

**LIBRARIANS, LAUC-B AND THE AFT:
THE STRUGGLE FOR ACADEMIC STATUS
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY,
1963-1991**

WILLIAM L. WHITSON

**BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA
1992**

HISTORY OF LAUC-BERKELEY

This chapter will deal with the history of the Librarians Association at Berkeley in several sections. Because Berkeley librarians were so active in the development of the movement for improved status, which led to the establishment of LAUC, a relatively extensive account is given in the background section. The evolution of LAUC-B itself is treated in three principal sections. The first focuses on the organization itself, and its role in campus and library “governance”—how it served as a mechanism for non administrative librarians particularly to have a “voice” in the ongoing decision-making process of library and campus operations. The second section focuses on the peer review process, and the more general question of professional status—the extent to which librarians were able to take responsibility for defining and enforcing the standards for appointment, promotion and advancement of librarians. The third section covers progress in the area of professional perquisites, ranging from salary to support for professional development and activity in the form of leaves, funding and the flexible use of time, as well as the “professionalization” of job assignments. Since so much of this area has also been the concern of the union, relations between LAUC-B and the union will be included here. The fourth section deals with the affiliated librarians.

[Author’s note: This chapter is a first draft, derived from the archival record and filtered through the author’s recollections. It has not yet been possible to consult with anyone mentioned here, or with any others who share this history, to corroborate its accuracy, balance and interpretations. The author apologizes for any misconstructions of the record, and welcomes comment.]

Background

The history of LAUC-B is the history of the development of academic status —of a new, more challenging professional role for librarians. It was precipitated from the cloud of professional self-awareness that emerged nationally in the 1950’s, when Library Council, the statewide advisory group of University Librarians, recommended that librarians be administered within the University structure as academic appointees rather than staff employees. President Clark Kerr made the change on paper in 1962, but the actual implementation of that decision has been a very long, slow process—a process incomplete to this day.

Once the change in status was announced, lower-level librarians began to ask what academic status meant, and demanded fundamental change in librarians’ roles, to follow faculty models rather than those for staff.

There were over 175 librarians on the staff in the early 1960’s, appointed to positions classified in a five-rank hierarchy. Beginning librarians and a few others worked as Librarian 1. Most reference librarians, bibliographers, and catalogers performing basic library operations were classed as Librarian 2. Unit heads, assistant department heads and those with more advanced special skills were normally classed as Librarian 3. Department Heads and large unit heads might normally be Librarian 4. A few of the department head positions with the largest scope might be classed as Librarian 5.

The University Librarian since 1945, Donald Coney, was a member of the Academic Senate, and identified more with faculty than with the librarians on his staff. Much collection development was still done by faculty members; the librarian-bibliographers were mostly language specialists working in the Acquisition Department. In his last annual report of 1967, Coney devoted 5 of 6 pages to a detailed list of important acquisitions, and only on the last page mentioned developments having to do with the staff. Management was hierarchical, decisions were made at the top with little consultation or involvement of staff. Librarians felt themselves a low-status occupational group, underpaid, under appreciated and denied perquisites and opportunities for continuing education, professional leave & travel, participation in the University governance process, and so on, which would allow them to function as real professionals. In addition, political activism was in the air in the mid-1960’s. The Free Speech Movement which took place on campus in the Fall of 1964 defined the era. Librarians, too, were ready to question authority and fight for their rights.

Unions had emerged as powerful agents for improved working conditions, achieving a peak of membership and respectability in the 1950's, though they chiefly represented skilled trades and industrial workers. Professional groups had strong associations such as the American Medical Association, the American Bar Association, the Association of American University Professors, and the National Education Association, but among the less advantaged professional groups, the more militant approach of the union movement began to make inroads during the 1950's and early 1960's. Among public school teachers, many of the younger teachers, the more independent thinkers, the politically liberal or radical, turned to the American Federation of Teachers. The AFT also began to grow on college and university campuses.

The Berkeley University Teachers Union (later renamed University Federation of Teachers), Local 1474 of the AFT, was founded in May 1963. Several librarians were among the organizing group, and one among them, Rudy Lednicky (Slavic Bibliographer), was the first Recording Secretary. The organization grew very rapidly during the year of the Free Speech Movement, 1964-65. Many faculty members were uncomfortable having librarians in their organization, however, and the concerns of the two groups were very different. So in 1965, the librarians, now 30 strong, formed a separate Library Chapter, and began to function independently. The Library Chapter grew to 50 members by May 1967 representing nearly one-third of the professional staff. In the Fall of 1967, the Library Chapter received its own charter as AFT Local 1795, with the name University Federation of Librarians. It was at that time the most significant group of unionized librarians in the country.

Many of the early leaders of the librarians' union had strong personal commitments to unions as a matter of political and social principle. Some came from labor union families with life-long commitments forged in the struggles of the 1930's. Most of the group, however, were not so much committed to labor unions as simply interested in organizing effectively to achieve real changes in librarian status. Until the end of 1966, Rudy Lednicky served as Chairman of the Library Chapter. From early 1967 until later that year, the Chairman was an ambitious middle manager, Eldred Smith, Head of the Search Division of the Acquisition Department, who represented the more "moderate" or pragmatic group.

The period from 1962 until 1969 was largely one of discussion and debate. The new "academic status" meant initially little more than a change in which campus offices handled our paperwork. In most respects, librarians continued to be governed by staff personnel policies. Only at the end of the decade did concrete change begin to occur, and even then, it was individual University Librarians who took the initiative. Campus and statewide implementation of "academic status" really didn't take place until the next decade, largely between 1973 and 1976.

Although the Library Chapter was by no means the only organization involved in this discussion, the union did play a significant role, especially up to the time LAUC was established in 1967/68. Under the editorship of Allen Covici (General Reference Service), it published 12 issues of a handsome 4-8 page newsletter, *CU Voice*, between 1965 and 1969. Through its activity, it served as a forum for developing a list of the changes librarians wanted and began to put pressure on Library and campus administration to recognize the need for change.

Several proposals were worked out in detail and submitted to Library and campus administrations. One was a proposed Grievance Procedure for Non-Senate Academic Employees, presented in July 1966. The tenure issue received a great deal of attention with the Ishimatsu case, reported in the November 1966 issue of *CU Voice*. When Chizuko Ishimatsu, the Head of Cataloging at UCSF, challenged her peremptory dismissal, first appealing within the UC structure up to the Regents, then in the California District Court of Appeal, the judicial hearings clearly exposed the fact that, as long as they were unprotected by either tenure or a union contract, UC librarians could be fired for any reason, at the discretion of the University.

Another significant effort of the Library Chapter was to conduct a survey of librarian salaries at other academic libraries. A detailed questionnaire was sent to fifty-two libraries; forty-six responded and information for one more was found in the New York Times. In 1967, UC ranked 35th of 48 in beginning salaries, and 23rd of 35 for the top salary in the first position above beginning librarian.

Several sets of recommendations were developed during 1966 and 1967. Their fullest statement appeared in a comprehensive, 15 page list of recommendations for change, entitled the "Library Improvement Program," which was submitted in August 1968 to the new University Librarian, James E. Skipper, as well as to UC President Hitch, UCB Chancellor Roger Heyns and Vice-Chancellor Earl Cheit, members of the Library Council, the Academic Senate Library Committee and to all librarians in the UC system. It began by strongly recommending full faculty status for librarians, with "all the rights, privileges and responsibilities it embodies," but went on to list all the "interim measures" which should be adopted until full faculty status might be granted. Its 109 points covered a wide range of topics, from professional matters such as tenure, peer review, sabbaticals and a voice in governance, to personnel policies such as those governing recruitment and transfer (internal reassignment), access to files and review of administrative personnel, to specific improvements in library services and facilities, to salary and benefits issues and collective bargaining.

One substantial early proposal came from a librarian not involved with the union. In September 1966, John Emerson (Music Library), a serious scholar in the field of medieval chant and liturgy, proposed a one-quarter sabbatical-like leave at 2/3 pay, open to any Librarian 2 or above, for purposes of research, continuing education or other professional activity, awarded by a peer committee. The proposal was viewed quite favorably by Mr. Coney and was widely supported by librarians.

Other organizations in California were also debating academic status in the mid-1960's. The State College Librarians Round Table issued a Position Paper calling for full faculty status for librarians, which was formally adopted by the Board of Directors of the California Library Association in October 1966.

The College, University & Research Libraries Section (CURLS) of the California Library Association appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Status, which included two UC Berkeley librarians, Marc Gittelsohn (Agriculture) and Eloyde Tovey (Bancroft), and was chaired by Fay Blake at UCLA. Their "Position Paper on Status and Benefits for Librarians in California's Colleges and Universities" was based on the State College Librarians Position Paper. Its eleven points called for full faculty status, including equal salaries, sabbaticals, tenure, advancement to higher rank based on merit and independent of administrative position, scheduled workloads which included time for independent research and other professional activities, access to grants, fellowships and research funds, including the right to serve as principal investigators, access to the same review, grievance and appeal procedures as other faculty, and full membership in the Academic Senate. This position paper was formally adopted by the CURLS Ad Hoc Committee at a meeting during the ALA Conference in San Francisco in June 1967.

In August 1966, President Clark Kerr appointed a Special Administrative Committee, the Hoos Committee, and the statewide Academic Senate appointed the Special Committee on Non-Senate Academic Ranks, the Speiss Committee, to look into the status of non-Senate academics and make recommendations. The Library Chapter of the Berkeley University Teachers Union made a number of efforts to provide input to these committees. A copy of its proposed Grievance Procedure for Non-Senate Academics was forwarded in September 1966, and a revised version was sent in March 1967, along with eight other detailed proposals regarding the rights and privileges of librarians.

In March 1967, the University Librarian distributed a questionnaire to UCB librarians, based on one which had been done at UCLA, in order to gather information about librarians' concerns to send to the Speiss and Hoos Committees. The questionnaire was criticized by the union as inadequate and full of ambiguities, however, and only 30 library staff responded. A second questionnaire, also from UCLA, was distributed April 21. The Library Chapter urged librarians to submit their own comments to the committees, and organized a special evening meeting for librarians to discuss their ideas. When the Hoos Committee held a hearing on the Berkeley campus, on April 17, 1967, the Library Chapter presented a nine-page paper giving its general position and a number of specific recommendations. A number of librarians spoke, some from carefully prepared texts.

One of the more interesting aspects of this period was the way in which Berkeley's University Librarian, Donald Coney, finally moved to respond to the fast-moving developments with his own initiatives in early

1967. The union had begun pressuring him in the Fall of 1966 to attend a general meeting of librarians to listen to and discuss their concerns. He was adamant in refusing any such appearance, even if the meeting were sponsored by an ad hoc committee. The union declined his invitation to send several representatives to meet with him privately. In February 1967, the union wrote to propose that he include three elected non-administrative librarians in his group of top-level managers, the Library Advisory Conference, to improve communication between the lower and higher levels of the administrative hierarchy. He responded that this idea—or an alternative—was already under consideration.

He then appointed a committee of five librarians, chaired by Music Librarian and Professor Vincent Duckles, to “design a professional liaison group which could discuss with him matters of mutual interest.” On May 11, the committee submitted its report, proposing a Library Advisory Board of 10 members. The University Librarian would chair the group, and appoint one other administrative librarian. The other eight were to be elected by the professional staff, one representative from each of six administrative jurisdictions and two from a seventh. Library administration distributed ballots on May 25 and encouraged all to vote. 117 ballots were cast out of a potential total of 142. The elected members were William Berges (Forestry), Grace Dote (Graduate Social Sciences), Sheila Dowd (Map Room), Marc Gittelsohn (Agriculture), Ralph Hansen (Catalog), Catherine Moreno (UGL Project), Eldred Smith (Acquisition), and Annette Voth, along with Mr. Coney and AUL Helen Worden.

The Library Advisory Board met five times between October 1967 and April 1968. The focus of its discussions was Working Paper #1 on Librarian Classification and Pay Plan, issued by the Library Council Personnel Subcommittee, and later, Working Paper #2. Its discussions were captured in unusual detail in minutes recorded by Catherine Moreno. They provide an interesting snapshot of the issue of academic status as seen at the time of LAUC’s formation, both from the vantage point of the “old guard,” represented by Mr. Coney, and from that of the leaders of the faculty status movement (including Eldred Smith).

Mr. Coney presented an argument which seems to have relevance as much today as it did then. He said that it was very well for librarians to want to gain in pay and perquisites by redefining their role to more closely imitate the faculty, but that this might mean having other staff perform jobs traditionally the province of librarians. Furthermore, he questioned whether those that allocate funds to support library collections and services—the UC faculty and administration— would have any interest in employing a new class of librarian involved in scholarship, publication, teaching and professional activity. He felt that faculty were really only interested in getting books on the shelves and making them available.

Though its discussions were interesting and probably had some influence on the thinking of librarians at Berkeley, the LAB was overshadowed by the founding of LAUC in mid-1967 and the work which was taking place during the same period to establish the new organization.

There was one other significant development in late 1967. A split developed in the librarians’ union between those who continued to believe that a union was an effective way to challenge the University and force it to accommodate librarians’ demands, and those who finally concluded that unions were inappropriate for professionals, and wanted librarians to devote all their attention to the alternative offered by LAUC. Those who decided against pursuing the union option, led by the Chairman, Eldred Smith, resigned from the union.

In 1969, Eldred Smith published an article in *ALA Bulletin* on the organization of LAUC in which he describes LAUC as a tactical choice made by UC librarians as the most effective way to achieve their goals, rejecting both of the alternative approaches: (1) the employee organization, which had been favored by UC librarians prior to the formation of LAUC, and (2) the professional association, which supported librarians in the California State Colleges as they worked to gain their objectives through the California legislature. He concluded that if LAUC did not lead to better benefits, improved status and a real voice in matters that concern them, librarians could always return to the alternatives originally rejected. In fact, a number of librarians maintained a different perspective from the start, viewing LAUC and the union as complementary, not competitive.

In 1967, the American Library Association held its annual conference in San Francisco. A number of librarians, most of whom had been active in the union, arranged a meeting of UC librarians. From that meeting, LAUC emerged. Those uncomfortable with a union found LAUC a far preferable alternative. It would function for librarians as the Academic Senate did for faculty, serving as a vehicle for “shared governance” and enhanced status. At the same time, librarians committed to the union believed that LAUC would offer a second channel through which to work. As an officially supported in-house advisory body, LAUC could work from within University, campus and Library administrations to press for enhanced professional status, while the union continued to press from the outside, using resources (such as political action) not open to LAUC. Rudy Lednicky and Myra Kolitsch, from UCB, were part of the statewide Steering Committee, which worked to establish LAUC as an organization through the summer and fall of 1967. At Berkeley, Library administration extended a kind of informal recognition by authorizing an organizational meeting on work time, in October 1967. LAUC held its first statewide election in December 1967 and elected Berkeley’s Eldred Smith as President.

FORMATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

LAUC-B librarians approved a set of Bylaws by January 1968. Thirty-six members attended the first LAUC-B meeting on March 13, and nominated candidates for the first Executive Committee. The election was conducted and the new Executive Committee met on April 1, with Myra Kolitsch (UGL Project) as Chair. It appointed committees on Recognition, Librarian Status and Library Policy.

The LAUC-B Chair formally requested that LAUC-B be recognized as an official advisory organization, in a letter to the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, William Bowsma, on June 13, 1968. The University Librarian, Donald Coney, retired at the end of July, and Dr. James Skipper arrived as new University Librarian, meeting with the Executive Committee on August 16. Dr. Skipper was immediately supportive, agreeing to authorize duplication and distribution of the LAUC-B Bylaws, ballots and other LAUC communications, and allow LAUC-B meetings on Library time.

Skipper was also presented with the union’s Library Improvement Program, and met with union representatives in a series of meetings during the fall. In order to develop a program that would respond to both LAUC-B and AFT concerns and proposals, he appointed a Task Force on Academic Library Personnel, with Eldred Smith as Chair, Margaret Studhalter (Catalog Dept.) as a LAUC representative and liaison to the LAUC-B Executive Committee, Margaret Johnson (Education-Psychology), Kimiyo Hom (Astronomy/Math), Ann Gilbert (Periodical Room) and Frank Brechka (History Bibliographer).

A number of issues surfaced as LAUC-B began to define its purpose: what should be LAUC-B’s stance toward the newly created Library Advisory Board? How could communication within the Library be improved; what should be LAUC-B’s role in providing a “voice” for non-administrative librarians? What should be done about the myriad of specific issues—tenure, grievance procedures, redefining librarians’ job roles, etc.? Was LAUC really just an “in-house” union? How much work time could be spent on LAUC activities? Would the creation of LAUC lead to a sense of division between librarians and other staff?

A new Executive Committee took office in January 1969, with George Davis of the Government Documents as Chair. The Task Force on Academic Personnel submitted its report in May, calling for LAUC to serve as the “main organizational vehicle for librarians to have a voice in library policy and procedures,” and proposing a review process in some detail, including a Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Appeals. UL Skipper distributed the Task Force Report for discussion and comment, but in the meantime recognized LAUC within the General Library, adopted the Report’s recommendations regarding the role of the Executive Committee and agreed to implement the proposed academic review process within the General Library. Meetings to gather comment were held in September, the union presented a detailed response, the Report was revised and a final version was issued on November 11.

