

LAUC-SD Membership Meeting
February 25, 1997
Seuss Room

Attending: L. Abrams, S. Bertaux, P. Brueggeman, A. Butros, K. Cargille, L. Claassen (chair), R. Coates, T. Dearie, J. Donovan, S. Dunlap, T. Echavarria, C. Graham, R. Gustafson, J. Hanson, S. Jurist, E. Kanter, R. Lindemann, K. Lucas, A. Perez, A. Prussing, B. Renford, B. Slater, G. Steel, D. Talbot, J. Thompson, D. Tweedy, E. Valdez, B. Westbrook, R. Wang, K. Whitley

Meeting called to order at 3:05pm

1. Library Sciences Journal Cancellation - Duffy

Duffy has emailed the cancel list to everyone. The final list will be different--send feedback to him. LAUC-SD R&PD subscriptions are not affected by this; they will consider adding some titles after the cancellation process.

2. Acceleration Report - Richard and Peter

Richard started with questions about the process for deciding our stance on this issue - vote at this meeting or mailed ballot. Decision was to proceed with discussion of revised report and get the sense of the body.

The 6 models are summarized following these minutes.

After general agreement to drop model #5, general discussion followed on the 4 remaining possibilities outlined in the new document, including a 6th possibility of making no recommendation at all. Much of the discussion covered similar points as the previous meeting's discussion, with the additional consideration of pegging requirements for where the librarian's emphasis was placed (A or B/C/D) depending on their current rank.

Decision was to subsume model #4 into #1, to eliminate model #3 from consideration, and to reject model #6 of doing nothing at all. This left a decision between #1 and #2.

A straw vote between #1 and #2 yielded 14 in favor of #1 and 12 in favor of #2, with some people not voting or having had to leave the meeting. Everyone agreed that this was still very close and that a decision of this sort should be put before the membership as a whole.

Motion was made, seconded and carried to conduct a mail ballot of #1 versus #2 and to accept the decision of the majority. The secretary will send out ballots.

3. LAUC-SD Archives - Karen and Barbara

Karen and Barbara are actively working on the archives in the LAUC office.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10pm

Respectfully submitted,
Kathy Whitley

Appendix 1 - Summary of Models in Acceleration Discussion

Model #1 - Consideration of both Criterion A and Criteria B/C/D (to the extent that they are relevant) for exceptional achievement: This position argues that acceleration is possible for a person who accomplishes an exceptional body of work within the period of time under review and that the body of work should encompass all aspects that would be considered for a normal merit increase.

Model #2 (as revised) - Consideration of any one of Criteria A/B/C/D for exceptional achievement: This position argues that is achievement in Criterion A is not exceptional, then exceptional work in any one of Criteria B/C/D is sufficient for acceleration. Contributing to the professional at an exceptional level is in and of itself worth. This model assumes that performance in Criterion A is acceptable.

Model #3 - Consideration of only Criterion A -- rejected.

Model #4 - Consideration of Criteria for exceptional achievement depends on the rank of librarian -- subsumed into model #1.

Model #5 - No accelerated merit increases are allowed - rejected.

Model #6 - Make no recommendation - rejected.

Appendix 2 - Acceleration Document - Revised

Acceleration Report
Peter Brueggeman, Richard Lindemann
1/17/97

One benefit of peer review is that librarians set the guidelines under which they will be considered. Currently, one could argue that UCSD librarians are not being given equitable consideration for acceleration since opinions about whether an acceleration is justified vary widely. Defining the context in which peer review considers accelerations could contribute to a common understanding of when accelerations are merited and,

consequently, to a more equitable process for all participants.

At issue is how broadly or narrowly we apply "exceptional performance" in considering accelerations. Accelerations are merit increase decisions made earlier than the prescribed period of service or involving an advancement of more than one step. Consideration for merit increase is governed by criteria specified in APM - 360-10 and APM - 210-4-e [pertinent sections are printed below]. The APM language regarding accelerations is vague and appears within the broader context of merit increase and promotion. The possibility of acceleration is mentioned in only one sentence: "accelerated promotion is possible if achievement has been exceptional" [APM - 210-4-e-(2)]. Within the spirit of the APM, LAUC-SD may wish to interpret that sentence to mean "accelerated merit increase or promotion is possible if achievement has been exceptional." This interpretation would clarify imprecise wording that could be narrowly applied to allow only accelerated promotions and to disallow accelerated merit increases.

To paraphrase the APM, a candidate for merit increase or promotion is judged on the basis of the first of the following criteria, and, to the extent they are relevant, on one or more of the last three:

- (1) professional competence and quality of service within the library;
- (2) professional activity outside the library;
- (3) University and public service; and
- (4) research and other creative activity.

