

Librarians Association of the University of California

## Second Special Assembly (2014-15)

Tuesday, April 14, 2015

11:00 am – 1:00 pm

ReadyTalk

phone: 866-740-1260

access code: 9181033#

**DRAFT \*\*\* MINUTES \*\*\* DRAFT**

### A. Call to Order (Matt Conner)

President Matt Conner called the meeting to order at 11:03pm.

### B. Announcements

Election reminder from Secretary Christina Woo: According to the current LAUC Systemwide Election Calendar (<http://lauc.ucop.edu/elections/calendar-2015.pdf>), the LAUC Secretary submits the slate of nominees to each Divisional Chair at the end of March, lets them know the election date (June 1, 2015), and that “additional nominations may be submitted by members.” **ACTION: The deadline for those grassroots nominations is this Friday, April 17<sup>th</sup>.** Nominations must be accompanied by the written consent and biographies of the nominees, using the same format as those of the nominees on the slate the Nominating Committee prepared.

Our Spring Assembly is this Friday, April 17 (see [http://libraries.ucsd.edu/about/pro/lauc-sd/8\\_assembly/index.html](http://libraries.ucsd.edu/about/pro/lauc-sd/8_assembly/index.html)).

### C. Roll Call (Christina Woo)

**Present:** Matt Conner (President 2014-2015), Diane Mizrahi (Vice President/President-Elect 2014-2015), Nick Robinson (Past President) arrived later, Christina Woo (Secretary 2014-2015), Dean Rowan (Parliamentarian).

LAUC-B: Rita Evans (Chair), Elliott Smith (Delegate and Secretary), I-Wei Wang (Delegate and Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect) arrived later

LAUC-D: Bruce Abbott (Chair)

LAUC-I: Keith Powell (Chair), Cynthia Johnson (Delegate and Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect), Annette Buckley (Delegate and Member-at-Large)

LAUC-LA: Rikke Ogawa (Chair), Lynda Tolly (Delegate and Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect), Orchid Mazurkiewicz (Divisional Delegate)

LAUC-M: Elizabeth McMunn-Tetangco (Chair), Jerrold Shiroma (Delegate)

- LAUC-R: Rhonda Neugebauer (Chair), Christina Cicchetti (Delegate)
- LAUC-SD: Roger Smith (past Chair) for Penny Coppernoll-Blach (Chair), Adele Barsh (Delegate)
- LAUC-SF: Evans Whitaker (Chair), Sarah McClung (Delegate and Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect)
- LAUC-SB: Kristen LaBonte (Chair), Chrissy Rissmeyer (Delegate and Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect), Gary Colmenar (Delegate and Secretary)
- LAUC-SC (1): Deborah Murphy (Chair)

Out of a possible 28, we need a quorum of 15, and we have 22.

#### **D. Approval of Minutes of First Special Assembly on April 7, 2015 (Christina Woo)**

Miki Goral (LA) asked about the term, “amendments,” which was used frequently during the April 7 Special Assembly for the suggested changes we made and therefore appear in the minutes— “amendments” to what? President Matt Conner noted they are amendments to the CPG/Committee on Professional Governance’s revisions/recommendations. After CPG issued them, we have been discussing the revisions and amending them. Ultimately, they will be put forward to a vote. The revisions will need a majority vote to pass. If they do not pass, they will not go to the membership for a vote. These are amendments to CPG’s revisions (“Proposed Bylaws Changes” dated March 30, 2015— see <http://lauc.ucop.edu/assembly/special-assembly-cpg-final-recommendations.pdf> ), not to the current language in Article III of the Bylaws. Miki Goral (LA) again wondered if it was appropriate or accurate to label these “amendments” to the proposal.