John Emerson became Chair in 1970, a year in which LAUC-B really began to flower. The proposed “CAPA Guidelines” were revised and adopted, and the first Committee on Appointments, Promotion and Advancement was appointed February 13, 1970. Berkeley’s Task Force Report was distributed to all of

the other campuses, and in April 1970, the Statewide LAUC Committee on Privilege, salaries, Conditions, and Security of Employment presented a revised version of the Report under the title "Consensus of the Views of the Nine Campuses on the Statewide Issues Contained in the Report of the Berkeley Task Force on Academic Library Personnel." It was approved by Statewide LAUC and forwarded to Vice President Taylor, as a partial response to the first draft of a new Section 82 of the APM, submitted by Library Council's Subcommittee on Personnel, which covered much of the same ground in a far less satisfactory manner.

From the very beginning, there was concern on the part of Library administration about how LAUC-B as an advisory body would mesh with the hierarchical administrative decision-making structure responsible for managing the library. The union's Library Improvement Plan included a section recommending a host of specific improvements in operations,¹ and since LAUC's purpose was to serve as an advisory structure, there was a natural inclination to form committees to advise on every aspect of library operations. To evaluate this approach and outline a proposed course of action, LAUC-B appointed a Committee on Academic Purpose, in March 1970: Jean Peck (Catalog), Chair, Sheila Dowd (Map Room), Vincent Duckles (Music), Eleanor Engstrand (Gov. Docs.), and Catherine Moreno (UGL Project). The report was serialized in CU News, beginning April 30. It recommended five standing committees, with a charge to each committee: Public Service (space utilization, reference staffing, hours, bibliographic control, circulation/ILL policy, public information including leaflets, signage, student relations [organized instruction, surveys, student library committee]) Collection Building [later changed to Development], Staff Development (career development for librarians), Library Operations (channel for staff suggestions for improving operations), and Faculty Relations. All but the Committee on Faculty Relations were appointed at the end of June. The new LAUC-B committees tackled the full range of library issues: space planning, reference staffing, hours, bibliographic control, circulation, tours, exhibits and library instruction. Of the 168 librarians on the staff, 48 were serving on a LAUC-B committee.

During this period, LAUC-B reached a high point in its influence within the General Library. UL Skipper gave a "State of the Library" address at the LAUC-B Spring Assembly in 1971 to librarians and other interested library staff. LAUC-B appointed an ad hoc committee in February 1971 to work out a plan for the reorganization of the Main Library reference service; its report was submitted in June. The Collection Development Committee surveyed all library units for their Collection Development policies. The Public Services Committee made recommendations relating to reference services, the establishment of a Catalog Information Desk, and authority cards in the Author-Title Catalog.

LAUC-B also began to establish itself on campus. Responding to the atmosphere of street warfare in Berkeley in 1969, LAUC-B adopted a resolution in May 1969 condemning the "current handling of the public unrest problem in Berkeley by University and local authorities." In 1970, it sent a letter expressing concern for employee safety when tear gas was used on campus against demonstrators. In Spring 1970, during the Cambodia crisis, LAUC-B participated in the "reconstitution" of the University, but consciously adopted a "moderate" stance, endorsing the work of the Steering Committee set up to collect and distribute information on anti-war activities. Librarians were duly punished along with others, however, when the Legislature denied a planned "range adjustment" (cost of living increase) for all academic employees to punish UC faculty for their role in the strike.

On a more peaceful note, LAUC-B held its first annual joint dinner with the Stanford University Librarians Association, a tradition which continued until 1985.

Campus administration was less willing to accommodate LAUC-B's initiatives than the University Librarian had been. One example occurred when, in November 1970, Dr. Skipper announced he would resign, effective June 1971, to become Executive Vice President of the Kraus Thompson Organization, Ltd., managing its European division from offices in Liechtenstein. Skipper's resignation presented an opportunity for LAUC-B involvement in the process of selecting his successor. LAUC-B requested a representative on the Search Committee. The Vice Chancellor was unwilling, however, to appoint anyone but a tenured faculty member. Happily, one librarian on the staff, Music Librarian Vincent Duckles, was also a Professor in the Music Department, and he was appointed to the Search Committee. The LAUC-B Executive Committee did, however, have an opportunity to meet with the Search Committee, and participated in the process as one of the interviewing groups.

On July 29, 1971, Vice Chancellor Robert Connick finally responded to LAUC-B's request for recognition by agreeing to a two-year trial period, contingent upon certain changes in the Bylaws. The changes were to return to a single organization for both the General Library and the Non-General libraries (the Bylaws had been amended a year earlier to provide for two separate sections), and to drop "concern for matters other than Library policy and governance" from its purpose.

In June 1971, James Skipper left. Eldred Smith was appointed Acting University Librarian in July. Rather than serve a caretaker role, Smith moved boldly ahead with new administrative initiatives. He appointed a Committee on Affirmative Action Program for Women, with Anne Lipow as Chair. The Committee's *Report on the Status of Women Employees in the Library of the University of California, Berkeley*, submitted in December 1971, became a landmark document in identifying a librarian salary inequity using comparable worth arguments. It demonstrated clearly that librarian salaries were lower than those of other job titles in the University or elsewhere which required similar levels of education and expertise, but did not suffer discrimination as female-typed occupations.

Smith's second major initiative was more problematic. He established a new Library Advisory Council, with advisory administrative committees dealing with Reference Services, Selection and the Catalogs. Even though the LAUC-B Chair was made an ex officio member of LAC, the establishment of parallel committees caused confusion and undercut LAUC-B's role in advising on routine library management. The parallel structure continued only until the new University Librarian, Richard M. Dougherty, arrived in July 1972.

Dougherty brought a strong commitment to participatory management and staff development, but felt that all committees advising on library operations should come under a single administrative umbrella. LAUC-B agreed to disband its three overlapping committees (Public Services, Library Operations, Collection Development) and make another recently appointed LAUC-B committee, the Ad Hoc Committee on Main Library Renovation and Expansion, a LAC subcommittee. In exchange, Dougherty agreed to have LAUC-B nominate at least half the members of each advisory committee. LAC was reorganized to include regular LAUC-B representatives (in addition to the Chair, who was an ex officio member), along with department head representatives and the top-level administrators. The Staff Development Committee became a joint LAUC-B/LAC committee, reporting to both groups.

In October 1972, with the new committee structure, Non-General librarians were appointed to several of the committees as non-voting guests, and two support staff were added for the first time to the Staff Development Committee.

Beginning in 1969, the University proposed new sections for the Academic Personnel Manual (82 and 51-4) defining the librarian series as academic appointees, and providing general policies for appointment, promotion and advancement. In spite of extensive comment by LAUC and the union, on both the local and statewide levels, and a lengthy process of reconsideration and revision, the final version of the APM sections was still considered unsatisfactory in important ways by many LAUC-B members. The 1971 and 1972 LAUC-B Executive Committees sent a joint letter to Chancellor Bowker in January 1972, protesting the lack of an adequate salary scale, true security of employment and a grievance procedure. The new sections were added to the APM nonetheless, effective July 1, 1972.

Nineteen seventy-three was a year of budget cutbacks and reorganization in the General Library. Library Advisory Council held a retreat in Strawberry Canyon in January, and brainstormed ideas for changing priorities, cuts and new programs. There was a substantial across-the-board reduction in serials subscriptions. General Reference Service was merged with Collection Development, as a way of better utilizing librarian expertise and enhancing career growth by expanding the scope of responsibilities of each individual librarian.

In January, the AUL for Technical Services, Joseph Rosenthal, announced the establishment of an administrative intern position, to rotate every six months among librarians in the several technical services departments. Other members of Library administration were evidently planning to establish similar positions. The failure to consult LAUC-B, LAC or department heads provoked an angry letter of

protest from the Executive Committee. Dougherty apologized for the oversight and agreed to review the change in six months, but dropped plans to create additional positions without compensating the home units. LAUC-B asked for the establishment of guidelines to govern creation of new positions drawn from existing staff.

There was considerable LAUC-B discussion of the need for guidelines dealing with reorganization and staff reassignment generally, and some sentiment that CAPA should be routinely consulted when more than one department was involved; but no guidelines were developed.

Later in 1973, LAC itself was reorganized, discontinuing department head representation (except for the Chair of the Department Heads group) in favor of LAUC-B-nominated members.

In general, UL Dougherty was quite willing to consult with the LAUC-B Executive Committee in a meaningful way. One problem with this openness, however, surfaced in the campus discussion of the Report of the Library Task Force of the UC Academic Planning and Program Review Board. LAUC-B appointed a subcommittee to analyze the report and prepare a response, and Dougherty was eager to meet with them, but was also concerned that the matter be handled confidentially, to avoid friction between the campuses or antagonizing the Legislature. [The Report recommended giving priority to Berkeley and UCLA in collection development, asking other campuses to pare down their collections.] It turned out that none of the other campuses was treating the Report in a confidential fashion, so the issue was dropped. The incident made him fear, however, that he might not be able to consult with the LAUC-B Executive Committee in quite the same way he could with his administrative cabinet, since it might sometimes be difficult for him to justify a demand that a given matter be treated as confidential. In fact, LAUC-B was quite sensitive to the issue of confidentiality; for example, at that time, there was a specific procedure for routinely bracketing items in the minutes that were not to be included in the version printed in CU News. Discussing it further, the Executive Committee assured Mr. Dougherty that they would always respect anything he asked to be kept confidential, though they might try to persuade him to change his mind if they disagreed with his judgment.

The issue of Executive Committee continuity arose in 1973, when only one of the 1973 Executive Committee members was elected to the 1974 Committee. The Bylaws were amended in 1974, to provide for two-year terms for the General Library and NGL representatives (1st year as Alternate), and provide for the election of a Vice-Chairman/Chairman-elect. The Secretary's title was changed to Secretary-Treasurer, the Vice-Chairman and Secretary-Treasurer were included in the delegation to statewide LAUC assemblies, and CAPA was established as a standing committee. One proposed amendment, to change the title of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson, was defeated 40-22. In 1976, there was another Bylaws revision, principally to change from a calendar to academic year basis, following statewide LAUC, and change the name from Librarians' Assembly to Librarians Association. This time, the membership agreed to adopt the neutral term "Chair." The Executive Committee for 1977 served from January until August, and the next Committee took office in September 1977.

Nineteen seventy-four was the year LAUC-B had its most extensive interaction with campus administration, as Vice-Chancellor Mark Christensen was forced to come to terms with LAUC-B's peer review guidelines, before he could bring himself to officially approve them. He had a number of lengthy joint meetings with the LAUC-B Executive Committee and CAPA, along with the University Librarian and others from the administrative cabinet, to debate both the philosophy and concepts involved in the faculty peer review process and the specific provisions of the Berkeley librarian review procedures. He then rewrote the procedures himself, approved them and promulgated them as official policy, before leaving his position in July 1974.

Nineteen seventy-four was also one of LAUC-B's busiest years. The Executive Committee met weekly for the first two months, then every two weeks. It held five assemblies. The debate over peer review standards and performance expectations, especially what it would take for a librarian to be promoted to full librarian, led to the production of LAUC-B's largest report, the *Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion Review*, involving the work of over 50 librarians.

From 1972 to 1974, there was a gradual increase in the number of support staff appointed to advisory

committees. Staff Development Committee was evenly divided, with four support staff and four librarians, and there was support staff representation on LAC. When an Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Structure of LAC proposed abolishing the Library Advisory Council, replacing it with a five-person planning committee, and allocating other functions either to the administrative cabinet, to the department heads group, or to the LAUC-B Executive Committee, there was strong opposition to the idea, much of it coming from support staff, who feared they would lose some of their representation in advisory groups. The proposal was eventually dropped (October 1974).

The following year, in 1975, the LAC Steering Committee pushed through a different reconstitution of LAC, this time reducing the number of LAUC-B appointees to four, and creating a separate Nominating Committee for LAC and its advisory committees. LAUC-B no longer appointed members to any advisory committee, but rather selected two members of the Nominating Committee. LAUC-B was deemed responsible for professional standards and status issues, and issues that were statewide or regional in scope, while LAC was responsible for library policies and programs. Some support staff questioned the very “legality of the professional concept as a whole.”

In 1975, LAUC-B was officially recognized, along with recognition of statewide LAUC. It corresponded with Provost George Maslach to request input into the search for a new Dean of the School of Librarianship. Finally, rather than requesting a LAUC-B member on the Search Committee, LAUC-B sent a letter requesting that the Search Committee be expanded to include members representing women in the profession, graduates of the School, local employers of graduates of the School, and/or librarians on the University staff. The request was rejected, but the Executive Committee felt it had made campus administration more aware of LAUC-B’s potential advisory role.

One notable accomplishment of 1975 was the adoption of a local appeals procedure for performance review decisions. LAUC-B resurrected the proposal for an appeals procedure which had been dropped two years earlier, worked out a less ambitious proposal, without an appeals board, and submitted it to Vice Chancellor Heyman. The document, entitled *Administrative Review Procedures for Librarians Requesting a Reconsideration of a Salary or Promotion Decision*, was issued as a supplement to the “CAPA Guidelines” in July 1975.

The restructure of the librarian salary scales, and incorporation of a salary inequity adjustment, also occupied considerable LAUC-B attention in 1975, as it had during the preceding three years. Berkeley librarians had played a major part in the development of the issue, ever since the union had conducted the first survey of comparison institutions in 1966. The union had played a prominent role in the lengthy legislative campaign (1972-75) for a salary inequity increase, and two representatives from Berkeley were on UC administration’s Statewide Committee on the Restructure of Librarian Salaries: Gwendolyn Lloyd, of the Institute of Industrial Relations, representing LAUC, and William Wenz, the Library Personnel Officer, representing personnel administrators.

With most of the work to achieve recognition, peer review and salary restructure nearly completed, LAUC-B began to talk about going beyond concern for its own status, standards, organization and procedures, and providing advice on broad library-related issues. One of the first major issues to come along was the issue of using OCLC or BALLOTS (later RLIN). LAUC-B sponsored a forum for all staff to explore the issue of automated bibliographic control, with the UL Richard Dougherty, AUL/Technical Services Joseph Rosenthal and Systems head Susan Martin as speakers. In 1976, LAUC-B prepared a detailed analysis of the Salmon Plan, holding two meetings with Steve Salmon present for questions and discussion.

Interestingly, the librarians employed by statewide UC in the Library Automation Program (the predecessor to Division of Library Automation) decided in 1977 that they preferred not to deal with the ramifications of academic status—especially peer review—and so chose to be reclassified into other job titles.

In 1976, Jane Flener resigned as AUL/Public Services, and two LAUC-B representatives, Geri Scalzo (Grad. Social Sciences) and Dorothy Gregor (Public Health), were appointed to the Search Committee for a new AUL. The LAUC-B Executive Committee interviewed seven candidates; Elaine Sloan was chosen, to begin in 1977. Other less successful advisory initiatives were an exploration of whether LAUC-B

might have input into the Library budget for 1977/78, and whether LAUC-B might have some input to the College Curriculum Committee.

In 1976 and 1977, LAUC-B also began to turn to librarian career development as a concern. LAUC-B proposed Staff Development Committee funding of a series called LAUC Seminars on Career Development, to bring in noteworthy outside speakers for half-day colloquia at Strawberry Canyon. SDC appropriated \$800, and three colloquia were sponsored during Fall 1976: Page Ackerman (UCLA), William McCoy (UCD) and Archie Kleingartner (UC administration). There was also a seminar given by a panel of former CAPA members. In 1977, the LAUC-B Seminars were run by a committee consisting of Richard Cooper (Middle Eastern Bibliographer), Chair, Lan Dyson (Moffitt), Geri Scalzo, Dorothy Gregor and Rita Kane (Biology), and a series was held every two weeks covering CONSER, CLASS, library planning, and management. In 1977, to formalize its commitment to programs for career development, LAUC-B appointed a LAUC-B Program Committee.

In October 1977, the Library Advisory Council again redefined itself, becoming the Advisory Committee to the University Librarian (ACUL), dropping the LAUC-B Chair as an ex officio member and reducing the number of LAUC-B members on the Nominating Committee from two to one. LAUC-B protested the reduction of its advisory role. The 1977 Executive Committee spent several meetings debating LAUC's advisory role, with several, led by Chair Richard Cooper (Collection Development), arguing that LAUC should concern itself only with professional governance and development matters, not with library operations, while others, such as Julia Cooke (Library School), arguing just as strongly that LAUC should concern itself with the full range of issues confronting us as professionals, including those involving library operations. The two chief problems complicating LAUC-B's role in advisory committees were the fact that the Library advisory committees had to include support staff (which LAUC could not represent) and exclude Non-General librarians (who were LAUC members).

In 1978, UL Richard Dougherty resigned to take a position as Director of the Library and Dean of the School of Library Science at University of Michigan. AUL/Technical Services Joseph A. Rosenthal became Acting UL in July. This time, LAUC-B again requested participation in the UL selection process, with at least two librarians on the UL Search Committee, and the Vice Chancellor agreed, asking for 5-7 nominees. Richard Cooper and Rita Kane were the final appointees.

Joe Rosenthal was appointed University Librarian in October 1979. The Advisory Committee to the University Librarian (ACUL), with seven appointed members serving staggered 3-year terms, along with the UL and AULs as ex officio members, now had no LAUC-B participation. LAUC-B argued that to exclude the LAUC-B Chair was to thwart the legitimate advisory role assigned to LAUC, and asked that the LAUC-B Chair be made an ex officio member. LAUC-B also asked that the minutes be more widely distributed.

Rosenthal agreed to distribute minutes through *CU News*, but refused to allow LAUC-B to have an ex officio member. Meeting with the Executive Committee in December 1979, he outlined his view of LAUC as responsible for defining and maintaining professional standards and professional development through CAPA and through career development programs. In his view, participation in policy-making was part of every librarian's responsibility, so that there was no longer a need for LAUC to play a role in this area. He told LAUC-B that if it wished to have a role in policy advice, it could take the initiative, but it must also be sure that its role was "effective and not redundant."

