

Minutes, LAUC-SD Membership Meeting  
March 14, 1995

Attending: P. Brueggeman, A. Butros, K. Cargille, H. Colson, P. Cruse, J. Donovan, T. Echavarria, C. Graham, R. Gustafson, J. Hanson, M. Horres, C. Jahns, E. Kanter, B. Miller, P. Mirsky, A. Prussing, B. Renford, B. Slater, G. Steel, R. Wang, B. Westbrook, S. Starr (recorder)

I. Announcements

1. The Chair of the LAUC Committee on Committees has sent out our proposed revised bylaws to committee members for review.
2. The next LAUC Lunch will be 3/30/95 in Canyon View.
3. A. Prussing, Chair of the Nominating Committee, announced that the interest forms will be distributed to members the first week in April. J. Donovan volunteered to join Anne and K. Lucas on this Committee.

II. Library Personnel Office Update (J. Hanson)

J. Hanson gave an update on changes that have occurred as part of the library's reorganization of the Human Resources Cluster. She has moved her office into the Administrative suite and Maureen Harden has moved into her old office. J. Hanson will continue to have oversight for Academic Reviews, but J. Tait will be handling more of the logistical issues. J. Hanson will also continue to serve as an advisor and will be involved in any disciplinary situations in the Library; she will also continue to represent UCSD at meetings with other UC Personnel Officers. M. Harden will represent the library in human resources issues on campus. J. Hansen will continue to chair the reclassification committee.

Three interviews have been scheduled for the Head, SIO Library and interviews are also being scheduled for the Western European History Bibliographer. Two candidates are currently being interviewed for Infopath Director. The Staff Training position has been posted with a closing date of March 30, 1995. The Director of Media Central (not a library funded position) is almost ready for recruitment.

III. CAPA Update (H. Colson)

The new guidelines adopted this year for writing self reviews seem to be working well. Reviews are generally 4.5 to 5 pages long. J. Hanson reminded the meeting that to make this a formal guideline requires a vote of the membership and revision of our

Academic Peer Review Guidelines. This process should begin in late Spring/early Summer to have the formal guidelines in place for the next review cycle.

### III. Research and Professional Development Report (B. Westbrook)

A summary of the survey of membership needs went out in January. The results indicated that most people approved of expenditures for serials using R&PD funds and most people wanted to continue support for travel. There was little interest in expenditures of funds for equipment (only 4 people responded to this item) and about half wanted some kind of continuing programming (e.g. 3 programs on the same topic).

### IV. Salary Bifurcation

E. Kanter led a discussion of the proposal from UCOP to group non-Senate academics with staff instead of faculty when considering salary increases. He has sent a letter to Chancellor Atkinson as has J. Lowell (copies of Lowell's letter were distributed). This is a very serious situation but there may still be an opportunity to change the proposed policy. Members are encouraged to write letters to administrators on campus and at UCOP.

### V. UC Centralized Web Server

E. Kanter led a discussion of the draft proposal to establish a centralized Web Server. He noted the positive effects of such a proposal: centralized distribution would eliminate duplication of effort and provide support to existing efforts. The negative arguments are that each campus needs to tailor it's page to local programs, that the web is changing too fast to establish policies now, that it might be hard to keep such resources up-to-date, and that items paid for locally (eg. electronic journals) could not be included on such pages.

R. Miller reported that at a recent HOTS meeting it was decided that UCB would host a listserv for discussion of the UC Digital Library and a WEB site which would be an archive for proposals and status reports related to the Digital Library.

Discussion continued with the following points: the proposal is not clear on responsibilities, we need to learn from past shared projects which have encountered some difficulties, pooling our energy and sharing expertise should be encouraged. The document distributed actually contained two separate proposals, one from a Government Documents librarian and the other a draft proposal from CDC. CDC is identifying a need; the proposal from Documents may not be the only way to meet that need.

### VI. LAUC SD Awards

Both UCLA and UCB give an award each year to a librarian of the year. The pros and cons of establishing such an award at UCSD were discussed. Some members felt it could be divisive and might tend to favor those who promote themselves. Others felt that it would be useful to recognize extraordinary performance. The Executive Board will send a proposal out to the membership and solicit feedback.