Parliamentarian Dean Rowan stepped in, noting Miki is correct, and we are doing this in a somewhat unorthodox way. Rather than address each of CPG’s proposed changes during a business meeting, and then having to amend those proposals, we are trying to consolidate all of these into one document to make it easier for all of us. Strictly speaking, we cannot amend CPG’s report—it’s their report. Matt Conner then pointed out that our possible amendments would change the text of the CPG revisions for what we would approve for the final vote. Lise Snyder (LA) cautioned that calling these “amendments” would get cause problems later, since that term connotes something more formal than the ideas we’ve been discussing. We agreed to call these “suggested changes,” so “Possible Amendments” (generated at the April 7 Special Assembly—see <http://lauc.ucop.edu/assembly/special-assembly-possible-amendments-april-7-14-2015-rev.pdf> ) will now be referred to as “Suggested Changes” to the CPG’s proposed revisions (current draft proposal) to the Bylaws. **ACTION: In the DRAFT of the April 7 Special Assembly minutes, Christina Woo will replace “amendments” with “suggested changes.”**

Hearing no other changes or corrections to the minutes, they were approved with the terminology change suggested.

#### **E. Discussion of CPG/Committee on Professional Governance Recommendations**

We will spend the first hour discussing the changes we've come up with so far, since we covered all of the points at the first (April 7) Special Assembly. During the second hour, we will vote, with the aim of cleaning up this draft and leaving the clear essentials to present at the April 17 Assembly at UCSD. At that meeting we'll go through the draft, section by section, look for any final suggested changes, then vote on all of the key issues.

Matt Conner led off again by again addressing the first questions—from Cynthia Johnson (I) and Miki Goral (LA) from the last time, starting with Cynthia's about what would happen to the AULs.

Matt Conner answered that the AULs will stay in LAUC if they have the AUL title code. If they do not (e.g., are in a managerial series with a non-AUL title code), they are not members of LAUC, have no official connection to LAUC. If a division wants to invite them to their meetings and include them in their discussions, that is up to the division, but those without the AUL title code are outside of LAUC—that is the status quo. If these changes are passed, there are two additional options:

- Affiliate status will be allowed, in which AULs will be invited to participate as affiliates, but it's largely symbolic and gives them no membership privileges
- If the membership idea passes, then once the AULs make it through the qualifications, they would be given membership privileges—that is the future of the reclassified administrators.

To answer Miki's question, "Why are we doing all this?" Matt described LAUC's serious problems: slow but steadily diminishing numbers, and—doing nothing—we may disappear. Example of current strains: we do not have a chair of the CPG/Committee on Professional Governance. It was too difficult, too much work—it was!--and this is not an isolated incident. Matt Conner's experience is that every LAUC statewide standing committee he's been on since 2009 has struggled to find a chair, get itself organized, and spent months just to get going, because no one had enough time. And all of us are stretched too far to be able to work as an organization, including at the division level. Our shrinking numbers are a critical problem—we're feeling the crunch everywhere.

Matt Conner added that we're also losing our scope. There used to be a time when librarians could speak authoritatively on all aspects of our profession: public services, technical services, etc., even allowing for specializations. Those ideas were captured in our Position Paper revisions. Now we're seeing new positions that are utterly different from before: directors of digital services, online strategy, and pedagogy, to name a few professional positions in the library field. The people filling these positions at UC Davis are super qualified, with PhDs in neuroscience, anthropology, and English, and JDs. They are not the kind of people coming out of library schools, and they are working in the areas of change we—as librarians—have invoked. At UC Davis, UL MacKenzie Smith will consult with these high-priced advisors, and—if they're outside of LAUC--Matt Conner doesn't expect her to take the extra step to get input from LAUC-D, too. So, adding to diminishing numbers, our scope of expertise and influence is shrinking at the same time.

Matt Conner asked, "What can we do to alter our fate?" We heard several suggestions at our April 7 First Special Assembly. One is to redesign the Librarian series to incorporate these new library professionals whose title codes are outside the Librarian series. That will be the drift of our

conversation with UCSD UL Brian Schottlaender at the April 17 Assembly. Matt has spoken with CoUL/Council of University Librarians and with individual ULs about changing the scope of the Librarian series, and the response has politely but consistently been no. Posing this question again and expecting something different is unrealistic. Our time with Brian will be productive, but at the end we'll likely disagree.