In April 1980, however, he suggested that the LAUC-B Chair might serve in the Department Heads group, and the Executive Committee agreed to try that approach. The standing committees, such as Reference Services Committee, Collection Management & Development Committee, and Committee on Bibliographic Control, continued to function under ACUL, and the UL did agree to allow the regular appointment of NGL representatives on each of the committees. The Staff Development Committee continued to be responsible jointly to ACUL and LAUC-B.

LAUC-B Executive Committee had for several years been interested in improving communication with members, and providing members with better information about LAUC. In 1975, a communication tree was developed, so that each Executive Committee member would have responsibility for direct contact

with certain library units. In 1976, a LAUC-B Information Packet for New Members was issued, and in early 1980, this grew into a binder-sized LAUC-B Handbook, sent to each member. The 1979/80 Executive Committee also instituted a program for welcoming and orienting new librarians: each was taken to lunch by two Executive Committee members.

After periods in the early 1970's during which the Executive Committee met weekly, the Executive Committee settled into a twice-a-month pattern which continued for the most part until the mid-1980's, when the Executive Committee began meeting once a month. A resolution was passed in 1979 requiring that monthly summaries of LAUC-B minutes and concerns be published in *CU News*. The 1980/81 Executive Committee recommended the adoption of "Goals for Annual Review" as a means of focusing LAUC-B efforts over a period of time by defining objectives and steps to achieve them.

The LAUC-B Executive Committee interviewed candidates for a new AUL/Technical Services in May 1980, and for a new AUL/Public Services in early 1981. Dorothy Gregor and Rita Kane assumed their respective positions in July 1980 and April 1981.

Continuing the effort to become more of a presence on the campus and beyond, the 1981/82 LAUC-B Executive Committee adopted a goal of exploring the possibility of LAUC-B representation on Academic Senate committees, and reciprocal faculty representation on LAUC-B committees. The Executive Committee also favored the idea of having LAUC-B and the University Librarian become more active in the political arena, writing letters to legislators regarding library-related legislation. At this point, there were 163 LAUC-B members: 125 from the General Library, 30 in the Non-General libraries, three systemwide librarians, and five employed on a temporary basis.

Administrative stipends was among the most controversial statewide issues receiving attention in 1981/82. A local ballot on stipends yielded 51 against and 34 in favor. The UCB position was that a statewide policy was needed, that stipends might be permissible if tied to additional duties, that they should be temporary, not tied simply to administrative or supervisory responsibilities, that they should be granted in consultation with CAPA, and that appointments be for only two years, with renewal options thereafter.

A proposed Library Specialist series was first discussed in 1980, in response to reports of the Library Council Personnel Committee dealing with the restructure of the Library Assistant series. LAUC-B strongly objected to the overlap and confusion between the Specialist and the Librarian series, fearing that the University might begin using the Specialist series to fill librarian jobs. The proposal was also criticized for emphasizing basic librarianship skills, rather than specialized technical skills. Nevertheless, LAUC-B did agree that a higher pay scale was needed for top Library Assistant jobs. There were further objections to the proposed Library Unit Head Specialist, in 1981/82. On the other hand, UCB reactions to the first efforts in 1982 of the LAUC Committee on Definition of a Librarian were also rather negative.

Support for research and professional development became an important focus in the early 1980's. The University appropriated money to support librarian research, through LAUC's University Research Grants for Librarians Program, and LAUC-B established a Committee on Research, sponsored three workshops on writing grant proposals and awarded funds to three UCB librarians.

Jack Leister (Institute of Governmental Studies Library) chaired a LAUC committee on the Northern Regional Library Facility in 1979/80, and was made a LAUC representative on the NRLF Board in December 1981. The matter became an issue, however, when LAUC-B decided that LAUC should have a regular voting member on the Board. The Chair of the NRLF Board, UCB's Joe Rosenthal, initially opposed the idea, but eventually the Board recommended that LAUC be given one non-voting member, on the same basis as the UC Academic Senate. Rebecca Martin (Biology Library) was appointed to a three-year term in February 1983.

Internal recruitment became a major issue in 1982, when the Library decided to post the vacant Head of Education-Psychology Library position for applicants only within the General Library. LAUC-B appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on Internal Recruitment and debated the issue extensively. LAUC-B decided that internal recruitment was better than an internal transfer, but that the norm should be

external recruitment. Rosenthal agreed that internal transfer or recruitment should be used only when needed to solve a personnel problem, take advantage of an opportunity created by a vacancy, or because finances required it. The Ad Hoc Committee drafted a set of "Guidelines for Handling Vacancies in Librarian Positions," which was forwarded to CAPA, to the University Librarian, and to Vice Chancellor Maslach in late 1982. A revised document, "Guidelines Governing Internal Recruitment and Transfer for Professional Positions at UC Berkeley," was scheduled for discussion in Spring 1983, but was tabled pending the resolution of the collective bargaining question, since UC was now prohibited from consulting with LAUC about any matter which might be within the "scope of representation" of an employee organization. LAUC-B attempted to revive the issue in 1983/84, but nothing was resolved

Later, the 1984/85 Executive Committee resurrected the document, revised it, and adopted it as a LAUC-B position paper "Guidelines for Filling Vacancies in Librarian Series at U.C. Berkeley," and in July 1985 sent it to the University Librarian, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the UC Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs. Although UL Rosenthal indicated in November 1985 that he accepted the guidelines "in theory," acknowledged that they were substantially "in effect" in the General Library, and proposed to Vice Chancellor Park that they be adopted as a campus administrative document in July 1986, no action was apparently taken. The 1986/87 Executive Committee, under Norma Kobzina, again discussed, revised and adopted them in April 1987, but they are not mentioned again in the LAUC-B record.

The 1982/83 and 1983/84 Executive Committees had to contend with the general uncertainties about LAUC's role in the context of collective bargaining. The Memorandum of Understanding was signed in October 1984, providing a new framework for LAUC's role, since professional and governance concerns were reserved to LAUC, while matters relating to salary, benefits and working conditions were covered by the MOU. One consequence of the new environment was that LAUC had to take responsibility for the allocation of funds for research and professional development, so the responsibilities of the Committee on Research were enlarged, the Committee became the Committee on Research and Professional Development, and the Staff Development Committee narrowed its focus to the needs of support staff.

The Search Committee for a new AUL/Technical Services, in early 1984, consisted of one AUL (Sheila Dowd), one LAUC-B representative (Ivan Argüelles), one department head and one support staff representative. The LAUC-B Executive Committee served as one interviewing group. Sue Rhee was selected to replace Dorothy Gregor.

The advisory committee structure underwent further changes in the mid-eighties. In September 1983, Library administration decided to suspend ACUL, have the advisory committees report directly to the Library Administrative Group, and assign to the LAUC-B Executive Committee responsibility for nominating librarians for the standing committees. The University Librarian would consult monthly with the LAUC-B Executive Committee on library policies and programs. LAUC-B welcomed the change as a potential strengthening of LAUC's role.

A year later, Library administration proposed that LAUC-B take full responsibility for the Library Policy Advisory Committees. LAUC-B appointed a Subcommittee on Committees to evaluate the proposal. Following its recommendations, with some changes based on comments from LAUC-B and from the Library Administrative Group, the Library defined a new General Library Policy Advisory Committee structure in 1985, which has continued to the present day.

LAUC-B nominates librarians for certain "slots" on each committee, and Staff Development Committee nominates support staff for other "slots," but the committees are appointed by the University Librarian and report to Library administration. Non-General librarians are also appointed to each committee, based on nominations from the Committee on Non-General Library Affairs (which has one member on the LAUC-B Nominating & Elections Committee). Each committee was to designate one librarian as liaison to the LAUC-B Executive Committee. Besides the Policy Advisory Committees, there are a number of strictly administrative committees, such as the Public Services Advisory Group to Technical Services, Cataloging Council, and any task forces Library administration might appoint. LAUC-B also has several of its own committees, but not dealing with Library policies and operations.

In 1983/84, the campus finally began to allocate a discrete fund (\$4500) to cover LAUC-B Executive Committee travel & meeting expenses. Previously, expenses had been covered through the General Library administrative budget. In 1985/86, LAUC-B submitted a comprehensive budget request to the Vice Chancellor for the first time, totaling \$6700; nearly the full amount (\$6000) was approved.

The 1983/84 Executive Committee was very concerned with problems of communication with the UL, the Vice Chancellor and the faculty, as well as with the general lack of participation by LAUC-B members, and developed a two-page outline of objectives and goals, in order to improve matters. The next year, the Executive committee established a regular schedule of two meetings each year with the Vice Chancellor. A similar schedule was set with the University Librarian, but the Chair and Vice-Chair also met separately with him every other month. In 1986/87, the meetings with the Vice Chancellor changed to once a year.

Even though the new UC Presidential Statement on the Status of LAUC, issued in September 1985 to conform to the redefinition of LAUC's role embodied in the Tier 2 "Compact" issued with the collective bargaining agreement, clearly gave LAUC a role in advising campus and library administrations on the "operations and policies of the libraries," and in "the planning, evaluation and implementation of programs, services or technological changes in the libraries of the University," most of the development of LAUC-B's role in the late 1980's involved efforts at reaching out to establish new links with campus bodies beyond the Library.

One effort which produced tangible results involved campus parking. Although the parking privileges granted librarians might seem clearly a "benefit" which should have been the province of the union, LAUC-B took strong action in February 1986 (along with the union) to protest a revision of Central Campus eligibility which eliminated central campus parking privileges for Associate Librarians. Eventually, nearly all the librarians who lost their eligibility were re-granted their privileges on an exceptional basis, and LAUC-B, with the help of Library administration, was able to gain LAUC-B representation on the Campus Parking Committee. Catherine Cortelyou (Transportation) was appointed to the Committee in 1987.

In his Spring 1987 meeting with the Executive Committee, the University Librarian suggested expanding relationships with the School of Library and Information Studies and the Academic Senate. The Executive Committee met that summer with Dean Robert Berring of SLIS to discuss having faculty members serve on advisory committees, establishing a mentor program for Library School students, expansion of the intern program, recruitment of minorities, incorporating bibliographic instruction in the curriculum, and development of a recommended LAUC reading list for Library School students. Over the next two years, all these ideas were explored. One initiative tangible enough to be finally realized was the "LAUC-B Notable Books" list, complete by Gary Handman in 1988.

In the late 1980's, LAUC-B was responding to an increasing number of campus and statewide plans and recommendations dealing with libraries and automation. In 1986/87, there were the Proposal of the California Library Networking Task Force for "multitype library networking," the reorganization of the Division of Library Automation, MELVYL development plans, report of the statewide Task Force on Academic Computing, a revised Library Plan for Development and the Library Automation Review Committee report. In 1988/89 there was a major report on the future of the UCB libraries for the WASC accreditation visit, and the Library Council "Electronic Database Access Proposal."

Another major initiative on the campus level was the first Spring Symposium on "The Right to Know: Access to Federal Information," which was held in the Boalt Hall Auditorium in April 1987. The all-afternoon program included prominent faculty members and outside speakers. Three of the five papers were later published in *Government Information Quarterly*, thanks to efforts by Marc Levin (Institute of Governmental Studies Library). The second Symposium, held in October 1988, dealt with "Information, Knowledge and Wisdom: the Library in American Education and Culture." Although it was an all-day program, and enlisted speakers as notable as Alexander Astin (UCLA), Theodore Roszak (author), Patricia Holt (S.F. Chronicle Book Review Editor) and UC Vice-President William Frazer, the attendance was disappointing.

Another outreach initiative was the establishment of a UC Berkeley “Public Communication Liaison” to publicize LAUC through articles in *UC Focus*, *UC Notice* and other channels, in the way Jean Smith (UCSD) had begun to do for statewide LAUC. Ellen Meltzer (Moffitt) served the first year (1987/88), and Barbara Glendenning (BioSciences) the second.

Better relations with the Academic Senate Library Committee were recommended by UL Rosenthal in a fall 1987 meeting, and this initiative was pursued over the next several years, beginning with an informal “brown bag” lunch meeting of the Senate Library Committee and LAUC-B Executive Committee in August 1988. The idea of representation on the Senate Library Committee, in an “observer” or non-voting capacity, was discussed in 1988/89, and in October 1989, incoming Chair Pete Evans wrote to the Committee, which accepted the proposal. The Vice-Chair/Chair-elect of LAUC-B was made an ex officio non-voting member. Ron Heckart, the 1989/90 Vice-Chair, was the first to serve.

When Vice Chancellor Park appointed an eleven-member Commission on the Future of the Berkeley Libraries in early 1989, it included only three librarians—the University Librarians from Berkeley and Davis, Joe Rosenthal and Marilyn Sharrow, together with Nancy Van House, of the School of Library and Information Studies. LAUC-B requested representation, and also recommended someone on the Commission representing the Ethnic Studies departments. Ellen Meltzer, past Chair of LAUC-B, was appointed to the Commission in September 1989, and Lily Castillo-Speed, Head of the Chicano Studies Library, was appointed in November. The Commission submitted its report in Spring of 1990.

The late 1980’s saw a number of LAUC-B activities relating to the issue of cultural diversity. Recruitment of minority librarians was the focus of discussions in 1987 and 1988 with the Library, the Vice Chancellor and the Library School. In October 1988, the Executive Committee discussed the work of CLA’s CSL Library Recruitment Committee with UCB librarian Susana Hinojosa, and considered a proposal from Colette Myles for an ad hoc committee on minority recruitment. When UL Rosenthal requested advice from LAUC-B regarding the same issue in October 1989, Chair Pete Evans appointed an ad hoc committee to develop guidelines for recruitment of minorities, consisting of Ellen Meltzer, Armanda Mason, Diane Brown and Lily Castillo-Speed. The Committee submitted a lengthy set of recommendations to LAUC-B, involving action by the Library, LAUC-B, the School of Library and Information Studies and other statewide and national minority groups.

On the initiative of Ellen Meltzer, 1988/89 Chair, LAUC-B joined with the CARL (California Academic and Research Librarians) and CSU chapters of the California Library Association to co-sponsor a program at the November 1989 CLA Annual Conference on “Cultural Diversity in the Curriculum: Radical Reform or Institutionalized Change.” The following year, LAUC-B sent four representatives to the Cultural Diversity Workshop, held at UCLA in October 1990.

The stress of the continual budget squeeze led the Library to hold a major retreat in October 1988. “Target 95” attempted to identify ways the Library could trim operations to maintain excellence in an era of declining resources. LAUC-B did not participate, since such planning was deemed the responsibility of administrative units. One advisory committee, the Committee on Bibliographic Control, had been dissolved earlier (May 1988), in order to eliminate unnecessary committee work, and in meetings with LAUC-B following Target 95, UL Rosenthal urged further scrutiny of committees and of the peer review process, in order to reduce the time spent.

In fact, he appointed a Task Force on Librarian Review Process (Geri Scalzo, Ellen Meltzer, Ron Heckart) to review the peer review process with this end in mind. Their report, submitted in September 1989, suggested a number of ways to clarify the process and provide models or guidance for peer and administrative reviewers. The major outcome of Target 95, however, was the development of new policies restricting service to non-primary clienteles, about which LAUC-B commented in November 1989.

The AUL for Collection Development, Sheila Dowd, retired in September 1988, and the Executive Committee appointed a four-person subcommittee to interview the five candidates for the position. David Farrell was appointed in the Spring of 1989.

Two Delphi Questionnaires were distributed in 1988/89 to gather librarian comment on the priorities

LAUC should assign various possible activities. Eleven areas of activity were identified and ranked by 30 respondents: the role of the professional, electronic information access, staff retraining, minority recruitment, UC systemwide planning, improved financial support for individual librarians, library budgets, equity in performance review, and miscellaneous other issues.

The work of several statewide LAUC committees received attention during 1989/90 and 1990/91, as UCB representatives reported their work and solicited comment: Jim Spohrer, for the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Resources; Ginette Polak, for the Committee on Professional Standards, regarding proposed revisions of APM 140 (Non-Senate Academic Grievances) as well as a proposed section 150 (Non-Senate Corrective Action and Dismissal); and Roy Tennant, for the Library Plans and Policies Committee report on the impact of electronic information on UC libraries.

The 1990/91 Executive Committee welcomed a new Chancellor, Chang-Lin Tien, and Vice Chancellor, John Heilbron. The Chancellor was invited to speak at the Spring Assembly, and the Vice Chancellor first met with the Executive Committee and UL Rosenthal in October, resuming a tradition of holding such meetings on an annual basis. One topic was the possibility of LAUC-B representation on Academic Senate committees other than the Library Committee, such as those dealing with instructional planning and academic computing.

In 1989, Patricia Vanderberg (Catalog) asked the LAUC-B Executive Committee to see whether a librarian as a LAUC-B representative could be included in the academic procession at the Berkeley Convocation, rather than march as a Library representative in the staff group, as had always been the custom. The Chair, Pete Evans, attempted to explore the issue with the campus, but was unsuccessful. Ms. Vanderberg decided to participate, but was forced to march in the staff group. The case served as a reminder that in a great many matters, where employees are still categorized as faculty or staff, librarians are treated as staff. LAUC-B's efforts were rewarded, however, when Milt Ternberg and Alison Howard, the first two recipients of the Distinguished Librarian Award, represented LAUC-B in the academic procession at the inauguration of Chancellor Chang-Lin Tien in Spring 1991.