Reasonable flexibility is exercised in weighing the comparative relevance of these criteria.

Given the above considerations for judging a merit increase or promotion, how then should a candidate be judged for an acceleration "...if achievement has been exceptional"? Comments expressed at the December 17th meeting and received afterward embody these models for peer review judgment of an acceleration:

- 1) Consideration of both Criteria A and Criteria B/C/D (to the extent they are relevant) for exceptional achievement:

This position argues that acceleration is possible for a person who accomplishes an exceptional body of work within the period of time under review and that the body of work should encompass all aspects that would be considered for a normal merit increase.

- 2) Consideration of any one of Criteria A/B/C/D for exceptional achievement: This position argues that if achievement in Criteria A is not exceptional, then exceptional work in any one of Criteria B/C/D is sufficient for acceleration. Contributing to the profession at an exceptional level is in and of itself worthy.

This model assumes that performance in Criteria A is not substandard.

- 3) Consideration of only Criteria A for exceptional achievement: This position argues that exceptional service to the UCSD Libraries within Criteria A is in and of itself deserving of consideration for acceleration. This model assumes that performance in Criteria B/C/D is not substandard.
- 4) Consideration of Criteria for exceptional achievement depends on the rank of librarian: This position considers the context for exceptional achievement as dependent on the rank of librarian and involves graduating expectations, in which a librarian advances through the Assistant Librarian steps almost exclusively on the basis of Criteria A, through the Associate Librarian steps on the basis of both Criteria A and Criteria B/C/D (with Criteria A being given greater weight at the lower steps and Criteria B/C/D given increasing weight in the higher steps), and through the Full Librarian steps on the basis of both Criteria A and Criteria B/C/D. In this model, acceleration would require exceptional achievement in Criteria B/C/D in the higher steps of Associate Librarian and in all steps of Full Librarian. As in normal merit increases, this model is vague as to which step of Associate Librarian it is required for achievement to be exceptional in Criteria B/C/D.
- 5) No accelerated merit increases are allowed. This position considers normal merit increase sufficient to reward achievement and argues that accelerated merit increases are not described in the APM (which mentions only accelerated promotion).

LAUC-SD should decide a model to choose for peer review of accelerations in order to ensure equitable consideration for acceleration among librarians. Since consensus is unlikely and since this pertains to the critical peer review process, it may well be that a majority view is adopted.

We hope that further discussion of these models at the upcoming membership meeting will lead to a motion to select the most desirable one or to ballot the membership, which would lead to drafting a position paper that reflects the majority view of the membership.

=====
Appointment and Promotion Manual
Librarian Series

360-10 Criteria

- b. A candidate for merit increase or promotion in this series shall be judged on the basis of the first of the following criteria, and, to the extent they are relevant, on one or more of the last three:
 - (1) professional competence and quality of service within the library;
 - (2) professional activity outside the library;

- (3) University and public service; and
- (4) research and other creative activity.

In the consideration of individual candidates, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised in weighing the comparative relevance of these criteria.

- c. Promotion shall be justified by demonstrated superior professional skills and achievement and, in addition, demonstrated professional growth and accomplishment and/or the assumption of administrative responsibility. The assumption of administrative responsibility is not a necessary condition for promotion.
- d. An explanation of these criteria is set forth in APM - 210-4.

Appointment and Promotion Manual Review and Appraisal Committees

210-4 Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on the Appointment, Merit Increase, Promotion, Career Status Actions for Members of Librarian Series

- b. ...In conducting its review and arriving at its judgment concerning a candidate, each review committee shall be guided by the criteria as mentioned in APM - 360-10 and described in APM - 210-4-e.

e. Criteria

- (2) Merit Increases and Promotions: At the time of original appointment to a title in this series, each appointee shall be informed that continuation or advancement is justified only by demonstrated skills and achievement which will be determined after objective and thorough review. . . . [A]ccelerated promotion is possible if achievement has been exceptional. An appointee will be eligible for promotion only if there are demonstrated superior professional skills and achievement. For some, promotion may involve a position change; for others, promotion may not necessarily involve position change but will depend upon increased responsibility as well as growing competence and contribution in the same position. The assumption of administrative responsibilities is not a necessary condition for promotion.

A candidate for merit increase or promotion in this series shall be judged on the basis of professional competence and quality of service rendered within the library and, to the extent they are relevant, one or more of the following: professional activity outside the library; University and public service; and research and other creative activity.

(See APM - 360- 10.)