depend the level at which the librarian comes in to the system.

Review process in general-- B. Slater brought up the idea of the review going from the Review Initiator to the University Librarian. This would put a lot of emphasis on the Review Initiator. K. Cargille suggested that CAPA could look at the reviews and could say, "We agree". P. Mirsky said that if this occurred she would be concerned about the lack of peer perspective. B. Slater suggested that we take time to think about it and that we would discuss it as an agenda item this fall.

5. Stipends Process.

The administration felt that the decision as to whether to award stipends was a Cabinet decision. M. Harden provided documentation on what the other were doing and the costs. UCSD will award \$250 a month to each of nine department heads. This is similar to the other campuses, with the exception of UCLA, which is following the academic model (where the stipend is dependent on the size of the department's budget). Very little discussion followed, as it was felt to be a "done deal."