The University budget crisis and the loss of staff due to the first Very Early Retirement Incentive Program (VERIP), later referred to as "Plus 5," dominated much of LAUC-B's agenda in 1990/91. Both the University Librarian, Joe Rosenthal, and the AUL for Public Services, Rita Kane, announced in late 1990 that they would be retiring under VERIP. The Executive Committee discussed with UL Rosenthal proposed ideas for handling the impending AUL for Public Services vacancy, and recommended individuals the Committee felt might be appointed to fill the position on an interim basis. Eventually, the Assistant University Librarian for Collections, David Farrell, was made Acting Associate University Librarian for Public Services and Collections, assuming responsibility for both AUL roles.

The Vice Chancellor also requested suggestions for LAUC-B representatives on the Search Committee for a new University Librarian, and submitted a draft position announcement for LAUC-B to review. LAUC-B Executive Committee also expressed concern about arrangements for an interim UL, and willingness to discuss the matter, but the issue became moot when UL Rosenthal was recalled on a part time basis to continue to serve as UL until December 1991, shortly before the arrival of his successor.

Ron Heckart and Camille Wanat were appointed to the seven member UL Search Committee, and Ms. Wanat was made Co-Chair, with faculty member Arnold Leiman, Chair of the Academic Senate. The Executive Committee sent a letter with its views on the qualifications and skills a University Librarian ought to possess.

Since the Library would lose a great many librarians with the VERIP, and the intention of campus administration was that they would not be replaced, there was a likelihood of increased workloads and reassignments. In December 1990, the LAUC-B Executive Committee began a series of discussions regarding the ramifications for both reassignment and recruitment, and for expectations and criteria in the review process. A two-page analysis, "Personnel Options in the Wake of the "Plus 5" Early Retirement Program," was developed to promote a common understanding of what could be done under the existing policies and procedures.

In Spring 1991, Chair Ron Heckart and the Executive Committee developed a position paper, "Peer Review Standards in a Time of Retrenchment," recommending that (1) candidates and review initiators should note constraints on outside activity and these constraints should be considered by other reviewers, (2) the proper emphasis in evaluating professional activities should be on quality and impact, not whether they occur on the national level, and (3) all reviewers should be more flexible and accommodating in their approach to standards during this period. The paper underwent prolonged review and revision, partly in order to reach some agreement with Library administration, which initially reacted negatively. A revised draft, now titled "The Librarian Series and Peer Review: A Reassessment for the 1990's," was forwarded to the Vice Chancellor and to incoming UL Dorothy Gregor in December 1991. A final version, somewhat softened and qualified, and titled "The Librarian Series in the 90's and Beyond," was issued April 30, 1992, and distributed to Vice Chancellor Heilbron, UL Gregor, CAPA and the LAUC-B membership.

Criticism of the advisory committee structure had been developing over the last few years, exacerbated by the desire to eliminate unnecessary activities and meetings that wasted time. Some changes were being proposed—the AUL for Collections outlined a plan for reorganizing the Collection Management and Development Committee. The LAUC-B Nominating & Elections Committee, chaired by Bill Whitson, charged with nominating librarians for advisory committees, conducted a survey of what LAUC-B members thought about LAUC-B and Library committees, in the summer of 1991, to provide background information for any review of the committee structure. While respondents generally felt that LAUC-B should continue to play a role in the advisory committee structure, people preferred committees that had important work to do (such as CAPA), that had well-defined tasks, that were well-run by their chairs, and—in the case of advisory committees—that were listened to. The chief complaints were of poor committee management, administrators who didn't take committee input seriously or failed to structure or make clear the decision-making process, and the fact that some individuals found it difficult to secure committee assignments, and attributed it to bias or favoritism. The LAUC-B Executive Committee reviewed the report, found it useful, and agreed that review of the committee structure was needed, but decided to await the arrival of the new UL.

The following June, Susana Hinojosa discussed another survey with the Executive Committee—the report of a Communication Task Force appointed by Library administration, which distributed questionnaires to all Library staff. The survey revealed a deep alienation between support staff and librarians, as well as confusion about the committee structure, a sense that management often did not allow people to contribute, a desire for direct communication with the top, and for effective management training.

In 1992, The Executive Committee met with Vice Chancellor John Heilbron in March, with Acting Dean of SLIS Nancy Van House in April, and with the new University Librarian Dorothy Gregor in May. Professor Arnold Leiman spoke at the Spring Assembly.

In March 1992, Chair Becky Lhermitte wrote on behalf of LAUC-B to Provost Judson King to support "the continued presence of the School of Library and Information Studies as an integral, vital part" of the University. At the same time, three LAUC-B members, Beth Rebman (Music/SLIS faculty), Susana Hinojosa (Moffitt/Minority Mentoring Program), and Andrea Sevetson (Government Documents/LAUC-B mentoring coordinator), working with Associate Dean Charlotte Nolan (SLIS), developed a proposed Library School Mentoring Program, which would involve both LAUC-B and the Library.

In February 1992, LAUC-B established an e-mail reflector, for distribution of announcements, agendas, minutes and other communication. Although 30 LAUC-B members still did not have e-mail at the time, the campus was moving rapidly to provide it to all staff.

It should be remarked that communication has always been a problem for LAUC-B, because of the size of the group. In the early years, LAUC-B Assemblies generally involved a great deal of discussion (and even the use of parliamentary procedure, to control motions and debate!), and there were often more than two scheduled during the year. By the late seventies, however, Assemblies had settled into a pattern of two per year, and were generally rather formal, mostly involving reports from the LAUC-B and committee chairs, and representatives to statewide committees. At times, efforts were made to change this, by providing reports in print form, or carefully scheduling a period for discussion of a

pressing issue, but without much impact. In recent years, guest speakers have frequently been invited, so that the Assembly became part “program.” Because of the ineffectiveness of the Assembly as a forum for discussion of issues, “LAUC-B” has generally come to mean the LAUC-B Executive Committee, since that is the only LAUC-B group which meets regularly to discuss LAUC issues. Agendas are now distributed by e-mail and the meetings are open, but relatively few others ever attend. There is little sense among Berkeley librarians generally that they belong to or participate in LAUC-B, except through work on LAUC and LAUC-B committees, and many issues come before the Executive Committee and evoke a “LAUC-B” response without most of the members being much aware of them.

In September 1990, there were 154 librarians in LAUC-B. By August 1991, the number of librarians had declined to 128. By August 1992, the number had dropped still further, to about 115, and the prospect in Spring 1993 was that LAUC-B’s numbers would continue to decline, as the most severe budgetary crisis in the University’s history imposed “downsizing,” reorganization, reassignment and the increased utilization of lower-paid staff to perform jobs once done by librarians. One cannot help but be reminded of UL Coney’s warning that it might be very well for librarians to redefine their role as closer to the faculty model, and thereby justify higher pay and status, but ultimately the University might not be willing to pay us to perform such a role, and would simply hire others to do what we used to do.

In October 1991, the campus announced the selection of a new University Librarian, to replace Joseph Rosenthal. Dorothy Gregor, recently University Librarian at UC San Diego and earlier a participant in the history of LAUC-B, arrived in February 1992, to assume leadership of a library and staff faced with unprecedented challenges, and a rocky transition into a new era, with new roles for both librarians and for LAUC-B.

PEER REVIEW

The peer review system we have today developed from the Report of the Task Force on Academic Personnel, first released in May 1969 and issued in final form on November 12, 1969. It was in turn derived from elements of the faculty review system in the Academic Personnel Manual, as well as from the various position papers of the University Federation of Librarians and the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Status of the College, University and Research Libraries Section (CURLS) of the California Library Association.

All these called for peer review in appointment, tenure, dismissal and grievance decisions. They also called for appointment and advancement to be based on professionally defined standards, criteria and procedures and for advancement to the higher ranks to be open to non-administrative librarians. The Task Force Report, however, was the first statement which took the existing faculty provisions of the APM and adapted them to librarians’ needs and aspirations. It defined the Librarian Series, with Assistant, Associate and Librarian ranks; it defined criteria and procedures for appointment to the series, for promotion and advancement review, and for review resulting in security of employment. The procedures all involved peer review by committees of librarians appointed by LAUC-B or by the University Librarian.

The original proposal was different in several respects from what we eventually adopted. The most critical area dealt with openness vs secrecy. In the Task Force proposal, the candidate was informed of the membership of his/her Review Committee, and given the right to appear before the Committee; was given access to all reports and recommendations concerning him/her; and had the right to see the report of the Review Committee. While such a system will appear radical to most UC Berkeley librarians today, it is found elsewhere; indeed, it has been followed all along at nearby San Francisco State University, where the peer Review Committee performs the tasks assigned to our “review initiator.” The assumption of the Task Force was that professional employees should be expected to take responsibility for their actions and judgments, and deal in a mature way with the knowledge of the judgment of colleagues as well as supervisors. The other chief difference was in the establishment of a Committee on Appeals, separate from CAPA, and the provision of a special review process including a hearing before a peer committee, for cases involving demotion or dismissal of librarians with security of employment.

When the proposal was submitted for comment to the Senate Library Committee, however, its Chairman, Delmar Brown, wrote back to advise that, in the judgment of the faculty, this degree of openness would render the reviews perfunctory and nearly always favorable, since no one wants to be “known as the one who voted against the promotion of a colleague.” They recommended instead that the membership of the Review Committee [ad hoc committee] be kept confidential, that the departmental report [recommendation], the Review Committee report and the CAPA report all be kept confidential, and that in the case of denial, a special report or explanation be prepared jointly by the Director [University Librarian] and CAPA. They also recommended one academic non-librarian on any three-person review committee. On the whole, however, the Library Committee found the Task Force Report “recommends some truly constructive personnel changes—many that are long overdue...especially...your move to provide meaningful participation in the formulation and implementation of library policy,...your clear statements of rights and privileges for librarians.” They were also impressed with the appeal procedure, which, “for promotion appeals, moves beyond anything we have in the Senate.”

John Wagner, Campus Personnel Manager, also reviewed the Report and made a list of comments. Among his concerns was the use of “just cause” as the only basis for dismissal. He pointed out that “just cause” is normally used in union contracts and is much stronger than “arbitrary, capricious or unreasonable actions by administrative officers,” which was the basis for filing a grievance in the non-Senate academic appeals procedure.

The Report was also submitted to each of the other campuses, and in April 1970, the Statewide LAUC Committee on Privilege, salaries, Conditions, and Security of Employment presented a somewhat revised version of the Report under the title “Consensus of the Views of the Nine Campuses on the Statewide Issues Contained in the Report of the Berkeley Task Force on Academic Library Personnel.” The Consensus document largely omitted the detailed procedural and appeals elements mentioned above, leaving such matters to campus-level development. It was approved by Statewide LAUC and forwarded to Vice President Taylor, as a first “counter-proposal” to the first administrative draft of a new APM Section 82.

The original “CAPA Guidelines” [Berkeley review procedures] were based on the original Task Force Report, modified by the considerable comment and discussion which took place in summer and fall 1969. There were initially two documents: “CAPA Guidelines for the Appointment Policy, Criteria, and Procedures,” (2 pp.), approved by the LAUC-B Executive Committee on February 24, 1970, and “Advancement, Promotion and Review for Academic Library Personnel, The General Library, University of California, Berkeley,” (6 pp.), adopted by the LAUC-B Executive Committee on March 3, 1970. The provisions of both documents were relatively terse, closer in most respects to the pared-down, more conservative recommendations of the Consensus statement than to the more ambitious proposals of the Task Force Report.

The definition of three academic ranks does not appear, since librarians were still classified in the five rank system, and no mention is made of tenure, security of employment, or appeals. Criteria for appointment took some pains to establish the M.L.S. degree as a minimum requirement, while allowing for exceptions. Criteria for advancement and promotion cited four areas, the first being “professional service in the library,” but stated only that “reasonable flexibility is exercised in weighing the relative merits of these [four] criteria, particularly in their relation to the...position.”

CAPA consisted of five members, appointed for staggered three-year terms. Aside from reviewing all candidates for appointment, its duties included selection of the Promotion Review [ad hoc] committees, in consultation with the University Librarian, reviewing cases involving advancement of more or less than a normal step, assisting ad hoc committees by gathering additional material, and consulting with the University Librarian on questions arising in specific cases. There was no peer review for normal merits, and no CAPA review of promotion cases. The ad hoc committees were made confidential, but the reports of those committees, with committee members’ names and signatures removed, were given to the candidate. Non-librarian academics could be appointed to ad hoc committees.

The procedure for promotion involved submission by the department head of a job description card and a letter of recommendation including a comprehensive assessment of the librarian’s qualifications, which had been discussed with the librarian. The Promotion Review committee could ask CAPA for additional documentation, but all materials other than the department head recommendation were kept confiden-

tial and destroyed after the appeal period expired. The recommendation of the Review Committee was sent to the candidate and department head, as well as to the University Librarian, and a copy was retained in the personnel file. The University Librarian could meet with the Review Committee if his decision differed. An Associate University Librarian might be included in the meeting if the Review Committee were willing.

At this very time, on April 1, 1970, the Personnel Subcommittee of Library Council, which had earlier written Working Papers No. 1 & 2, proposed a first draft of Section 82, defining the status of librarians and providing criteria and procedures for appointment, promotion and advancement. The contrast with the Task Force Report and the first CAPA procedures is striking. The University Librarian acted as reviewer, consulting with "appropriate professional library personnel," and made recommendations directly to the Chancellor, who would consult with a Standing Committee appointed by him, composed of representative Senate and non-Senate members. Appointments to the Assistant rank were to be for fixed terms of not more than two years each, with a maximum period of University service in the title of six years (the appointment pattern still used for faculty, although the maximum period is eight years). Appointees in the series were specifically not granted either tenure or security of employment. Appointments at the Associate and Librarian ranks were simply "continuing during satisfactory performance of duties."

LAUC-B found the proposal "so deficient in content and structure that it rewrote the entire document," incorporating its own proposed changes, and submitted it directly to Vice-President Angus Taylor, on May 13, 1970. The LAUC-B revision did work generally with the structure and content presented, however, so that even with the changes, the Section 82 document still contrasts markedly with the Consensus document. The most important changes were adding tenure for Associate and Librarian ranks, and provision for dismissal only for cause and after review by a peer committee. along with provisions for the University Librarian to consult with a peer committee of librarians before making recommendations in merit and promotion cases.

Other divisions also commented, of course, and statewide LAUC, in addition to approving the Consensus document in April, discussed the Section 82 proposal with University administration continuously over the next few months. Vice-President Taylor did take the LAUC recommendation of the Consensus document quite seriously, and incorporated much of it into a revised Section 82 proposal in the summer of 1970. LAUC-B, while grateful for the improvements, still expressed serious concern about the lack of a grievance procedure, the lack of a revised salary structure and the issue of tenure or security of employment. It worked extensively all year to discuss proposals and counterproposals, both with Dr. Skipper and campus administration, and with statewide LAUC and University administration. The UFL was also contributing lengthy comment, to both LAUC-B and various levels of administration. Another draft of Section 82, issued in April 1971, shortened the document, gave campuses greater autonomy in devising their own procedures, gave greater leeway for the Chancellor to delegate authority to the University Librarian or other administrative officers, made appointments "indefinite" at the Assistant level, and introduced the terms "career status" and "potential career status." A new Section 51-4 defined criteria for appointment, promotion and advancement and the review procedures.

In the meantime, LAUC-B began to implement peer review on its own, within the General Library. The first CAPA, consisting of Kimiyo Hom (Chair), Rudy Lednicky, Sondra Shair, Naomi Held and Margaret Studhalter, was appointed in February 1970, and served until September 1971. Kimiyo Hom was also at this time Berkeley's representative on the LAUC Committee which was working on the Consensus document, and both she and Margaret Studhalter had been part of the Task Force on Academic Personnel.

The first CAPA reviewed 11 merit cases of more or less than a single step, and 46 applications for seven positions above the L1 level. The 1971 Annual Report notes some problems with the process: "many still feel the department head can evaluate better than a committee of peers," and "lack of confidence between the administration and CAPA." In fact, in February 1972, Acting UL Smith reported to the Executive Committee that some dissatisfaction had been expressed with peer review, and the suggestion made that there be two avenues available: either a peer review or a purely administrative review. The Executive Committee felt, however, that more staff had expressed favorable comments than unfavorable ones, and

that more than one year's trial was necessary.

The first full review cycle took place in 1971-1972, with Rudy Lednicky as Chair. Sixty-six candidates were reviewed by ad hoc committees or CAPA. Acting UL Eldred Smith disagreed with eight of the recommendations (four positive and four negative), and in three of the negative cases the committees rewrote their evaluations and recommendations after meeting with Smith. The new University Librarian Richard Dougherty arrived near the end of the cycle, and chose to reverse two of the other five recommendations.

A number of improvements in the review procedures were proposed in 1971 and 1972, as people began to gain experience with the process. The arrival of the new UL Dougherty in June 1972 also occasioned a series of meetings to discuss peer review and other issues. Some of these meetings also included the new AUL for Technical Services, Joseph Rosenthal (who was to succeed Dougherty as UL in 1978), as well as Eldred Smith and the Personnel Officer, William Wenz. A new version of the "CAPA Guidelines" was developed, combining the document on appointment with the one on advancement and promotion review. The new nine-page document, "Appointment, Promotion and Advancement Review for Academic Library Personnel," was adopted by LAUC-B in February 1973. Although it was further revised over the years, it is essentially the same as the campus "Procedures for Appointment, Promotion and Advancement" still in use today.

