

**LAUC-SD
Membership Meeting**

November 20, 2001
2-4 p.m.
Seuss Room, Geisel Library

Present: D. Ambrose, L. Barnhart, M.L. Bergstrom, S. Berteaux, P. Brueggeman, A. Butros, K. Calkins, K. Cargille, L. Claassen, E. Cowell (convenor), K. Creely, B. Culbertson, S. Deng, M. Din, J. Donovan, S. Dunlap, L. Galvan-Estrada, S. Isozumi, C. Keil, S. Lawson, S. Lawson, K. Lucas, S. McGuinness, R. Melton, P. Mirsky, A. Perez (secretary), A. Prussing, B. Slater, S. Starr, A. Tarango, D. Tweedy, P. Weiss, B. Westbrook, J. Williams, J. Yang

Introductions of New Staff

- L. Barnhart introduced Paul Weiss, Head of Original and Special Materials Cataloging.
- S. Starr introduced Sue McGuinness, Pharmacy Librarian at the Biomedical Library, and Steve Lawson, now in a permanent position at the S&E Library.

Cultural Diversity Committee Report (A. Prussing, Chair)

- The statewide committee has officially changed its name to the LAUC Diversity Committee, our local committee proposes we do the same. Two weeks notice is required, therefore, a proposal will be sent via email to the membership in December for the January membership meeting.
- Plans are to bring back the Film@Noon series for some films on the Middle East. Both library staff and the campus community would be invited.
- Investigating a librarian fellowship program. A. Prussing has contacted Brian Schottlaender and he is interested. UCSB has a two-year program for graduate students.
- Partnering with Brian and Library Administration to organize a series of lectures on the current international situation. Brian suggested Peter Cowhey, Institute on Global Conflict & Cooperation, as a possible speaker, and the Friends of the Library.
- Investigating a mentorship program, similar to USIP, a program run by T. Echavarria, a former librarian. This program would encourage student workers to attend library school.
- J. Williams has updated the Cultural Diversity Committee webpage. He and V. Williamson will add links from Sage.

We have the largest Cultural Diversity Committee in years. Other members are Leslie Abrams and Julie Yang. If you have ideas for the committee, please contact any member.

CAPA Election Results

Will be sent via email next week.

Goals Proposal (Sam Dunlap, CAPA Chair)

After a brief discussion the membership approved the motion to remove the Goals statement from section 15 of the ARPM and add it as Appendix 10 to the APRM. This change is effective immediately. It is still possible that the University Librarian could later ask the librarians to write goals, and Library Administration would determine the mechanism and reporting procedure.

Proposed Changes to the ARPM (Sam Dunlap, CAPA Chair)

1. Clarification of the concept of "Review Initiator"

Background: In some departments there are cases where the Department Head may delegate portions of the review process to the Immediate Supervisor. Current library vocabulary speaks of the "Review Initiator," yet this concept appears only once in the ARPM (III.C.1. below). The following changes clarify the concept and responsibilities of the Review Initiator, whether assumed by the Department Head or the Immediate Supervisor.

III. Roles and responsibilities of participants

C. Department Head

1. Defined as: The individual who has primary responsibility for the department to which the position is assigned. Also refers to Assistant/Associate University Librarians when evaluating Librarians who report to them. May also be referred to as the Review Initiator. (The Department Head may delegate the review process to the Immediate Supervisor, except that recommending the personnel action may not be delegated)

Change to:

1. Defined as: The individual who has primary responsibility for the department to which the position is assigned. Also refers to Assistant/Associate University Librarians when evaluating Librarians who report directly to them. Will also be referred to as the Review Initiator. In some cases, the Department Head may choose to delegate the review process to the Immediate Supervisor. In this case, the Immediate Supervisor will be referred to as the Review Initiator and shall work closely with the Department Head throughout the course of the review period. The recommended personnel action remains the responsibility of the Department Head.

III. Roles and responsibilities of participants

D. Immediate Supervisor

2. Roles:

a. Assumes the role of Department Head in conducting the review, if the Department Head delegates the responsibility. Note: The Immediate Supervisor does not assume responsibility for recommending the personnel action.