Matt Conner has heard there may be other professional organizations that can save the day for us, but—from his two-year term as CARL secretary--CARL/California Academic & Research Libraries has no interest in the academic status of LAUC. If it did, would it make any difference to CoUL? Some would turn to the union, but they have moved far too slowly.

Lise Snyder (LA) did not agree with Matt Conner's scenarios and the conclusions he's drawn. She said there are other issues at play that he hasn't touched on. Louise Ratliff (LA) asked Matt Conner where he got his figures to support his observation that the LAUC membership is diminishing. She also challenged his assessment that LAUC committee work was too time-consuming, so it was nearly impossible to find chairs. She also took issue with his evaluation of the PhD as making someone immensely qualified to work in library positions. When they don't have library degrees, they're not qualified to work within the environmental scope of an academic or ARL library. She disagreed that LAUC is losing its scope.

To her, the conversation so far raises lots of points but is not coherent or rational. The revisions to the APM, which has gotten muddled up with the membership issue, is a separate issue. She has no sense of what the point of the Bylaws changes are, because every speaker has brought up a different issue. She referred to the APM 360 Appendix A as defining LAUC's membership and role, and changes we make need to be done in the context of the APM. There are many outside issues that contribute to hiring and appointing people outside the Librarian series, but they don't go through peer review, and we do. As a result, this makes this a mix of apples and oranges that should go back to the committee to start over.

Debbie Murphy (SC) followed up by saying the ULs have contributed to this confusion and mess, and it merits our discussion and attention. She encouraged Matt Conner to move forward with this.

Matt Conner continued, saying that he stands by his statements. When he chaired the LAUC Diversity Committee in 2012, that committee's study of the demographics of LAUC showed a universal prediction that the number of librarians was going down, with not enough new librarians to replace retirees (see p. 25 of <http://lauc.ucop.edu/committees/cd/cd-final-2012-2013.pdf> ). With our current Bylaws, we're in trouble, and the CPG recommendations are meant to counter this downward trend.

Miki Goral (LA) commented that the numbers of LAUC members are going down, because libraries have chosen to post positions and hire outside the Librarian series—that's why LAUC has fewer librarians, not because there are fewer librarians. Matt Conner disagreed, referring to the LAUC Diversity Committee report of 2012/13, which found that library schools will produce only 25% of the MLIS librarians needed in the next ten years to fill vacancies created by retirements. This is unrelated to the UC libraries hiring outside the Librarian series.

Adam Siegel (D) said that during UL MacKenzie Smith's nearly three-year tenure at UC Davis, a great deal of hiring has taken place, but not in the Librarian series, and she reclassified the AULs out of the AUL title code into staff administrative positions. Going outside the Librarian series has been her prerogative. He did not see that LAUC should bend over backwards to make hiring in the Librarian series more attractive to the ULs. As non-academic employees, the new hires are not subject to peer review; many are "at will" employees. The most we can do is to advise, which is LAUC's role.

As for the shrinking LAUC memberships, Matt Conner can find those numbers. Debbie Murphy (SC) said that at her campus there simply have been no hires, even with attrition. The remaining librarians' plates have gotten more and more full with less and less say on what their plates will hold. Matt Conner admitted that as President he has the power to name committee chairs, but he cannot force anyone to undertake the responsibilities.

What are our strategic moves? If the ULs won't change, where does that leave us? Lise Snyder (LA) will be at the Assembly at UCSD and will stand up to Brian Schottlaender. We can be adversarial, but if CoUL says no, then what? Lise Snyder (LA) said the ULs have made it clear that they need to offer salaries outside the Librarian series in order to hire people with the qualifications they're looking for. We can't bow down to them and say this is OK. Why are they disrespecting our profession? Librarianship has changed over the years, and the APM proposal should address that. She stressed that we need to push that, but UCOP will not entertain that unless LAUC and CoUL agree on changes.