Because of the large number of cases, it was decided to allow a single ad hoc committee to handle more than one case, and this soon proved to have a positive value in providing a broader perspective. Because documentation was inadequate to provide the ad hoc committee with sufficient basis for an evaluation, the Guidelines now provided for the candidate to submit a self-evaluation, along with supporting documentation, and suggest up to three names from whom letters of evaluation could be requested. Because librarians in the Non-General libraries were clamoring for their own peer review procedures, the procedures were modified to include them; CAPA was expanded by the addition of two NGL's.

Because there had been inconsistencies in the standards being applied by the various ad hoc committees, CAPA was given the additional responsibility for "assessment of the parity and equity of all judgments," through a review of all ad hoc committee recommendations and consultation with the appropriate administrator. CAPA could add its own comment to each dossier, evaluating the "parity" of the ad hoc committee's judgment. In instances where there was a question about the parity of the committee judgment, the University Librarian or other administrator might meet with CAPA.

Due to complaints that insufficient emphasis was being given to the primary job assignment—essentially, that we were moving too rapidly toward a faculty model while most librarians were still operating in the old mode—the "Criteria" section applying to advancement and promotion was revised to provide that the candidate would be "judged on the basis of the first of the ...criteria, and, to the extent they are relevant, on one or more of the last three." The main criterion thus became "professional competence and quality of service within the library." [This change was made in the Berkeley local procedures (CAPA Guidelines) in 1972; the APM Section 82 was apparently changed later.]

A number of other changes were discussed. Library administration agreed to train department heads in evaluation. The UCLA review model, in which the Vice-Chair of LAUC appointed ad hoc committees from a 12-member panel, was considered as an alternative, discussed with Dougherty, and dropped. LAUC-B and Dougherty agreed no one should serve on ad hoc committees but librarians. The fact that the new Section 82 would not allow the candidate to see the review committee report means that it was in conflict with UCB procedures; Dougherty agreed to advise the Vice Chancellor that our practice was more appropriate for librarians and that we would continue the Berkeley practice.

Since the Guidelines had omitted any grievance or appeals procedure, LAUC-B appointed Lisa Cziffra (Chair), Jack Leister and Carlene Brown as a committee to work on an in-house appeals procedure, to resolve "grievances resulting from failure to be advanced, demotion or firing, and dissatisfaction with library operation." A first draft was completed in August, and a final version was accepted at the end of December and recommended to the 1973 Executive Committee. In the Spring, however, Dougherty raised objections, arguing that the procedure, including a standing Appeals Board, was unnecessary and un-

wieldy, that existing APM 191 grievance procedure should be adequate. The proposal was dropped.

One other issue that caused considerable debate in 1972 was the extent to which CAPA should be involved in appointments which were in effect internal reassignments, especially those to positions which might be newly created through administrative reorganization, or when the reassignment included promotion. LAUC-B generally felt that past administrative actions demonstrated a need for explicit guidelines which would insure fairness and consistency. Library administration felt that everyone would be best served by allowing it flexibility to match individuals with positions. The CAPA Guidelines excluded cases involving internal reassignment or temporary appointment from the appointment review process.

Finally, the need for a private office for CAPA and the LAUC-B Executive Committee became critically important with CAPA's assumption of responsibility for soliciting and handling confidential letters and other supporting documentation. Even though the Personnel Officer argued that he was in the best position to handle this responsibility, LAUC-B and CAPA at this point felt very strongly that CAPA should have responsibility for the review materials. Although CAPA argued simply that too many librarians distrusted the Personnel Office, responsibility for the materials was a symbolic reflection of overall responsibility for the review process. Nevertheless, in a later meeting, Dougherty reopened the point, insisting that the Personnel Office solicit the letters. As a compromise, LAUC-B agreed, but the letters were to be returned to CAPA by the review committees, for it to hold and destroy at the end of the appeal period (assuming an appeal process would be adopted). Room 493 was finally assigned to LAUC-B & CAPA in early 1973.

An interesting historical footnote is that the matter of possible evaluation of supervisors by their staffs was raised in several of the meetings, since Mr. Dougherty had written an additional paragraph for the criteria section providing that librarians with supervisory responsibility were to be evaluated for their performance in that capacity. Mr. Dougherty did not wish to make provision for staff evaluation of supervisors at that point, but said that he expected it to come, and "noted that if done well it can be of value."

The revised CAPA Guidelines were submitted to the new Vice Chancellor, Mark Christensen, in February. They were returned with suggestions for minor changes in May, resubmitted shortly after, but then further objections were raised, chiefly having to do with improving the expansion of the review process to cover NGL's. Laurel Burley, an NGL representative and Vice-Chair of the Executive Committee, worked on the changes and another revision was returned in November 1973. In 1974, the Vice Chancellor began to devote greater attention to the Guidelines, and held a number of special meetings with the Executive Committee, CAPA and Library administration, to hammer out once and for all the changes he would require before approving and officially promulgating the Procedures.

Christensen insisted that the procedures parallel those of faculty more closely. CAPA should function like the Senate Budget Committee and add its own written evaluation to each review, not just comment on the recommendation of the ad hoc committee. Most important, he was adamant that ad hoc committee reports must be only summarized, not sent verbatim to the candidate, and that ad hoc committees be appointed by the UL, not by CAPA. He also decided that the Vice Chancellor should be the final decision-maker, so that NGL's and librarians in General Library would be treated in the same way. The UL was to discuss disagreements only with CAPA, rather than with the ad hoc committee. Vice Chancellor Christensen actually revised the "Procedures for Appointment, Promotion and Advancement" (CAPA Guidelines) himself, and promulgated them as official campus procedures in June 1974.

At the April 25, 1974 Assembly, the proposed changes were presented and explained, but there was considerable opposition among the 43 librarians present to the substitution of "summaries" for the verbatim reports of the ad hoc committees. A motion to protest this change was passed with only four "no" votes, and the Chair Bill Whitson sent a letter to the (by then) outgoing Vice Chancellor and other interested parties communicating and explaining that sentiment. Dougherty wrote back criticizing the Chair for the letter's assertion that "the majority of UCB librarians continue to feel that the academic peer review procedures at UCB [to which we were being asked to conform] provide for an unwarranted degree of "confidentiality." Dougherty did not believe the 43 librarians attending that meeting repre-

sented the views of librarians as a whole. The Executive Committee sent out a straw ballot in October, but even though overwhelming numbers of the 54 members voting opposed the changes, the straw ballot was criticized for bias in the wording of the questions, so was deemed inconclusive and LAUC-B dropped further efforts to oppose the changes. Besides the loss of the verbatim reports, the majority objected to having CAPA do its own review, and to requiring that the UL discuss disagreements only with CAPA, rather than with the ad hoc committees. In any event, the Procedures were finally issued officially by campus administration, and peer review was fully established.

The Procedures were barely on their way to approval when a new crisis erupted over performance standards. Meeting with LAUC-B in March 1974, the University Librarian asserted that promotion to full Librarian should NOT be a normal expectation, but happen only in exceptional cases. LAUC-B resisted this proposition, but finally agreed that Librarian rank required more exceptional qualities than Associate Librarian.

Then, in April 1974, Dougherty complained that there would be 17 candidates for promotion to Librarian in 1974, and 11 more were expected the following year, but that there was very little to differentiate them since cases were based chiefly on job performance. He saw little in the way of the development of specialties and accomplishments beyond the primary assignment which would justify promotion at this level—especially for those without major management responsibility—and concluded it would be premature to promote most of these candidates (even though at this point only 14% of the librarians were at the full Librarian level). His statements, both verbal and written, precipitated extensive discussion. Seventy-one librarians attended the May 16 Assembly to debate the issue, including the ways librarians differ from faculty, the 40-hour week, the limited relevance of research & publication. Dougherty wanted more concern with professional growth, and a willingness to work more than 40 hours/week.

LAUC-B did articulate general principles underlying promotion criteria, in May 1974, but also went on to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion Review, “to develop career models which could serve as guides to both promotion review committees and to UCB librarians planning their own professional growth; to draft policy statements regarding the levels of performance [expected] in various career specializations...; and to develop guidelines for effective documentation.” Neal Kaske chaired the Committee, which also included Allan Covici, Richard Cooper, Louise Eastland, Ann Gilbert, Catherine Moreno and Kent Schreifer. The AHCPR in turn appointed 5 subcommittees, so that 35 librarians were actually involved in what became a monumental effort over the next few months. A 70 page report was submitted in November. It was debated at length, accepted by LAUC-B, but not officially adopted due to the complexity of material included.

In spite of all the work invested in the Report, it proved impossible to prescribe career models and standards for performance in the way some had hoped. The Report did provide an array of useful material, from suggested formats for the self-evaluation, biography and an annual statement of goals, to discussions of career models and specializations, and suggestions for preparing documentation. There were a number of appendixes with information about librarian advancement patterns at Berkeley, including some comparisons with UCLA. While the material in the Report could give an individual an idea of the kinds of things expected, each individual was still left with the responsibility to develop his/her own career pattern, and each case would have to be evaluated in its own terms.

In 1975, the appeals procedure proposal was resurrected. This time the proposal limited itself to an in-house reconsideration of a promotion or merit increase decision. The new “Procedure for Librarians Requesting Reconsideration of a Promotion or Salary Decision” was adopted in July and added to the Procedures document.

AUL recommendations were added to review dossiers on an experimental basis during the 1974-75 cycle, at the initiative of Library administration. LAUC-B recommended that copies be made available to candidate and supervisor, with the candidate given the opportunity to meet with AUL and to respond. Library administration insisted they be treated as confidential.

When the experiment was evaluated at the Fall Assembly, there was strong member sentiment for continuing to include AUL recommendations, but making them available to candidates. Vice Chancellor

Michael Heyman replied that he wished to continue to include the AUL recommendations, but that they must be confidential at least until the general issue of confidentiality was resolved at statewide UC level. (President Saxon had appointed special group to study academic confidentiality in personnel records). In January 1976, LAUC-B recommended continuing to include them for another year (rather than dropping them altogether), in order to at least allow CAPA and the review committees the benefit of knowing the AUL position and responding to it.

Associate and Assistant University Librarians themselves were given a framework for appointment and evaluation through the adoption of APM Section 83 in 1975. In discussion of the draft proposal in 1973 and 1974, there was some resistance in LAUC to the creation of a separate managerial group. The separate AUL series was seen as undermining collegiality. At the very least, LAUC favored dual appointment in the AUL and librarian series, so that AULs would have retreat rights and be subject to the same peer review process as other librarians. Section 83 as adopted provided for neither dual appointment nor for any performance review by a LAUC committee. Instead, each campus was left to develop its own procedures for merit review.

The issue came to LAUC-B's attention in 1978/79, when the University Librarian at UCSF asked LAUC-B to suggest the names of UC Berkeley AULs who might serve on a review committee for a UCSF AUL. LAUC-B consulted each Berkeley AUL, but found none willing at the time to serve on such a committee, and questioned UCSF's unilaterally adopting such a procedure, and imposing an obligation on UCB's AULs, without first consulting UCB. At Berkeley, the University Librarian had developed very simple procedures involving an administrative review every two years, with documentation consisting of a self-evaluation and a recommendation by the UL to the Vice Chancellor.

LAUC again discussed the issue of retreat rights for AULs and ULs in fall 1982, and the LAUC-B Executive Committee met with UL Rosenthal to discuss the AUL review process he had developed. In spite of the fact that both Dougherty and Rosenthal had made comments supporting the concept of evaluation of supervisors by those working under them, no procedures have ever been pursued which would provide such an option.

The Procedures were amended in 1976 to provide that mandatory review of Assistant Librarians for career status and promotion be moved from the 3d to the 4th year. Also in 1976, Library administration proposed disqualifying Assistant Librarians from review committees, and allowing only Librarians on review committees for promotion to Librarian. LAUC-B resisted the idea, and reached a compromise to limit to committees to librarians with career status, and require two Librarians on review committees for promotion to Librarian. At the same time, the Executive Committee persuaded campus administration to accept changes in the CAPA Guidelines to give the Executive Committee clear responsibility for policy changes in the review process. CAPA's role was to be strictly limited to implementing policy.

In Spring 1976, Vice Chancellor Heyman decided to make a change in the final decision-maker, so that he would no longer be both the final decision-maker and the officer of appeal. He delegated the role to the UL for General Library, and to various provosts, deans and statewide administrative officers for NGLs. Since he failed to consult LAUC-B and made the change midway in the review cycle [3/15/76], LAUC-B met with him, and objected to the timing of the change and lack of consultation. Heyman agreed to postpone the matter till the next year. In 1977, Heyman proposed making the University Librarian the final decision-maker in all cases. Non-General librarians protested strongly, preferring that the Vice Chancellor remain the final decision-maker in all cases. They voted 15 to 1 to continue with the Vice Chancellor as final decision-maker, and 14 to 1 in favor of an appropriate Provost or Dean, rather than the University Librarian, if the Vice Chancellor insisted on delegation. In the end, the Vice Chancellor delegated final decision-making responsibility to the University Librarian for the General Library, but continued to serve himself as final decision-maker for the NGLs.

In response to general concern that UL Dougherty was imposing more stringent standards than were being required on other campuses, the 1976 LAUC-B Executive Committee decided to ask LAUC for a comparative study of review procedures. LAUC did appoint a Committee on Comparative Standards for Peer Review, which served from 1978/79 to 1980/81, but after extensive study of the problem of comparing rates of advancement, the Committee was forced to conclude there was no way to easily and mean-

ingly demonstrate inconsistencies in the standards being applied, and efforts to insure consistency among the campuses turned largely to the compilation of comparative statistics. Berkeley's Ingrid Pfeiffer (Law), after serving on CAPA, began compiling a table "Librarians Employed Statewide, as of Fall [1982], by Rank and Step," publishing it for the first time in CU News in December 1982. She continued compiling the statistics for a number of years. Statewide LAUC also developed a form in the early 1980's for reporting comparative peer review statistics. Compilation and review of the data was eventually assigned to the Committee on Professional Governance, as a means of imperfectly monitoring advancement decisions across campuses, in the hope that inconsistencies might be noticed and addressed.

On a more immediate, practical level, LAUC-B organized in 1976 the first program to assist librarians in preparation of dossiers. This was to become a regular adjunct to the review process. Over the years since, LAUC-B has held "brown-bag" lunch programs nearly every Fall to brief librarians on the review process and answer questions, has held half-day programs on the review process several times (in 1981, 1986 and 1992), and a number of others dealing with aspects of peer review and career development. As time went on, these became an almost routine responsibility of the Program Committee.

LAUC-B also developed a number of additional written guidelines to explain the process. CAPA wrote two one-page sheets "Guidelines for Candidate's Self-Evaluation" and Guidelines for Supervisor's Evaluation (Full Librarian Merit Review)" which were adopted by LAUC-B, distributed in October 1979 and referred to by the University Librarian in his administrative cover letter initiating the 1979/80 review cycle.

In 1976, CAPA was reviewing only promotions, merits more or less than normal, and normal merits at the Librarian level. There was a general reluctance to allow the review process to become too much work. This was the reason CAPA did not review normal merits at the lower levels. A librarian up for promotion review could request no more than three letters partly because CAPA feared people would abuse the privilege and it would take reviewers too much time to deal with more. In early 1977, a candidate for a regular merit asked that letters be solicited. LAUC-B decided that "such requests should be honored, but it should be made clear that they are not required and the practice is not encouraged." In order to better evaluate people and differentiate between significant and routine accomplishments, however, the University Librarian was constantly pushing for better documentation. In 1976, he raised a flap by asking for documentation to support normal merits, as well as accelerated merits and promotions. Although LAUC-B quarreled with him over the timing and manner of his request, they agreed it should be added in the future.

CONFIDENTIALITY

In the mid-seventies—the post-Vietnam, post-Watergate era—there was a national movement to enact legislation at the federal and state levels providing for the privacy of public records concerning individuals. The goal was to give individuals access to information in such files, together with mechanisms to challenge, add to or correct such information on the grounds of accuracy or relevance. The U.S. Privacy Act was passed in 1974. California privacy legislation which would have required completely open files was passed in 1975 (the "Moscone privacy bill"), but was vetoed by Governor Brown. A new bill, with substantial modifications insisted on by the University, (S.B. 1586 - the "Roberti bill") was passed in 1976, but was again vetoed by Governor Brown, who instead issued an Executive Order enacting many of the provisions. Since the Executive Order could not apply to the University, Brown asked the University to reform its personnel records policy on its own.

The proposed legislation would have affected the University's use of confidentiality in the academic review process, so the University administration, the Faculty Association, the University Council-AFT (and eventually LAUC) all became involved in the debate over the details. A committee chaired by UCSC Chancellor Angus Taylor submitted a report in January 1976. In response to Governor Brown's request, President Saxon appointed a second committee, the President's Advisory Committee on Academic Personnel Records, chaired by UCLA Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs Harold Horowitz, completed another report in November 1976, proposing a new APM Section 195, dealing with personnel

records, as well as changes to Section 191, dealing with grievances, and related changes in a number of other sections.

The Horowitz Report was entitled “University Policy Relating to Maintenance and Use of Academic Personnel Records And To Procedural Safeguards Designed To Assure Fairness In The Academic Personnel Process.” The Committee tried to recommend a comprehensive set of policies and procedures which would provide for academic appointees the safeguards being required by the proposed state laws, while protecting the degree of confidentiality the University considered vital to the maintenance of academic excellence. The critical element was that it recommended that the University provide only a summary of confidential materials in the review file (recommendations of department chairs, outside letters, recommendations of ad hoc or standing peer committees, recommendations or decision of other administrative officers), which would allow neither identification of names nor separate identification of the source of any comment. This was actually a greater degree of confidentiality than that in practice in many academic departments.