Change to:

a. Assumes the role of Review Initiator in conducting the review, if the Department Head chooses to delegate the responsibility. In this case, the Immediate Supervisor will be referred to as the Review Initiator and shall work closely with the Department Head throughout the course of the review period. The recommended personnel action remains the responsibility of the Department Head.

IV. Review Procedures: merit increase, promotion, and career status

E. Department Review Procedures

1. Notification

Early in the course of a personnel review, the Department Head shall notify the Candidate of the impending review and in one or more conferences with the Candidate make certain that the Candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process, including the criteria specified in Section 210-4 of the Academic Personnel Manual. The candidate shall be given the opportunity to ask questions and to supply pertinent information and evidence to be used in the review.

Change to:

Early in the course of a personnel review, the Department Head (in conjunction with the Immediate Supervisor in the role of Review Initiator, if applicable) shall notify the Candidate of the impending review. In conference with the Candidate, the Department Head (in conjunction with the Immediate Supervisor in the role of Review Initiator) will make certain that the Candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process, including the criteria specified in Section 210-4 of the Academic Personnel Manual. The candidate shall be given the opportunity to ask questions and to supply pertinent information and evidence to be used in the review.

IV.

E.

3. Department Head initiates Departmental Review

a. Responsibility for Departmental Review

- 1) The Department Head in the Candidate's home department shall initiate the review and assemble the review file.
- 2) The Department Head may request that the Immediate Supervisor prepare the review file, except that the Department Head shall make the recommendation for personnel action.

Change to:

1) The Department Head in the Candidate's home department shall initiate the review and assemble the review file. The Department Head assumes the role of Review Initiator.

2) The Department Head may request that the Immediate Supervisor prepare the review file. The Immediate Supervisor assumes the role of Review Initiator.

Ultimately, however, it is the responsibility of the Department Head to assure that items b-g below are carried out and is responsible for making the recommended personnel action.

IV.

E.

8. Department Head's Review

a. It is the responsibility of the Department Head to thoroughly evaluate the work of the candidate in relation to the criteria set forth in APM 360-10 and 210-4 e.(3) and to make an appropriate recommendation for advancement, promotion, career status, or termination. Off-cycle and accelerated reviews should clearly be identified as such.

b. The Department Head may request that the Immediate Supervisor prepare the departmental review. In this case, the Department Head need address only those points that have not been adequately covered by the Immediate Supervisor, or points of disagreement. If the Immediate Supervisor's review does not require elaboration, the Department Head may note, "I concur", sign and date it. The Department Head may not delegate the responsibility for making the personnel action recommendation.

d. The Department Head [...]

Change to:

a. It is the responsibility of the Department Head (in the role of Review Initiator) to thoroughly evaluate the work of the candidate in relation to the criteria set forth in APM 360-10 and 210-4 e.(3) and to make an appropriate recommendation for advancement, promotion, career status, or termination. Off-cycle and accelerated reviews should clearly be identified as such.

b. The Department Head may request that the Immediate Supervisor prepare the departmental review. The Immediate Supervisor assumes the role of Review Initiator. In this case, the Department Head need address only those points that have not been adequately covered by the Immediate Supervisor, or points of disagreement. If the Immediate Supervisor's review does not require elaboration, the Department Head may note, "I concur" (under section 9.a. below), sign and date it. The Department Head may not delegate the responsibility for making the personnel action recommendation.

d. The Review Initiator [...]

IV.

E.

12. Department Head's conference with the Candidate

The Department Head shall review the following documents with the Candidate and each shall be signed and dated by the Department Head and the Candidate: [...]

Change to:

The Department Head (with the Review Initiator, if applicable) shall review the following documents with the Candidate and each shall be signed and dated by the Department Head and the Candidate (and the Review Initiator, if applicable):

2. Career history

Background: The ARPM is silent on the issue of who should address a candidate's career history in cases of promotion from Associate to Librarian level and to the Distinguished Step Librarian X. Indeed, the ARPM states explicitly in IV.E.8.c "In preparing the written review, the Department Head shall consider activities and documentation that relate to the period under review only." CAPA proposes the following changes regarding career history as the responsibility of both the candidate and the Review Initiator.