Louise Ratliff (LA) supports pursuing the definitions of librarian work in the APM. Given LAUC's status quo, we should take a very strong position—in our advisory role—toward redefining and making more inclusive the tasks librarians do. We can do this in a very collegial but firm fashion. She knows of at least one UL who is in favor of this. Matt Conner reminded us that the LAUC Exec Bd suggested changes to the APM in the fall, but they were not approved. Matt was not allowed to include the membership on this—only the Exec Bd. When Matt checked on this, he learned that UCOP wanted to see consensus among librarians, meaning agreement from CoUL on LAUC changes. It boils down to convincing CoUL to change their policy. Louise Ratliff (LA) then reiterated that we as LAUC need to agree among ourselves first in order to take a strong stand and communicate collegially with the ULs. Matt Conner noted that we did that a month ago. On the Assembly website is a three-page document from the Exec Bd to Brian Schottlaender (and also to CoUL) describing every possible reason to include new hires in the Librarian series—see [http://libraries.ucsd.edu/about/pro/lauc-sd/0\\_files/assembly-2015/librarian-series.pdf](http://libraries.ucsd.edu/about/pro/lauc-sd/0_files/assembly-2015/librarian-series.pdf)

Adam Siegel (D) suggested that we use our fledgling newsletter to highlight LAUC members across the system who are doing cool, exciting work in the Librarian series, even create a glossy, trifold brochure. This could send a message to the ULs to keep hiring amazing people like this—they shouldn't need to hire outside the Librarian series. Matt Conner responded by noting that our revamped LAUC website will feature "Meet Our Members" profiles. When Matt Conner countered that the ULs know who the librarians in the Librarian series are, and apparently that's not stopping them from recruiting outside the Librarian series. He doubted that reminding them of the talent they already have in the Librarian series will make any difference. Adam Siegel concluded that Matt Conner's description is leading us to believe that ULs like MacKenzie Smith have dug in their heels and will at most fill a token number of positions in

the Librarian series and will continue to hire outside of it, and that's our reality. We'll have to reshape our membership responsibilities so we can handle what we have to handle, including LAUC's core functions.

Rikke Ogawa (LA) said she respects the sincerity of the convictions shared here, and she added that she strongly values the MLIS; she pursued it because she thought it had a purpose for her career. She went on to acknowledge that professionals working in the library who have other graduate degrees and who have acquired knowledge of library standards, philosophy, and theory has added to the library as a whole. She has colleagues in the UCLA libraries who are not in the Librarian series and do not have the MLIS whom she would love to have in LAUC as full members. She would like this to work out perfectly so we can change the APM, and she's hoping there's still an avenue to do that. At the April 17 Assembly she'd like us to be able to have a reasonable conversation about this as a group without it ending with "the ULs are being stinkers, so we'll be stinkers, too."

Debbie Murphy (SC) followed up on the mention of the LAUC newsletter by recommending that we put a version of this lively discussion in our newsletter, so more members—including the ULs—can be part of this. Matt Conner agreed that we want to disseminate our information, and our newsletter is one medium for making our conversations more public.

Matt Conner summarized where we are now: We are not expecting to settle this today, but here are our strategic options. These Bylaws are a way for us to respond to some demographic and policy changes so LAUC can continue as an organization. If we don't go with this, our options are that we continue to advocate to the ULs to hire into the Librarian series only. We have mechanisms to do this: we have the long document we sent to CoUL, and we have our Assembly this Friday, but this is in the wake of a long history where they have not been receptive. If the ULs do not agree, what do we do next?

Debbie Murphy (SC) asked if LAUC has a sense of how many people who work in our libraries—not just LAUC members—are in the Librarian series and how many are not. Lise Snyder (LA) asked for clarification, wondering if we are counting people who have the MLIS degree vis a vis being called librarians. Debbie Murphy (SC) recalled that LAUC is collecting this information this summer, but Matt Conner (nor I as Secretary) recall this undertaking, but we can check on that later.