The position of the University Council-AFT (whose leadership at that time consisted largely of Senate faculty) was that faculty members should have access to departmental letters of recommendation, recommendations of ad hoc and Budget committees, and letters of deans and provosts, but that the identities of the ad hoc committees should be kept confidential, as well as the identities of authors of individual letters of evaluation. (Interestingly, this is precisely the policy which the University finally chose to adopt fifteen years later, in 1992.)

The LAUC Committee on Professional Standards, Privileges, Salaries and Conditions of Employment, chaired by Joyce Toscan (UCLA), reviewed the Horowitz Report, and specifically a number of proposed revisions to Section 82 which would implement its recommendations for librarians. Marilyn Lewis (Law) was the Berkeley member of the committee, and the Executive Committee devoted several meetings to a discussion of the issues. As was so often the case, practice and opinion varied substantially from campus to campus. In the case of librarians, it was found that on some campuses (UCI, for example), all materials—including the supervisor’s evaluation—were confidential, while on other campuses (e.g., UCSB), nothing was confidential, and on others, evaluations done by administrative officers (as opposed to peer committees) were not considered confidential.

In any event, the University announced it would implement the Horowitz Committee recommendations, precipitating renewed political activity. Senator Roberti introduced another bill, and with further modifications to suit the University, the Information Practices Act of 1977 was finally passed and signed by Governor Brown on September 9, 1977. On September 13, 1977, President Saxon transmitted to the Chancellors a set of revisions to APM Sections 51-4, 82 and 83 concerning academic personnel records for librarians. Almost all of the various safeguards in the procedures which require that an individual be given either copies of materials or summaries of confidential materials, and the right to respond to any such material in writing, date from that time. The changes even provided that one could submit to the review initiator the “names of persons who, in the view of the candidate, for reasons set forth, might not objectively evaluate the candidate’s qualifications or performance.”

The Information Practices Act gave all employees the right to see any materials written by persons “in a supervisory position with respect to the individual.” In the case of solicited letters or other confidential materials, the individual had a right to an edited copy of the text or a comprehensive summary. In the University, chairpersons of academic departments were not considered to hold “supervisory positions.” Thus, the University was within its rights to allow only comprehensive summaries, but there was some question about whether this could be applied to the reports of known committees such as CAPA and the Budget Committee, or to recommendations by library department heads, AULs or other administrators. Nevertheless, the new Section 82-35 provided that the summary “shall not identify separately the evaluations and recommendations...of review committees or administrative officers.”

Because LAUC-B found the matter ambiguous in the case of librarians, it sent a strong request in April 1977 that all evaluations written by any person in the supervisory chain prior to peer review be made available to the candidate (non-confidential). LAUC-B’s general conclusion in the confidentiality debate was that peer review recommendations should be confidential, but administrative recommendations

should not be. Thus, even though the new Section 82 allowed the option of making the recommendations of AULs or other administrators such as department heads above the level of the review initiator either available to the candidate or confidential, LAUC-B and Library administration agreed that at Berkeley, such evaluations were to be considered supervisory and would be made available to candidates.

One interesting consequence of these changes, for Berkeley, was the clarification of the concept of the “review initiator” as the person responsible for soliciting letters and other relevant documentation, conducting a comprehensive assessment, discussing the review with the candidate and providing oral or written summaries of confidential materials, and making a recommendation.

In fact, the CAPA Guidelines as early as 1972 had provided that the department head would initiate the review and provide a “comprehensive assessment of the candidate’s qualifications and performance,” and in Vice-Chancellor Christensen’s 1974 revision, he added the phrase “and performance and achievements in all criteria (described in Section 51-4...)” Nevertheless, the practice at Berkeley was generally for the department head or supervisor to evaluate the performance within the library. If letters were solicited, it was from names submitted by the candidate, and the letters were actually requested and received by the Personnel Officer, and added to the review packet before it went to CAPA. Thus the department head had little practical means to evaluate accomplishment beyond the primary assignment.

Another related change was to clearly provide that, in soliciting letters, the review initiator would request a reasonable number from names submitted by the candidate. This was in sharp contrast to Berkeley practice, which was to automatically solicit up to three letters, and only from names submitted by the candidate.

With the 1977 APM revisions, Berkeley’s practice in the solicitation of letters should have changed. Unfortunately, UL Dougherty, in his cover letter to department heads informing them of the new policies, focused on the requirement that librarians be allowed to inspect their review files (and apparently—although Dougherty does not mention it—receive summaries of any confidential materials). He informed department heads that the Personnel Officer would meet with any librarian who wished to inspect his/her file, and would continue to solicit letters at the request of the candidate and add them to the file before it was sent to the AUL or CAPA. Thus, local practice with regard to the handling of letters continued unchanged.

In 1978/79, the Berkeley representative on the LAUC Committee on Comparative Standards for Peer Review, Bill Whitson, discovered that Berkeley was not only failing to conform to the APM in the solicitation of letters, but that we were also obliged by the APM to involve a peer committee in every review action, including normal merits. In fact, this had been the case from the first adoption of APM 82 and 51-4 in 1972, although it was apparently never noticed. Berkeley had simply continued with its earlier practice of having peer committees deal only with career status, promotion and special merit reviews. The argument was always that, with so many librarians, reviewing normal merits would create an untenable workload for CAPA. With smaller campuses, there had evidently never been such a problem, and UCLA had from the beginning structured its review system so that there was no one peer committee which would have to review every action. It wasn’t until 1980, however, that our omission came to the attention of the Assistant Vice-President for Academic Personnel, Edward Blakely, who was greatly surprised, and ordered us to implement such a procedure. The 1980 Spring Assembly approved the change, recommending that the wording of the APM be clarified, the local Procedures were modified, and CAPA reviewed all merits for the first time in 1981/82.

The issue of the letters finally became clear in 1985/86, and the local Procedures were changed, beginning with the 1986/87 cycle, to allow the review initiator to solicit any number of letters, including a reasonable number from names submitted by the candidate.

DEMOTIONS AND TERMINATIONS.

Another issue which dragged on for years was that of local procedures for the review of “unsatisfactory performance,” or for handling of terminations and demotions. Section 82 had originally provided for

termination in the event performance was judged unsatisfactory, but had not spelled out any special procedures. Beginning in 1976, LAUC-B was asked to develop such procedures, for addition to the CAPA Guidelines. The 1976 Executive Committee began to work on the matter, but developed a number of questions, and finally sent a memo to the LAUC President inquiring about other campuses' experience and raising the question of appointing librarians from another campus to a special UCB committee to advise on the proposed termination of a librarian with career status. While the 1977 Executive Committee put the topic on the agenda several times, the Committee wished to wait for word back from state-wide LAUC.

In early 1978, the issue resurfaced as a crisis. UL Dougherty called the LAUC-B Chair, Arthur Waugh, into his office to inform him that he was considering terminating a career status librarian, and needed to have LAUC-B draw up appropriate local procedures as soon as possible, including guidelines for demotion as an alternative to termination. The whole matter was kept confidential, but the LAUC-B Executive Committee and CAPA held two joint meetings with Dougherty, and agreed that a subcommittee consisting of Art Waugh, Linda Beaupre and Jim Kantor would draft a set of proposed mechanisms and procedures. At Dougherty's request, the Chancellor's Office had also drafted procedures for termination of a librarian with career status, which he wished to submit for the subcommittee's consideration. The draft procedures essentially provided for the AUL to prepare the review and recommendation, give the librarian involved 10 days to respond, and send it to the UL, who would refer it either to CAPA or to a special three-person review committee. The UL would then make a decision. The librarian could appeal via Section 191. Similar procedures were to be developed for Non-General librarians.

The LAUC-B subcommittee investigated procedures used for the faculty and a proposed procedure for UCSC librarians, worked with the draft from the Chancellor's Office, and developed a set of proposals for termination review. These were a bit more elaborate than those from the Chancellor's Office, included more safeguards, such as language regarding the period of time over which unsatisfactory performance must have been a problem, and envisioned a five-person termination review committee appointed by CAPA—again limited in various ways to insure experience and impartiality. The proposal was sent to UL Dougherty in the summer of 1978, but he never responded, and the matter was dropped. The Executive Committee attempted to follow up after Dougherty left, but files from the Librarian's Office did not include the LAUC-B proposals.

In Spring 1979, the LAUC-B Executive Committee approved a resolution for the Statewide LAUC Assembly calling upon LAUC to appoint a committee to investigate demotions and terminations and make a recommendation for LAUC action. Statewide LAUC appointed an Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate Terminations and Demotions in October 1979, which in turn solicited input from the campuses.

Joe Rosenthal was appointed University Librarian in October 1979. In February 1980, he reminded LAUC-B of its responsibility for developing procedures and indicated he would edit the latest version of the draft and forward it. The Executive Committee and CAPA discussed the report of the statewide committee in May, and were willing to support most of its recommendations, including the concept of demotions as a less severe alternative to termination, but there was so much opposition from other campuses that the committee's recommendations were not accepted at the statewide Assembly. Instead, the LAUC Assembly voted that procedures for both demotion and termination review should be developed by each campus. In June, UL Rosenthal reported that the Chancellor had given him the power to demote, and asked CAPA to devise procedures. CAPA deferred the matter to the Executive Committee.

The 1980/81 Executive Committee, under Charles Martell, appointed an Ad Hoc Committee to Prepare a Position Paper on Demotions and Terminations (Barbara Kornstein, Chair, Tom Alexander, Jim Gault, Jean Peck, Virginia Pratt and Robert Starrs), which submitted a report in May 1981. The Committee based its work on the earlier report of the statewide committee. It proposed local "Principles and Guidelines" for both demotion and termination, but recommended against adoption of such procedures for demotion, since they had found that no other academic employees had such a procedure, and they thought it would be unwise for librarians to be the only academic class with such a procedure.

The proposal recommended that demotion should be considered a most serious action, and be undertaken only after documented findings of unsatisfactory performance in at least two previous reviews;

that it should relate solely to the first criterion: professional competence and quality of service within the library, and be based on demonstration that the unsatisfactory performance has resulted in a serious deterioration of services or operations; that it should only be undertaken after offering the librarian every opportunity for improvement, including, if appropriate, a change in assignment; and that review should parallel that for promotion, involving both CAPA and an ad hoc committee. The guidelines for termination were the same, except that termination should be considered an “extraordinary and grave” response to “repeated and gross failure...to carry out assigned responsibilities,” and a “history of extremely unsatisfactory performance.”

The Executive Committee agreed to drop the issue of demotions, and continued discussions with the University Librarian to work out mutually agreeable guidelines for terminations. A revised set of “Principles and Guidelines for Termination Actions — Librarian Series” was approved by a 61-9 vote of the LAUC-B membership in early 1982, and on March 18, 1982, the University Librarian and the LAUC-B Chair sent the “Principles and Guidelines” to Vice Chancellor George Maslach in a joint letter, requesting that they be approved and added to the local review procedures.

The final version retained most of the original elements: “extraordinary nature,” “repeated failure,” “documented history of extremely unsatisfactory performance.” Unsatisfactory performance was defined as “significantly impedes the effective functioning of the Library...” and a demonstrated “deterioration of services or operations,” or when it can be demonstrated that other staff were forced to assume the librarian’s responsibilities in order to prevent such a deterioration. Finally, wording was added to clarify that failure to make a contribution in areas beyond the primary assignment, while it might result in a denial of merit increases or promotion, should not be considered sufficient grounds for termination.

In April, Vice Chancellor Maslach referred the proposal to the Labor Relations Manager Phil Encino, for review by employee organizations. This is the last record of the matter in the LAUC-B files. The “Principles and Guidelines” were never formally adopted, and the matter never came up again as a topic of LAUC-B discussion.

OVERLAPPING STEPS

In the late 1970’s and early 1980’s, there were a number of discussions of problems which were a consequence of the overlapping steps at the top of the Associate Librarian range. These had originally been created in order to allow a decent level of life-time career earnings for those librarians whose performance levels did not justify promotion to full librarian. Normally, librarians devoting their attention mostly to their primary assignments rather than to making a wider professional contribution might expect to advance to the top of the Associate Librarian level, and find a “natural stopping place.”

One problem this created was with the librarian who had consciously decided to opt for a natural stopping point at Associate Librarian VII, or who for other reasons did not believe he or she was likely to be promoted. Some such librarians preferred to forego promotion review, and be considered instead for normal merit increases to steps VI and VII, just to save unnecessary time and effort. Others wished to defer promotion review until they could make a stronger case. On the other hand, many librarians, especially administrators and those who had served on CAPA, believed that everyone ought to undergo review for promotion at the normal point, Associate Librarian V, either because it was implicit in the structure, because it would insure consistent standards, or because it might result in the librarian’s being promoted after all, even when the person in question had doubts.

Furthermore, an unwritten interpretation was evolving among reviewers requiring higher standards at each step of the Librarian rank. Thus, it was generally considered more difficult to win promotion from Associate VI to Librarian II than from Associate V to Librarian I, and even more difficult to move from Associate VII to Librarian III. A librarian was better off, therefore, if forced to undergo review for promotion at the earliest opportunity, because it would become harder if one waited. On the other hand, some librarians not quite among the “high achievers” feared they might move to Librarian I, and be stuck there, unable to demonstrate the increased levels of accomplishment required for advancement within the Librarian rank; whereas, if allowed to remain Associate Librarians, they might advance more easily

to Associate VII (and a salary equal to that at Librarian II). LAUC-B finally decided promotion review should be mandatory at Associate Librarian, step V. Everyone would be forced to undergo the comprehensive career review involved at least once, at the time logically prescribed by the salary scale. The CAPA Guidelines were revised accordingly in 1979.

Other campuses did not appear to have a problem with this issue, perhaps because they generally did not make as much of a distinction between the review process for a merit increase and that for promotion review. At Berkeley, there was still at this time an enormous difference. Normal merit reviews at the Assistant and Associate levels were still essentially administrative. They required no letters, little or no supporting documentation, and were not reviewed by CAPA or any other peer committee. Thus, the challenge of preparing for one's first promotion review at the full Librarian level appeared much more daunting than was probably the case at other campuses, where the process differed less. As mentioned elsewhere, Berkeley's practice of not requiring peer review for normal merits below the Librarian level was finally recognized by University administration, and by LAUC-B and the campus administration, as a failure to conform to the APM, and the local Guidelines were changed in 1980/81.

Another problem not solved by mandatory review at Associate Librarian V was that there was still an inconsistency between the standards being applied for advancement from Associate V to Associate VI, and from Associate VII, and those being applied for advancement from Librarian I to Librarian II. Was it fair that someone at Associate Librarian VII be earning the same as someone at Librarian II? What if someone were then promoted to Librarian III? Would that librarian have had an easier time of it than one who had attained early (normal) promotion and had to undergo two merit reviews at the Librarian level?

This "problem" continued to bedevil CAPA and other reviewers. One response was to begin to impose higher standards even for advancement to Associate VI and VII. The University Librarian began to deny normal merits at this level in cases where there was little evidence of accomplishment beyond the primary assignment. Another solution the University Librarian introduced at some point in the mid-1980's was the "lateral promotion," in which a librarian was granted a promotion to Librarian, but without a pay increase. The librarian received the benefit of the recognition, the title, and the opportunity to advance within the Librarian rank in the future, but it was less than a full promotion. Though this practice was challenged in 1989 by the union, which pointed out that it did not apparently occur on any of the other campuses, both CAPA and the Executive Committee decided that the practice served a useful purpose.

Another approach to this problem was CAPA's issuance, in 1984, of an informal statement clarifying in more detail the criteria being used in the review process: "CAPA Interpretation of Criteria for Merit Increase and Promotion...during the 1983/84 review cycle." The Executive Committee released the statement to LAUC-B members, and it was used in several subsequent peer review workshops as a helpful and generally accurate reflection of how reviewers were interpreting the standards for advancement at various levels of the career ladder.

The original author of the statement, Bill Whitson, had hoped that—once it was revealed to all that we were requiring progressively higher levels of achievement at each step of the Librarian rank—LAUC-B would seriously examine or debate whether such an approach was necessary or desirable. It was his contention that, though a higher level of accomplishment was required for those at the Librarian rank than for those remaining at Associate, there was no need to require progressively higher levels of achievement at each step of the Librarian rank—only continuing professional growth and achievement. LAUC Position Paper No. 5, explicating the criteria, provided for a higher standard for Step V, but did not differentiate among Steps I-IV.

Even though LAUC-B appointed an Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Peer Review Issues in October 1984, there was little disagreement with the interpretation of the criteria described in the statement. The Subcommittee recommended better communication: bag-lunch meetings, and an in-depth program reviewing the history of peer review, to be given in 1985. The first bag lunch meeting generated concern that, rather than having a single "natural stopping place" at the top of the Associate rank, we now had several "resting places" in the upper ranges of Associate and at Librarian III, and that it was harder to advance

at these levels. Kimiyo Hom (Astronomy/Math/Statistics) called for a longitudinal study of librarian advancement patterns, and Ivan Argüelles (Catalog) agreed to carry the proposal to the LAUC Executive Board. A peer review “brown bag” the following year revealed concern about the fact that merit reviews at the full Librarian level now appeared to be nearly equivalent to promotion reviews, with the normal expectation being the solicitation of letters and full documentation.

