

**LAUC-SD
Membership Meeting**

November 19, 2002
2-4 p.m.
Seuss Room, Geisel Library

Present

D. Ambrose, M.L. Bergstrom, A. Butros, K. Calkins, J. Cheng, L. Claassen, H. Colson, P. Coppennoll-Blach, E. Cowell (chair), T. Dearie, S. Deng, M. Dun, S. Dunlap, A. Gold, J. Hanson, M. Harden, S. Ho, S. Isozumi, J.R. Jacobs, E. Kanter, D. Kegel, C. Keil, S. McGuinness, P. Mirsky, R. A. Nelsen, K. Peterson, A. Prussing, J. Reiswig, J. Silver, B. Slater, S. Starr, N. Stimson, D. Tweedy, A. Wallace, P. Weiss, J. Williams, V. Williamson (recorder), J. Yang

Announcements

Cowell introduced new LAUC-SD member James R. Jacobs, SSSL State & Local Government Information Librarian. Lynda Claassen introduced two new members from Mandeville Special Collections Library: Arvid Nelsen, Cataloger, and Jessica Silver, Public Services Librarian.

LAUC Statewide Executive Board conference call report

Cowell reported on highlights from the recent Executive Board Conference call. (For more details on the conference call, see the [Minutes of the LAUC Executive Board Meeting, Nov. 1, 2002 \(MS Word doc\)](#).) The statewide Information Literacy Task Force is proceeding with our own Amy Wallace as co-chair. The group's first task is to come up with a primary definition of information literacy. They are also in the process of clarifying the roles of the LAUC Information Literacy team vs. the SOPAG Heads of Public Services Information Literacy team.

The fall assembly will be held December 6 at UCSF. Dan Greenstein will be there to answer questions from LAUC.

The spring assembly will be here at UCSD; the exact date is TBA. Program ideas are still being entertained. One discussion topic example is the coordination of sharing among campuses. ULs will be invited to participate.

Round robin reports from campuses: Lots of hiring going on.

CAPA Annual Report and discussion of proposed changes to the ARPM

CAPA 2001-2002 Report ([report available online as MS Word document](#))

Dunlap reported that there were 16 files reviewed for the 2001 review cycle. He feels that one of the biggest reasons for CAPA's success this year was their adherence to the calendar. He noted

that the agreement and disagreement numbers do not pertain to all the same files. Also, there were a record number of new appointment files this year. Dunlap offered some reminders to the membership to keep in mind when writing their reviews:

1. Routine performance evaluations should adhere to the five-page limit. This applies to the self-evaluation as well as the (combined) evaluation of the Review Initiator and/or Department Head.
2. The Review Initiator's and/or Department Head's review should be evaluative in nature. While mention may be made as to the candidate's promise and potential, the review should not engage in wild speculation as to possible future accomplishments. Similarly, the review should not focus on detailed minutiae such as color or font size.
3. *IV.E.3.c "Request for Letter of Reference List from Candidate"* Letters of reference are normally used only in review for promotion, acceleration, career status, advancement to Librarian VI, **or in those cases in which the Department Head and/or Review Initiator does not have firsthand knowledge of the individual's performance in a certain area.** However, the Candidate's right to request letters of reference is in no way diminished by the above.

The Review Initiator and Department Head need feedback on the full range of the Candidate's responsibilities. This year CAPA observed that some Candidates submitted Letter of Reference lists that were not exhaustive. When applicable, Candidates need to submit exhaustive lists, or Review Initiators and/or Department Heads needs to request letters to evaluate such areas where she or he has no firsthand knowledge.

Proposed Changes to ARPM

Dunlap distributed copies of the proposed changes ([available online as MS Word document](#)). He noted that they were minor changes that had been suggested by B. Schottlaender at a previous membership meeting. He met with B. Schottlaender to clarify the suggestions. A motion was made to adopt the changes. Motion passed in all cases except the last two. [Approved changes available online as MS Word document](#).

Discussion: *V. Review Procedures: Appointments D. Recruitment 4. Interview.* Lengthy discussion ensued. Dunlap facilitated the wordsmithing session until the membership was happy with the new Paragraph D. Motion passed to accept the new language. Regarding the LMG section, the next time there is a department head recruitment, B. Schottlaender will urge all LMG members to participate in the interview.

Discussion: *V. Review Procedures: Merit Increase, Promotion, Career Status F. Peer Review Procedures 2. Instructions for CAPA for Forming Ad Hoc Committees c. Formation of Ad Hoc Committees.* Discussion ensued on the suggestion to add the "acceleration" regarding cases where an ad hoc committee is required. Change was accepted by the membership; motion passed.

Committee on Professional Governance survey report

See <http://www.ucop.edu/lauc/pg/annual01-02.html> to read the results of the "distinguished step" survey. E. Grassian, LAUC President, would like feedback from all the campuses. This survey report will also be an agenda item at the fall assembly.

LAUC-SD Research and Professional Development Committee – goals and future directions

K. Peterson and A. Gold distributed handouts detailing the two funds controlled by LAUC-SD R&PD. They asked the membership's thoughts on what should be done with the money that has not been used in recent years, particularly the research fund. The Committee would like to launch a campaign to help people understand what constitutes a research project and also how to find the time to do research.

The Opportunity Fund is designed to support local research. Its allocation is \$5000 annually. We currently have a balance of about \$27,000 and statewide committee has even more money.

The General Fund's current balance \$1056.88. It is used for journal subscriptions and programming, catering, etc.

Suggestions: Use to help defray the cost of travel to conferences and workshops, especially since there are more and more opportunities available. With the increasingly specialized nature of our work, there is a lot of interest among our staff to go out and learn new things and to network with other professionals. Nancy Stimson (representing IOC) proposed an Information Literacy Program where a couple speakers would come from other institutions. She guessed that they would need about \$800-1000 for honoraria.

Discussion ensued on what the funds can actually be spent on. What are the restrictions? How would approval for individuals be obtained? Would it be competitive or evenly divided? How can we go about facilitating research? We need to find a balance between the research side and the professional development side. Can the money be used to pay for professional association memberships? Can more money be given to people who are going to present at conferences to encourage research?

Peterson brought up the subject of the LAUC journal subscriptions and the amount of money spent on them. She suggested more discussion of the subscriptions in the future or maybe a survey about the funds. Peterson moved to cancel two paper subscription of the Journal of Academic Librarianship. Motion accepted.

Meeting adjourned at 4:03 p.m.