To provide an example of problematic decision-making, Lise Snyder (LA) recounted that she had worked for someone at UCLA who had a PhD (in Slavic Studies) but no MLIS and despite having been a CLIR fellow (<http://www.clir.org/fellowships/postdoc>) had no deep understanding of what line librarians do. She was originally hired in the Librarian series by an AUL who liked "her spunk." Referring to Rikke Ogawa (LA)'s hope that her non-MLIS professional peers not currently holding title codes in the Librarian series could be made full members of LAUC, Lise Snyder wondered how this person could be a full member of LAUC. This person doesn't participate in peer review (not subject to it, nor can serve on CAPA), and cannot serve on an ad hoc committee (for peer review). The creation of LAUC is tied to being academics and rendering judgment on our peers. Lise Snyder (LA) concluded that LAUC is not ready to vote on this at this Friday's Assembly. Matt Conner agreed that one hour this Friday is not enough time, but that is the time we have. We will be able to vote on this at the Assembly.

At 11:58, Matt moved on to the Assembly itself. What we approve today as changes to the CPG recommendations—by a majority vote—will go forward to the Assembly this Friday. Referring to no. 5 and 6 in the “Possible Amendments” document (<http://lauc.ucop.edu/assembly/special-assembly-possible-amendments-april-7-14-2015-rev.pdf>):

5. Sec. 4: List of membership eligibilities removed and replaced with the language of Section 3 of the current by-laws.

6. Sec. 4: List of divisional membership functions removed.

Section 4 is for clarification to the list; it makes no changes. The original CPG recommendation was to itemize the membership functions instead of listing them in a line of text—see Section 4 on page 2 of <http://lauc.ucop.edu/assembly/special-assembly-cpg-final-recommendations.pdf>. The current Sec. 3 does this. It was suggested to keep the original language in (current) Sec. 3. The list was intended to clarify what members can do. Matt Conner and Dean Rowan had seen that the current Bylaws do not specify any member functions at the division level, so that could be interpreted as “anything goes.” But it turns out that there are intrinsic functions for the division that are in the standard code and in case law. They are modified with our current Bylaws and general practice. For example, attendance at LAUC meetings is officially restricted to members, but our Bylaws don’t mention that, and the silence has been interpreted to let non-members attend. So, what we have is a patchwork of Bylaws, case law, and general practice. This itemized list was intended to clarify that, or are the existing Bylaws sufficient? Past President Nick Robinson recommended we stick with Sec. 3; it’s unnecessary and confusing to list the statewide and division-level member functions. As a newer member of LAUC, Adele Barsh (SD) found the original CPG recommendation useful.

Motion to delete the proposed changes in what would become Sec. 4 and keep the original Sec. 3: Debbie Murphy (SC) moved. Rita Evans (B) seconded.

Roll call of votes: Secretary Christina Woo conducted the division-by-division roll call of delegates:

24 Ayes from B: R. Evans, E. Smith, I. Wang; I: K. Powell, C. Johnson, A. Buckley; LA: R. Ogawa, L. Tolly, O. Mazurkiewicz; M: E. McMunn-Tetangco, J. Shiroma; R: R. Neugebauer, C. Cicchetti; SD: R. Smith; SF: E. Whitaker, S. McClung; SB: K. LaBonte, C. Rissmeyer, G. Colmenar; SC: D. Murphy

1 Nay: Adele Barsh (SD).

This motion carries, making deleting the proposed Sec. 4 and retaining the language in Sec. 3 of the current Bylaws. Matt Conner will clean this up and get this out today for Friday’s assembly.

No. 3 of possible amendments addresses the language of affiliate status (strike-outs are deletions; underscoring is addition):

3. Sec. 5: Affiliates would include more than Librarian Series employees if sec.2(c) passes. There is no need to authorize divisional “structures of participation.” All such structures must be established in divisional bylaws, which must remain consistent with

statewide's. There is no need to prohibit affiliate voting, etc. The right to do so is explicitly "exclusive" per sec. 3.

Persons employed as librarians in the University defined in Section 2 of this article on less than halftime appointments and retired LAUC members retired from such positions shall have affiliate membership. Affiliate members may participate in general meetings of the Assembly, but may not make motions, nominate candidates, become officers, serve on committees, be eligible for research and professional development funds, or vote. Divisions may extend membership of the affiliate category on their respective campuses via their Bylaws.