CAPA issued guidelines for “CAPA Interview Procedures for Appointments to Librarian Series” in March 1985. Besides clarifying the procedures, the statement addressed the issue of whether CAPA was supposed to simply certify that candidates met the minimum qualifications for appointment as a librarian at UCB, or whether it should attempt to weigh the qualifications of each candidate and make a judgment about which candidate was strongest. The policy carefully allowed for discretion, but clearly provided that CAPA should normally evaluate the candidates and judge among them. The issue arose again in 1989/90, when CAPA Chair Alison Howard, on behalf of CAPA, recommended to the Executive Committee that CAPA limit itself to certifying minimum qualifications.

Besides addressing specific problem areas in the review process, there were further efforts in the mid-1980's to better inform librarians and others on campus involved in the review process.

In March 1985, the Committee on Programs for Professional and Career Development (Mari Miller, Chair) sponsored an hour and a half-long LAUC-B Forum on Peer Review, “How Peer Review is Changing,” to review and reassess developments over the preceding 15 years. Seven current and former CAPA members spoke; 65 librarians attended; and 25 submitted written evaluations commenting on the review process. Considerable dissatisfaction was expressed. LAUC-B appointed a Subcommittee to follow up (Pat Davison, Pat Maughan, Cathy Moreno, Deborah Sommer, Barbara Radke). The subcommittee recommended training/orientation sessions each November, better local and statewide peer review statistics, a peer review fact sheet and a series of brown bag lunches on specific aspects of the review process.

In November 1985, a document providing Non-General Library administrators fuller instruction about their role in peer review was developed by the Committee on Non-General Affairs, revised by the Academic Personnel Office and forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for approval and distribution.

In 1985/86, CAPA found that too many review initiators were still failing to carry out their role in the review process in the manner prescribed in the APM—failing to review the entire career in promotion cases, failing to provide a comprehensive assessment including activities beyond the primary assignment, failing to interact with the librarian in the review process, to provide feedback and guidance. The Executive Committee asked the University Librarian to provide more instruction and guidance to supervisors about their responsibilities as review initiators.

One initiative on the part of the University Librarian to sharpen the focus of the review documentation was a proposal in the fall of 1982 that candidates be required to include in their dossiers the letter he had written them at the conclusion of their previous review, so that they could explicitly address the extent to which they had followed his advice. After discussion with CAPA and LAUC-B Executive Committee, he dropped the idea in favor of expecting the candidate to take the initiative to see that the substance of his last letter was addressed in the self-evaluation and in the evaluation and recommendation by the Department Head.

CAPA worked with the Executive Committee in 1986/87 to establish more explicit guidelines and procedures for its selection and operation. “Criteria for CAPA Membership” provided the Nominating and Elections Committee and the Executive Committee with criteria for CAPA appointments, including a discussion of “conflicts of personal and professional interests.” A “CAPA Procedures and Policy Manual,” describing CAPA’s working procedures, was discussed with the Executive Committee. Later, in 1989/90, CAPA asked the Executive Committee to establish clear procedures for the appointment of CAPA members and Chair.

A Task Force on the Librarian Review Process (Geri Scalzo, Ellen Meltzer, Ron Heckart) was appointed by UL Rosenthal in 1989 to recommend ways of streamlining the review process, to save time and work.

The Task Force submitted a report in September calling for improved information: an update of a booklet on the review process last issued in 1981, the addition of appendixes including LAUC Position Papers 1 and 3, a chart outlining the process, and guidelines for self-evaluation, supervisory evaluation, and for peer and administrative reviewers. The Task Force also recommended that the review initiator be specifically identified in each case, and that ad hoc committees and administrative reviewers be allowed to simply express concurrence with other statements in undisputed cases.

In 1989/90, the Executive Committee identified two problem areas in peer review that deserved attention in anticipation of the issuance of a new publication of the local review Procedures to replace a 1981 version known as the "yellow book." One was clarification of the identity of the "review initiator." The Committee recommended addition of a definition, so that it would be clear that the review initiator is always the supervisor to whom one reports, even when an individual is requesting a review. On the other hand, after discussing the matter with both the Library Human Resources Director, Janice Burroughs, and the Coordinator of Academic Personnel, Roberta Aasen (who handled the paperwork for affiliated librarians), the Executive Committee recommended that summaries of confidential material be prepared not by the review initiator, as dictated by the APM, but by either the Human Resources Department or the Academic Personnel Office.

The other was mandatory promotion review for those at Associate Librarian, Step 5. Mandatory review had first been adopted in 1979, but it had increasingly been questioned as unnecessarily restrictive, and it was found that Berkeley was the only campus with such a requirement. Chair Ron Heckart presented the recommendations at the Spring Assembly, and a straw vote approved dropping the mandatory review, so the wording was changed from "mandatory" to "customarily reviewed...", approved by the Chancellor's Office and implemented in the 1990/91 review cycle.

In 1990/91, the issue of review procedures for AULs reappeared, when UL Rosenthal asked the LAUC-B Executive Committee to serve as a reviewing body for promotion of an AUL. LAUC-B found it unfortunate that no clear, written procedures had ever been developed to provide for AUL review, even though they are required by APM 365-80-a. A survey by the LAUC Professional Governance Committee found that only five campuses had written procedures for the evaluation of AULs. In 1991/92, Pat Stewart (Public Health) was appointed to chair an ad hoc committee to establish procedures for review of AULs as required by the APM, and to investigate the feasibility of procedures for the upward review of other supervisors.

In responding to the proposed revisions of APM 140 and the proposed new APM 150, the Executive Committee wrote Vice Chancellor Heilbron that both policies seemed to reflect those for staff personnel more than faculty, especially in failing to provide for peer review, or for formal or informal hearings. The Committee also reaffirmed its strong support for the development of a Code of Conduct for librarians, as an important complement to any other procedures relating to corrective action or dismissal.

A proposed University policy change regarding employee access to confidential academic review records was the subject of a request for comment by the Vice Chancellor in early 1991. CAPA expressed some concern about allowing separate identification of the CAPA recommendation, found no problem with access to ad hoc committee recommendations, as long as their membership remained confidential, but had strong concerns about allowing access to even edited or "redacted" copies of solicited letters, since it was unlikely that confidentiality could be preserved. Such letters would inevitably become less specific and frank, and therefore much less useful. The LAUC-B Executive Committee concurred, and Chair Ron Heckart wrote a letter on behalf of the Executive Committee which reflected the CAPA comments.

LAUC-B was the source of a charge to the statewide LAUC Professional Governance Committee in 1991. The Committee was asked to clarify whether "reasonable trial period" of "not more than six years" in the provisions relating to potential career appointments of Assistant Librarians meant six years probation or five. In the only Berkeley case in which an Assistant Librarian was dismissed after failing to achieve career status, the librarian in question had actually been required to undergo final review for promotion in the fifth year, because Library administration determined that "not more than six years" applied to the period of actual employment, and the APM also requires that librarians dismissed under this provision be given at least six months' notice. To allow such notice, it was necessary to either conduct the final

review in the fifth year, or have it done out of the normal schedule. The University Federation of Librarians, which originally raised the issue, contended that the wording does not apply to the period of employment, and that it would be perfectly acceptable for the period of employment in such a case to be six and a half years. Since the relevant provisions are part of statewide policies, it was deemed a matter requiring clarification on the statewide level. The issue is still unresolved.

In 1990/91 and 1991/92, severe problems developed in the progress of dossiers through the peer review pipelines. While there had occasionally been individual librarians or reviewers who were late in submitting or passing along dossiers, tardiness had never before been endemic. Now there were a significant number of review cases so far behind according to the schedule that it reached crisis proportions. CAPA found it increasingly difficult to conduct its work efficiently, since it could not group cases to review similar actions at the same time. Always before, final decisions were announced by the end of the fiscal year, in June, so that any changes could take effect July 1, and it was rare for a case to remain undecided into the summer. In October 1991, the LAUC-B Chair, Becky Lhermitte, reported complaints by a number of librarians who had still not been notified of the outcome or status of their reviews from the year before. The CAPA Chair, Barbara Kornstein, wrote the Executive Committee to request that the 1990/91 CAPA, which would normally conclude its term in October, be extended until November 30, and be allowed to reconvene as necessary thereafter in order to act upon cases still incomplete from the 1990/91 cycle. The Executive Committee decided in October to write the UL, asking that completion of the 1990/91 reviews be made a top priority, to develop guidelines for a reasonable extension of the calendar, to be in compliance with the APM, and forward the CAPA letter. The following January, the matter was still alive. The Executive Committee agree that it was unnecessary to continue to reconvene the former CAPA to deal with hold-over cases, but that the present CAPA could review those cases.

While it was never clear to those not privy to the confidential review process exactly who was most at fault, the matter came up repeatedly at general meetings. We were told the blame was widely distributed: some of those undergoing review were late in submitting dossiers or responding to requests for further information, a number of review initiators, department heads and AULs were also late in taking actions required of them. There were two excuses readily apparent: a University decision that academic merit increases and promotions effective July 1, 1991, would not be funded (reducing the incentive to engage in the process, or complete it by June), and the fact that staffing reductions had greatly increased the workloads of many of those involved, especially at the department head and AUL levels.

As librarians retired, some were "recalled" or re-employed on a temporary basis, 49% time or less, in order to finish projects or fill a role until a successor could be appointed. The Executive Committee reviewed the issues involved and recommended to the Vice Chancellor that CAPA be consulted in the decision to make a post-retirement appointment, and that the appointee be subject to peer review after one year, and every three years thereafter.

At the July 1992 Executive Committee meeting, both the Ad Hoc Committee for Upward Evaluation of AULs and Supervisors (Pat Stewart, Elizabeth Byrne, Sonya Kaufman and Susana Hinojosa) and the Ad Hoc Committee to Develop Guidelines for the Extension of the Peer Review Calendar (Phil Hoehn, Ginette Polak and Deborah Sommer) submitted reports and recommendations, which were endorsed with minor changes and forwarded to administrative officers for comment.

The AHC for Upward Evaluation submitted a length draft policy and procedures document, similar in form to the local librarian review procedures, entitled "Criteria for Appointment and Review of Assistant and Associate University Librarians and Equivalent Titles at U.C.B.," along with a four-page report on upward appraisal as a personnel practice, and the feasibility of incorporating the concept into our review structure.

The recommendations of the AHC on the Peer Review Calendar provided for timely review of a librarian who failed to submit a dossier, required that a letter be added to the file of any librarian who comply with the timetable as reviewee or reviewer, gave the Library and Academic personnel offices responsibility for monitoring timetable compliance, required annual peer review workshops, and committed the Executive Committee to developing procedures for requesting extensions. The Executive Committee endorsed the report with minor changes, and forwarded it to administrative officers for comment.

During this twenty-five year period, LAUC-B's most important activity was the regular work of the Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Advancement. Every year, CAPA interviewed applicants for positions, recommended names for ad hoc committees, read dossiers, agonized over recommendations, and oversaw the review process. There were nearly always new problems to be resolved and policy issues to be debated. In the 1989/90 annual report, Chair Alison Howard reported reviewing 55 dossiers: 42 merit reviews (two accelerated), 7 promotion reviews, 3 career status reviews, and 4 special reviews. Four ad hoc committees were constituted. CAPA also reviewed 9 job descriptions for appropriate reflection of professional responsibilities and level, and interviewed 30 candidates for 12 positions. The Committee monitored postings of temporary librarian positions, advised on the proposed conversion of a temporary to a potential career status position, considered several changes in the review procedures, and wrestled with a dismissal case. The Committee met an average of once a week throughout the year, aside from the time spent reading and writing. It is ultimately this ongoing work which constitutes the history of peer review.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, REWARDS AND PERQUISITES

One of the questions during the early years was LAUC's legitimate range of concerns. The union's Library Improvement Program included several areas such as salary and benefits which could be viewed as either matters of professional status—necessary conditions for attracting the most qualified librarians and enabling them to develop professionally—or as the kind of “wages and working conditions” issues appropriately left to employee organizations. As the Task Force Report was reviewed by the other campuses, a consensus emerged that left most such matters to employee organizations. Although they were all enumerated in the early days as concerns or aspirations of librarians, LAUC therefore never took up matters such as a dental plan, waiver of fees for UC classes, flexible work schedules, a 35-hour work week, payment for sick leave accumulated at retirement, or even increased funding for professional travel and sabbatical leaves. Increases in salaries did become a LAUC issue, since it became integrally intertwined with the restructure of professional titles and ranks, but even in this case, the strongest roles were played by University administrators and by the union, with LAUC in an incidental role.

SALARIES

One of the most significant steps in improving the salary level of librarians was the work of the Library Affirmative Action Program for Women Committee, appointed by Eldred Smith in July 1971, and chaired by Anne Lipow. The Committee included both librarians and support staff, but its “Report on the Status of Women Employed in the Library of the University of California, Berkeley, with Recommendations for Affirmative Action,” clearly established comparable worth arguments showing that all library staff, men and women alike, professional and non-professional, were paid less than workers in other places who had similar levels of education and experience, but who were not in female-typed occupational groups or settings. The Committee proposed a number of remedies, including special salary increases to correct the inequities. Similar reports were done at UC Irvine and UC Santa Barbara in the next two years, and these reports provided the basis for further analysis of comparable worth data, as librarians worked to obtain salary inequity increases from the California Legislature and from UC administration over the next several years.

The most significant points at which the union affected the development of professional perquisites were during the 1972-1975 campaign for a salary inequity adjustment combined with the restructure of the salary scale, and during the 1983-84 negotiations of the first MOU.

In spring of 1972, building trades unions called a general strike on the Berkeley campus and at the Lawrence Berkeley and Livermore Laboratories which lasted ten weeks. The strike was coordinated by the Alameda Council Central Labor Council, whose gruff President, Richard Groulx, seemed the epitome of the old-line union leader, and an effective match for the UC administration. All campus unions supported the strike, including the librarians' AFT Local 1795 (University Federation of Librarians, Berkeley Campus), whose President at the time was Phil Hoehn. The matter was contentious, since

many individual union members felt they could not or did not want to participate, but no one was penalized by the unions for crossing the picket lines. Many AFT members, faculty and librarian, did participate, however, and forfeited income. LAUC-B canceled its Spring Assembly.

Because of the part the AFT played, Alameda County Central Labor Council gave us something in the settlement agreement. As part of that agreement, UC recognized the existence of a librarian pay inequity and agreed to negotiate with the AFT for an inequity adjustment not to exceed 12%, to be effective July 1, 1972. University Council-AFT proposed a 12 % increase, based substantially on the evidence and argument in the Report of the Library Affirmative Action Program for Women Committee, which had been published in December 1971, and had been praised by UCB Chancellor Albert Bowker as “an unprecedented and thorough inquiry.”

The State Budget for 1972/73 was relatively flush, due to some unexpected savings, so in addition to providing a 7.5% pay increase for all academic employees, it included an amount equal to about 1.5% of the total for inequity increases. The University chose to give nearly all classes 9%, and an extra 1% (totaling 10%) to librarians, along with teaching assistants and assistant professors. Thus, the University was able to claim they had given librarians a 2.5% inequity increase. One might also surmise that UC was willing to agree to the inequity increase in the labor settlement because it knew it would probably be giving small inequity adjustments that year to most academic classes. (The 7.5% increase was actually only about half of what was needed to compensate for inflation: UC academics had received no cost-of-living increases for three years, and in that time the cost of living had actually increased 17.2%).

In the meantime, Vice President Angus Taylor had been working on the salary scale as part of the restructure of the librarian series from a five-level to a three-rank system, in Section 82. His initial thinking, in a December 1971 memo to Library Council, proposed a long-range goal of a salary range which in effect would have represented an increase of 21.7% at the bottom and 40.1% at the top.

LAUC appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on Salaries in May 19, 1972, to propose a 1972/73 salary schedule which would begin the transition necessary by the adoption of Section 82 and secure a more equitable salary structure. The Committee, chaired by Joanna Tallman at UCLA, moved with incredible speed and produced a report by July 7. Gwendolyn Lloyd (Inst. of Industrial Relations Library), the Berkeley member of the committee, was especially commended for her contribution.

The University was not willing to implement the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations, however, claiming that they would cost far too much. Instead Vice President Taylor invited LAUC to appoint members to a Special Committee to Study Librarians' Salaries. Although there was considerable opposition among LAUC-B members to the creation of such a committee as undercutting the AFT efforts to negotiate improvements (a mail ballot in September 1972 returned 109 ballots, 55 for and 54 against participation), the decision of LAUC was to go ahead. Two of the eight members were from Berkeley, Gwendolyn Lloyd and William Wenz, the Library Personnel Officer. Justine Roberts, from UCSF was another “local” member, also active in the AFT. The Special Committee produced three reports, in October 1972, October 1973 and October 1974, and provided most of the groundwork for the actual implementation of revisions in the salary structure between 1972 and 1975.

While the Special Committee was doing its work within the University structure, the University Council-AFT, spearheaded by the UFL at Berkeley, kept up a continuous barrage of political pressure. First, it brought suit to challenge the University's violation of the labor agreement, since the University had unilaterally imposed the 2.5%, rather than negotiating with the union about the amount. Alameda County Superior Court Judge Lionel Wilson ruled in the AFT's favor, and directed the University to submit the matter to binding arbitration. In January 1973, UC-AFT filed a charge of discrimination with the EEOC charging sex discrimination by paying librarians as a female-typed employee group less than other male-typed classes which have comparable requirements and responsibilities. Then, in April 1973, librarians went to Sacramento to call on individual members of the Assembly Ways and Means Committee, to argue the case for an inequity increase much larger than the 9.3% increase that the University had requested. Mary Blackburn (Catalog), then President of the UFL at Berkeley, testified before the Committee and marshaled arguments supporting a 23.6% increase, immediately after Vice President McCorkle testified for the restoration of the 9.3% increase.