Note: This section was discussed above.

IV. Review Procedures: merit increase, promotion, and career status

E. Department Review Procedures

2. Notification

Early in the course of a personnel review, the Department Head shall notify the Candidate of the impending review and in one or more conferences with the Candidate make certain that the Candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process, including the criteria specified in Section 210-4 of the Academic Personnel Manual. The candidate shall be given the opportunity to ask questions and to supply pertinent information and evidence to be used in the review.

Change to:

Early in the course of a personnel review, the Department Head (in conjunction with the Immediate Supervisor in the role of Review Initiator, if applicable) shall notify the Candidate of the impending review. In one or more conferences with the Candidate, the Department Head (in conjunction with the Immediate Supervisor in the role of Review Initiator) will make certain that the Candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process, including the criteria specified in Section 210-4 of the Academic Personnel Manual. The candidate shall be given the opportunity to ask questions and to supply pertinent information and evidence to be used in the review. In cases of promotion from the rank of Associate Librarian to Librarian or advancement from Librarian V-VI (the distinguished step), discussion of the candidate's entire relevant professional career history is required. It is the responsibility of both the candidate and the

Review Initiator to work together to present a thorough picture of the entire career history in the review file.

IV. Review Procedures: merit increase, promotion, and career status

E. Department Review Procedures

3. Candidate's Self-Review

d. Candidate's Self-Review

Third paragraph:

In the case of advancement from Librarian IV-V, the candidate should summarize the highlights and comment upon relevant and significant achievements of their entire career as a Librarian, in addition to their accomplishments since their last review.

Change to:

In cases of promotion from the rank of Associate Librarian to Librarian or advancement from Librarian V-VI (the distinguished step), discussion of the candidate's entire relevant professional career history is required. It is the responsibility of both the candidate and the Review Initiator to work together to present a thorough picture of the entire career history in the review file.

IV. Review Procedures: merit increase, promotion, and career status

E. Department Review Procedures

8. Department Head's Review

c. In preparing the written review, the Department Head shall consider activities and documentation that relate to the period under review only. Reference to earlier events or projects, or to previous reviews, should not be made unless clearly essential to the current review.

Change to:

In preparing the written review, the Department Head shall consider activities and documentation that relate to the period under review only. Reference to earlier events or projects, or to previous reviews, should not be made unless clearly essential to the current review.

(Note: the following is the same language as that proposed for IV.E.3.d. above)

In cases of promotion from the rank of Associate Librarian to Librarian or advancement from Librarian V-VI (the distinguished step), discussion of the candidate's entire relevant professional career history is required. It is the responsibility of both the candidate and the Review Initiator to work together to present a thorough picture of the entire career history in the review file.

IV. Review Procedures: merit increase, promotion, and career status

F. Peer Review Procedures

2. Instructions to CAPA for Forming Ad Hoc Committees

f. Instructions to Ad Hoc Committees for Performing Reviews

6) Recommendations for promotion, career status, advancement to Librarian Step V and termination shall be substantiated with documentation consisting of the Candidate's prior review files. Additionally, if a Candidate's list of personnel action options for the current review includes one of those actions, the retrospective files shall be provided to an Ad Hoc Committee at its request regardless of whether the Department Head or a review committee has indicated that any of these actions is being recommended or considered.

Change to:

Add the following language as that proposed for IV.E.3.d. and IV.E.8.c. above:

In cases of promotion from the rank of Associate Librarian to Librarian or advancement from Librarian V-VI (the distinguished step), discussion of the candidate's entire relevant professional career history is required. It is the responsibility of both the candidate and the Review Initiator to work together to present a thorough picture of the entire career history in the review file.