Current Sec. 5 language in the CPG Recommendations is wiped away but adds only the last sentence: Divisions may extend membership of the affiliate category on their respective campuses. Past President Nick Robinson pointed out that if this recommendation is passes, it will be in conflict with Bylaws revisions passed/approved at the August 14, 2014 Special Assembly on the Bylaws, but deleting "general meetings of" will harmonize them.

Miki Goral (LA) said that the last sentence ("Divisions may...") doesn't belong there, because the statewide Bylaws should not talk about what divisions can do. Our long-standing practice already requires changes in divisional Bylaws to get statewide approval for conformity. Parliamentarian Dean Rowan countered that the inclusion of this sentence is added to explicitly give CPG the authority to allow divisions to create Bylaws to expand their ranks via affiliates.

Debbie Murphy (SC) recommends to change the language to "Divisions have the option to extend" instead of "Divisions may extend..."

Motion to use the text (in purple above), but delete the reference to general meetings; reword the last sentence to "Divisions have the option to extend membership of the affiliate category on their respective campuses via their Bylaws."

Before the motion was called, Elliott Smith (B) pointed out an ambiguity in the proposed text, noting a slight difference in the first sentence between documents. Specifically, one could interpret "Persons...on less than halftime appointments and LAUC members retired from such positions..." as possibly meaning retirees who had less than halftime appointments, not all LAUC retirees. Was that the intent? Dean Rowan agreed with Elliott's reading—this is ambiguous. Part of the problem is not knowing if Sec. 2c will pass. To eliminate this, Miki Goral (LA) recommended deleting "Section 2 of," which made sense, leaving "...as defined in this article on less than halftime appointments..." Lise Snyder (LA) suggested some word-smithing, resulting in:

Persons employed as librarians in the University defined in Section 2 of this article employed on less than halftime appointments and retired LAUC members retired from such positions shall have affiliate membership. Affiliate members may participate in general meetings of the Assembly, but may not make motions, nominate candidates, become officers, serve on committees, be eligible for research and professional

development funds, or vote. Divisions may have the option to extend membership of the affiliate category on their respective campuses via their Bylaws.

Dean Rowan questioned where the term “employed” belonged, but we decided to do that word-smithing later and present it to the Assembly on Friday.

Matt Conner called for the motion; Debbie Murphy (SC) move to adopt this revised text; Elizabeth McMunn-Tetangco seconded the motion.

Roll call of votes: Secretary Christina Woo conducted the division-by-division roll call of delegates:

21 Ayes from SC: D. Murphy; SB: K. LaBonte, C. Rissmeyer; SF: E. Whitaker, S. McClung; SD: R. Smith, A. Barsh; R: R. Neugebauer, C. Cicchetti; M: E. McMunn-Tetangco, J. Shiroma; LA: R. Ogawa, L. Tolly, O. Mazurkiewicz; I: K. Powell, C. Johnson, A. Buckley; D: B. Abbott; B: R. Evans, E. Smith, I. Wang

The motion carries with a unanimous vote. Matt Conner will make the changes to the CPG recommendations, including finetuning the first line, for this Friday’s Assembly.

No. 9 suggested changes are procedural for voting, not text-specific:

- 9. Global: Vote for the membership divided into votes for
  - a) Section 1 and Section 2 a and b to clarify title codes
  - b) Section 5 on expanding the affiliate category
  - c) Section 2c(i) on incorporating new members

The original plan was to present all of the CPG recommendations for an “all or nothing” vote. The suggested change was to group the recommendations into three sections for a simple majority vote from the general membership on each. Past President Nick Robinson suggested a different order: a, c, and b. for this Friday’s Assembly.

So, all or nothing, or subdivide them in the options for members to vote. With all or nothing voting, objecting to one section could generate a “no” vote even if the other sections had merit. There are inherent interdependencies, however, leading to the quandary where a LAUC member could vote one way on a section, depending on the outcome of the vote on another section. Ultimately the vote at this Friday’s Assembly shapes the voting options for the general membership. The Assembly does not have to vote on this; LAUC’s Election committee can decide, and it may request input from the Exec Bd. We can revisit this on Friday. We decided not to vote on this today.

Rest of this is easy to clarify the text for Friday:

From the Possible Amendments document (<http://lauc.ucop.edu/assembly/special-assembly-possible-amendments-april-7-14-2015-rev.pdf>), addressing each suggested change on the list:

- 1. Section 2(c): Include the “at half time or more” provision for membership.

Rikke Ogawa (LA) moved to accept this; Rita Evans seconded the motion. Voice vote: Many ayes; no nays; no abstentions. Motion passed.

Voice vote: passed.

2. Section 2(c)(i): This should remain a separate subsection (d). It's an instruction to LAUC to establish procedural rules, distinct from (a)-(c), which define criteria of membership.

Comments and suggested rewordings were mixed, including questioning the wisdom of putting a "promissory note" in the Bylaws. Nick Robinson suggested the simple addition of "See standing rules" added to the end of the proposed Sec. 2(c), so it reads:

c) all other persons holding appointments at half time or more who provide professional services in the university libraries substantially similar to those services identified in APM 360-4 irrespective of their status as determined by UCOP as academic, management, or staff appointees; and whose divisions have successfully petitioned LAUC for their inclusion (See standing rules).

Motion to accept this new wording and eliminate Sec. 2(c)(i) was made by Adele Barsh (SD) and seconded by Rikke Ogawa (LA).

Voice vote: Many ayes; no nays; no abstentions. Motion passed.

4. Sec. 1: Substitute website  
<https://tcs.ucop.edu/tcs/jsp/academicTitlesSearch.htm>  
as source of title codes in place of APM 112 and 113.

Websites change, so if we remove this, are we OK? We can discuss this on Friday. No one saw a need to include this as a suggested change.

7. Sec. 2c: Insert "affiliated units" after "University Libraries"  
All other persons who provide professional services in the University Libraries and affiliated units substantially similar to those services identified in APM 360-4 irrespective of their status as determined by UCOP as academic, management, or staff appointees; and whose divisions have successfully petitioned LAUC for their inclusion.

An "affiliated unit" is a library that does not report administratively to the UL. Some campuses have these; others do not. The persons must be in the Librarian series.

Motion to include include "affiliated units" (and clean up the typos) was made by Rikke Ogawa (LA) and seconded by Orchid Mazurkiewicz.

Voice vote: Many ayes; no nays; no abstentions. Motion passed.

8. Sec. 2c: Revise for clarity. The suggestion is to introduce a "lead" so that one does not

conclude that all the persons described in this section will be admitted. However, the section begins with “all other persons” to conform with the grammar of Section 2; 2a begins with the same phrase. There is no way to prefix this phrase without disrupting the grammar, and the qualification for successful petitions is introduced as soon as possible afterwards. No way is found to revise this. Suggestions for new language may be submitted to the Assembly.

Adam Siegel (D) wants LAUC to be federal, and is wary of divisions going too far afield in the classes of members to admit. Is letting people in non-academic positions be members of LAUC a wise move? This does open us to admitting members in non-academic titles.

The discussion was active, but our time was running out. There was concern that the general membership would not have enough time to understand and digest all of these issues. We will have time to discuss this further at this Friday’s Assembly. In the interest of time, Matt Conner called for a motion to adjourn.

#### **F. Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn was made by Linda Tolly (LA) and seconded by Rita Evans (B). The meeting was adjourned at 12:58pm.

Greetings LAUC members. This is a reminder of our second of two special assemblies to be held by conference call on Tuesday, April 14, 11am-1pm. Attached is the agenda which can be found with other supporting documents on the LAUC website:

<http://lauc.ucop.edu/assembly/>

For this upcoming Assembly, you will need three items.

1. CPG Final Recommendations (Second Special Assembly)
2. Possible Amendments (First Special Assembly)
3. Copy of the current language of Article III of the Bylaws which can be found on the LAUC website

<http://lauc.ucop.edu/about/bylaws/Bylaws-03-09.pdf>

Matt Conner  
LAUC President