IV. Review Procedures: merit increase, promotion, and career status

F. Peer Review Procedures

4. Instructions to CAPA for Performing Reviews

g. Recommendations for promotion, career status, Librarian Step V, and termination shall be substantiated with documentation consisting of the Candidate's prior review files. Additionally, if a Candidate's list of personnel action options for the current review includes one of these actions, the retrospective review files shall be provided to CAPA at its request regardless of whether the Department Head or a review committee has indicated that any of these actions is being recommended or considered.

Change to:

Add the following language as that proposed for sections IV.E.3.d., IV.E.8.c. and IV.F.2.f.6) above:

In cases of promotion from the rank of Associate Librarian to Librarian or advancement from Librarian V-VI (the distinguished step), discussion of the candidate's entire relevant professional career history is required. It is the responsibility of both the candidate and the Review Initiator to work together to present a thorough picture of the entire career history in the review file.

3. Access to letters of reference

Background: The ARPM is unclear as to who has access to the confidential letters of reference. Does the Immediate Supervisor, in the role of Review Initiator, have

access, or does only the Department Head? CAPA recommends the following changes to the ARPM.

IV. Review Procedures: merit increase, promotion, and career status

E. Departmental Review Procedures

3. Department Head initiates Departmental Review

c. Request for letter of reference list from candidate

d. Request to LHR to solicit letters of reference

e. Request for evaluations from Coordinators

f. Request for updated biography form and position description from candidate

CAPA recommends that the words "Department Head" be changed to "Review Initiator" or "Review Initiator, in consultation with the Department Head, as appropriate" in sections c-f above.

Fall Assembly Report (E. Cowell, LAUC-SD Vice Chair)

- E. Cowell, J. Reiswig, E. Valdez attended the Fall Assembly at UC Davis on November 15-16, 2001.
- LAUC Budget: we ended the fiscal year in the red, but President Deborah Murphy can not see any particular expense line that is responsible - it seems as though costs have simply gone up across the board.
- Campus visits program also continuing - Deborah will be visiting UCSD at our next Membership meeting, January 15, 2002.

Committee Reports and Charges:

- SLASIAC: will be doing a survey to provide feedback to VP Sandra Smith about the impact that increased summer session had on those campuses that participated
- The Committee on Diversity was congratulated on getting a lot more active this past year. Interesting note: the Committee conducted a survey on how divisional committees were organized - apparently UCSD is the only one which doesn't have a Libraries committee on diversity including librarians and staff. Ours is a LAUC committee only.

Myron Okada's Report from UCOP:

- Governor has requested a hiring freeze as well as current-year cuts of \$96 million from UC. Strategies on the table being considered by VP Hershman include mid-year fee increases for students, freezes on mid-year transfers. UC is "over-enrolled" by 7000 students for whom we receive no funding.
- For 2002/3, the Regents put forward a budget requesting full restoration of "partnership" funding including 4% increase for salaries. However, we are expecting to be asked instead to take a 15% cut in UC budget, roughly \$450

Million. Strategies are still being worked out, but include fee increases, putting "full funding" of summer quarter at other campuses on hold, funding for the four research institutes created by the Governor, enrolment cuts, programmatic cuts, reduction in frequency of course, etc. There will probably be salary impacts as well, but no details known.

- Myron reported he has NOT heard of VERIPS, but possible CAP deferred compensation provision for members of the retirement system.
- UC is under a state audit on undergraduate teaching and how UC's resources are used to support teaching. Under the "partnership" funding agreement, UC was supposed to make faculty more available to undergraduates and have ladder rank faculty teaching more undergraduate classes. Audit is looking at faculty workload reports to see if this has been honored.

Beverlee French Presentation:

- Spoke about co-investment model at CDL, resource sharing initiatives, Catalog and A&I transitions. The timeline for Ex Libris implementation for MELVYL is expected to slip. She asked for informal feedback on our preferences for overlap with old MELVYL if the calendar slips to the point where Ex Libris is not available until Fall. Informal opinion was strongly in favor of not dropping the old system if the new one has not been in place for a year. Look for opportunities to provide this feedback through our usual channels.
- Discussion then followed around CDL's personnel practice of employing librarians but not within the librarian series or with librarian titles.

Meeting adjourned at 3:45pm.