Next, University Council-AFT persuaded Assemblyman John Miller (Democrat, Berkeley) to introduce A.B.1412, directly enacting a 23.3% inequity increase for UC librarians. The bill was supported by the American Library Association [resolution adopted at ALA, Las Vegas, June 27, 1973], the California Federation of Teachers, the California Labor Federation and the Alameda County Central Labor Council. Ten librarians from Berkeley and San Francisco went to Sacramento to lobby for the bill, and it passed the Assembly by a vote of 56 to 14 on June 29. The University had in the meantime introduced its own bill (S.B. 1315, Petris), providing for only a 9.3% increase, so A.B. 1412 was eventually compromised to the 9.3%, as it passed the Senate—only to be vetoed by Governor Reagan.

Although a special 4.15% increase was provided in the 1974/75 budget, the union felt the inequity “gap” was far from closed. It conducted a second lobbying effort in April and May of 1975, again testifying before the Ways and Means Education Subcommittee in favor of a 7.52% inequity increase.

Although the 1973 legislative campaign was organized by the union, nearly all those involved were also active in LAUC-B: George Davis, Eleanor Engstrand, Jean Hudson, Rudy Lednicky, Cathy Moreno, Marilyn Peri (later Lewis), Linda Beaupré, Charles Shain, Bill Whitson. Justine Roberts was a member of the Special Committee to Study Librarians Salaries. For a significant number of UCB librarians, the union was always a complement to LAUC. Both organizations were merely different means to the same end: a better professional life for UCB librarians. Their histories can't really be separated.

In August 1972, the campus unions representing Library employees—AFT and AFSCME—formed a joint organization, the Library Union Caucus, which issued a monthly mimeographed newsletter. At least thirteen issues were produced over the next two years, contributing to the sense of a very immediate union presence in the Library. Regular contributors included Mary Blackburn (Catalog), Anne Lipow, Phil Hoehn (Bancroft), Alison Howard (Optometry), and Sonya Kaufmann (Education-Psychology) among librarians, as well as staff employees Stephen Silberstein (Systems) and Larry Oberg (Education-Psychology), who later became well-known library professionals.

CAREER DEVELOPMENT

LAUC-B's first order of business in the Spring of 1968, interestingly enough, was to propose to Library administration a special orientation program for new employees, focusing on “underprivileged members of minority ethnic groups.” The campus had made a special outreach effort in the mid-1960's to recruit employees from minority groups, and a significant number of African Americans were hired into paraprofessional positions in the Library. Most had only high school educations and no familiarity with a university environment. Concern for their morale and development as staff members prompted both the AFT and AFSCME union locals to recommend the institution of special staff development programs. Myra Kolitsch, the first LAUC-B Chairman, developed a personal interest in the issue, and eventually transferred from her positions as head of the Morrison Room and selector for the Undergraduate Library Project, to become the Library In-Service Training Officer and permanent member of the Staff Development Committee.

The Committee on Staff Development, consisting of Myra Kolitsch(Personnel), Gerald Giefer (Water Resources), Margaret Johnson (Education-Psychology), Janice Knouse (Catalog) and Catherine Moreno (Catalog), was appointed in July 1970, along with the other four initial standing committees recommended by the Committee on Academic Purpose. The Committee on Academic Purpose, which developed the charge to the committee, acknowledged that leave and funding for professional meetings and conference was “granted generously, sometimes with per diem and travel expenses being paid.” On the other hand, it found that “there has been no active attempt to encourage individual development.” There was no leave comparable to sabbaticals, and few librarians below the department head level actually attended conferences and workshops. Further, because of the “workload problem,” “consulting of professional literature [was] not encouraged to any degree.” The Committee was to conduct an active study of career development needs and the factors which inhibit librarians from addressing them.

The first Chair of the Committee on Staff Development was Myra Kolitsch, and the Committee's first

work was to write guidelines for applications for leave and funding support, involving written requests submitted through the department head to the UL, which were then referred to the Committee for review, and for a written recommendation back to the UL. In the 1970 Guidelines, the policy was to reimburse travel within the U.S., Canada and Mexico (or registration), but to not reimburse per diem expenses, in the case of librarians only attending a meeting or conference. Factors to be considered included the relationship or importance to various aspects of librarianship, and the type of participation and contribution. Funding could support both professional development of librarians or staff personnel, and contribution to the library, the campus, the University and the profession. Reduced allowances might be considered to accommodate more applicants.

The “Guidelines for Granting and Allocating funds for Attendance at Professional and Scholarly Meetings” were approved by the LAUC-B Executive Committee in May 1971 and after modification and approval by the Library’s Administrative Cabinet, they were published in October in CU News. Along with his introduction of the Guidelines, Acting UL Eldred Smith called for staff to submit requests for the whole of the 1971/72 academic year, so that all requests might be considered at the same time.

In January 1971, the Committee advertised in CU News for “two or three career staff members in staff personnel positions” to participate in the work of the Committee, which met about twice a month. The Committee had believed from the outset that staff personnel should be included in any such program for leave and funding support of career development, intentionally included them in the Guidelines, and persuaded the LAUC-B Executive Committee that they should be added to the Committee. Ken Legg (Circulation) and Diane Chamberlin were appointed to the Committee in Spring 1971. Nonetheless, in an August 1971 memo to Acting UL Smith relating to the Administrative Cabinet’s changes in wording, Myra Kolitsch felt it necessary to point out and justify the inclusion of support staff. In a subsequent memo, reporting the results of a survey, she again remarked on the invaluable contribution made by the two support staff members, and recommended that LAUC-B consider adding support staff to other LAUC-B committees.

The draft guidelines were actually approved by UL James Skipper on a preliminary basis in December 1970, so that the Committee could actually recommend action on requests received in 1970/71. Ironically, one of the first University budget “freezes” occurred that same year, and in December 1970, the Chancellor forbid spending General (19900) funds on any out-of-state travel, except for department chairmen and faculty members giving papers at conferences.

The first major effort of the Committee was the distribution of a questionnaire to all professional and support staff in both the General and Non-General libraries, to identify problems the Committee should address and determine priorities. There were at this time 94 librarians in the Main Library, 44 in branches and 27 in the Non-General group. Support staff numbered 218, 76 and 16, respectively. Responses were 51% from librarians and 35% from support staff. Although there were obvious differences in the responses of librarians and support staff, the professional responses revealed a widespread concern for inequalities of workload (favoring the Main Library) which prevented people from serving on committees and engaging in self development, as well as a lack of promotional opportunity—a general sense that people’s capacities were greater than their opportunities. The lack of advancement opportunities for women compared with men, and experiences of racial discrimination were also mentioned. Some librarians expressed misgivings about the peer review system (50% approved, 30% opposed), citing its secrecy elements and doubt that review committees could have sufficient appreciation of a librarian’s performance, without the opportunity to interview the candidate. Fifty-nine percent were interested in sabbaticals.

During the fiscal year 1971/72, the Committee acted on 48 requests from 37 persons, including 5 support staff. Leave was approved in every case, registration fees in 27 cases, transportation in 16, and per diem in 5. These approvals were recommendations to Library administration, which made payments from a “Professional Travel Fund” and an “Institutes and Workshops Fund.” A separate fund supported administrative travel expenses, which were not reviewed by SDC.

In 1972, with the reorganization of the administrative and LAUC-B committees under the incoming University Librarian, Richard Dougherty, the Committee on Staff Development was renamed the Staff

Development Committee, was made to report jointly to the Library Advisory Council (LAC) and to the LAUC-B Executive Committee, given a revised charge and an expanded membership.

The first product of the expanded SDC was a comprehensive, thirteen-page working paper “Organizational and Staff Development Program,” which was distributed for staff comment in December 1972. In addition to comment from the staff in an open meeting, and comments from the Library Union Caucus (a group representing both AFSCME and AFT), Library administration hired an outside consultant, Peter Hiatt, who met with the Committee, studied the matter and made a number of recommendations.

The Program included the first systematic proposal dealing with rotations and reassignments—a topic which was to recur time and again. A Subcommittee on Rotation (Peggy Stern, Leona Salwen, Jim Gault, Eva Chang) was established to develop guidelines. A document entitled “Rotation, Exchanges, Reassignments, Job Pool — Recommendations” was worked out over the next year and forwarded to Library administration in February 1974.

In 1973, the Staff Development Committee proposed an experimental program for supervisory evaluation, and worked with the AUL for Public Services, Jane Flener, to develop a Supervisor Evaluation Form, solicited volunteers to participate in a trial, and submitted a report on the experiment in February 1974. The process involved the submission of anonymous evaluations to the supervisor of the supervisor being evaluated, who summarized the comments and discussed them with the person being evaluated. The experiment was inconclusive, partly because most of those who volunteered to participate either as supervisors or evaluators already had relatively good relationships. There was a general feeling, however, that the summarizer needed to talk with the evaluators, in order to be sure their written comments were understood, since the summarizer in most cases had no direct knowledge of the working environment involved.

Communication was a top priority for UL Dougherty, so SDC appointed a subcommittee to work on a Communication Seminar. In 1973, Library Administration actually brought in two outside consultants, Brenda Dervin, from Seattle, Washington, and Helen Ross, to meet with SDC and outline the kinds of Communication Seminars they could conduct. Ms. Ross was selected and two seminars were held in February 1974. The Committee was required to select the 80 participants from 102 staff who volunteered. A second Communication Seminar was held in June 1975.

In 1972/73, SDC reported receiving 108 requests for leave and funding, from 77 persons, including 15 staff personnel. All 88 librarian leave requests were approved, 50 were given registration, 39 transportation and 15 per diem. Librarians were denied registration funding in 6 cases, denied transportation funding in 5 cases and per diem funding in 16 cases. Fifteen of the 17 staff requests involved only registration; only three required transportation funding.

In 1973/74, SDC dealt with over 70 requests, and began to find that the needs exceeded the funding available. The guidelines were revised for 1973/74 to eliminate all per diem and ground transportation to and from airports, allow no funding for the CLA Conference in San Francisco, limit funding to one person per library unit or department where 2 or more wish to attend an event involving substantial expense, and allow funding for a maximum of \$200 per person for either the ALA Midwinter or ALA Annual Conference. The problem of funding was discussed with UL Dougherty, and efforts were made to find additional funding and reassess administrative and SDC priorities for supporting various kinds of professional development and travel. A revised set of “Guidelines for Funding and Leave Support” was worked out in 1974 in consultation with LAC, sent to the LAUC-B Executive Committee for approval, and adopted in time for the 1974/75 funding cycle.

Even though SDC at this time was a joint LAUC-B/LAC committee, it dealt only with Library administration in the matter of funding for travel and workshops. In fact, even though it was composed half and half of librarians and support staff, and the librarian members were appointed from a slate nominated by LAUC-B, and there was a nominal “reporting” relationship to the LAUC-B Executive Committee, SDC really functioned from 1972 on as an administrative advisory committee.

The first effort to support librarians in doing research projects was a proposal by Myra Kolitsch in late

1974. SDC developed a set of "Guidelines and Procedures for Project Assistance" for providing clerical support to staff working on projects. After revisions by LAC and LAUC-B, the Guidelines were approved and Library administration agreed to set aside \$5000 from a special staff development allocation. Ann Basart (Music), who already had a project underway, which could be facilitated by the assistance of a work-study student, received the first grant in July 1975.

In 1975, LAUC-B and SDC considered a proposal for a committee to provide career counseling. Although people agreed it might be useful, the fact that no one could guarantee that initiative would actually be rewarded undercut the idea's appeal, and it was dropped. The experiment with rotational assignments of librarians to serve as Assistants to the AUL's raised questions about similar rotational assignments for support staff.

In 1976, Myra Kolitsch gave up the chair of the SDC. Jan Powell (Librarian's Office) succeeded her for a short time, but when she resigned in April to take a position elsewhere, Pat Jemerson (now Imani Abalos) became the first staff person to chair the Committee on a regular basis.

In 1976, the idea of career counseling reappeared in a new guise: LAUC-B requested that SDC fund a series of LAUC Seminars on Career Development, to bring in noteworthy outside speakers for half-day colloquia in the Strawberry Canyon meeting facilities. SDC allotted \$800, and three programs were given in Fall 1976 [see earlier mention for fuller description].

As the pressure mounted on librarians to become more active professionally, the number of leave/funding requests increased, and the difficulty in funding them became an increasingly troublesome issue. At several meetings in 1976, LAUC-B and SDC debated whether to give full funding (transportation only) to fewer people, or partial funding to more, and whether to consider all previous funding, the previous three years, or the previous year, in judging whether an individual request should be discounted in favor of a person who had not previously received funding.

In 1977, LAUC-B established a Program Committee, partly to continue to sponsor programs which would be of value to librarians in their professional development. There were two other groups also involved with programs, however. SDC also began a program of Seminars for Staff Development in 1977, with Willa Baum of the Regional Oral History Office as the first speaker. Then, in 1978, on the recommendation of SDC, ACUL also established a Program Committee, which was supposed to work in conjunction with SDC to sponsor programs at which those who attended professional meetings could report.

The University Federation of Librarians continued to be active, with about 50 members at UC Berkeley and UCSF. In 1977, the union conducted a comprehensive survey of librarians on the two campuses to determine how they felt about a long list of issues the union might address. It is the best record we have of how librarians felt about what they had accomplished over the preceding ten years. Eighty-four questionnaires were returned. Questions allowed responses on a graded scale, to indicate the strength of agreement or disagreement, so the tallies could be weighted (agree=1, disagree=-1, strongly agree=2, strongly disagree=-2, don't know, don't care=0). There was also a calculation of the percent of respondents who supported, opposed or had no opinion in each case. Altogether, there were 42 different issues, for which tallies could be compiled.

The issues which scored highest, with tallies of 113 to 151, and approvals of over 80%, dealt understandably with compensation: cost of living increases, dental plan, tying UCRS benefits to cost-of-living, paid sick leave on retirement, a 35-hour week (with no pay reduction) and a fee waiver for UC courses. Three issues closely related to career development ranked in the next highest group, however: sabbaticals (110, 78%), increased funds for travel (107, 79%), and improved access to grants and research funds (104, 78%).

Several other professional governance issues had solid support: strengthening the statewide advisory role of LAUC (87, 74%), strengthening the campus level advisory role of LAUC (83, 73%), strengthen or clarify the role of library advisory committees (80, 70%), extend grievance procedure to cover promotion & merit increase decisions (73, 64%), provide for staff evaluation of AUL's and UL's (70, 64%), and require regular staff meetings at dept. level (70, 70%).

It is interesting to note that the issue of tenure received a tally of only 89, with 70% in favor, 10% opposed, and 21% with no opinion, whereas it had appeared to be one of the most important goals a decade earlier, and its omission was one of the main reasons the joint 1970/71 and 1971/72 LAUC-B Executive Committees opposed the adoption of APM Section 82 in 1972.

Collective bargaining received an even lower tally (44), with 50% supporting, 20% opposing and 30% with no opinion. This was in spite of the fact that the union at this time was relatively visible and active. Thanks to generous “organizing” subsidies from the national AFT, University Council-AFT had a state-wide office in Berkeley, with a full-time Executive Director, vigorous leadership by a number of Academic Senate faculty, and a well-written newspaper, the *University Guardian*, distributed to all academic employees at least four times a year. There was also a great deal of general press coverage of the long campaign by the California labor movement to secure passage of public employee collective bargaining legislation. This “vote” may also be compared to that in the collection bargaining election in 1983, when 42% voted in favor of AFT, 39% voted for no representation, and 18% declined to vote.

The responses regarding peer review are most interesting. The survey issue “consider modification of peer review” had a tally of only 26, but 37% favored this course, while 13% opposed it and 50% had no opinion. The more drastic option, “consider eliminating peer review,” received a -1, but opinion was quite divided. Thirty-seven percent favored such a course of action, 39% opposed it, and 24% had no opinion.

SDC presented LAUC-B with a new set of “Guidelines and Procedures for Leave and Funding Support” in 1978, to accompany its “Request for Leave/Funding Support” form. By this time, the guidelines limited funding to lowest-rate air fare or registration (whichever largest), excluded transportation to and from airports, excluded per diem, limited funding to one ALA conference/year, and granted no amounts smaller than \$50 for Associate Librarians and above. Preference was given those with a formal role, and those attending for the first time.

SDC reports of the numbers of requests received included both those for local workshops, paid from the “Institutes and Workshops Fund,” where most of the recipients were staff, and those for professional meetings, paid from the “Professional Travel Fund,” where most of the recipients were librarians and the average amounts were much larger. In 1977/78, the amount budgeted in the Professional Travel fund was \$7500. \$7635 was actually allocated to 31 recipients, all but three librarians. The amount for ALA was \$262, and the average allocation was \$246.

In Fall 1979, SDC developed a “Proposal for a Clearinghouse for Staff Rotations” providing guidelines for rotational assignments, and calling for an annual listing in CU News of all librarians and support staff interested in rotations, with their qualifications, so that the process of selecting people for such rotational opportunities would be more “above board.” The LAUC-B Executive Committee strongly endorsed the plan.

In July 1979, the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) went into effect, and campus unions began petition drives to require collective bargaining elections. In defining the bargaining units, the Public Employee Relations Board (PERB) acceded to the University administration’s request that most librarians supervising other librarians at UCB be excluded from the Librarian bargaining unit, thereby causing a division within the LAUC-B membership between those librarians who would be covered by the provisions of any union contract and those who would not. This was to complicate the matter of allocating funds later on, since librarians in the bargaining unit would have one allocation, and those excluded from the bargaining unit would have another.

The University Federation of Librarians President Bill Whitson sent letters to LAUC-B Chair Gail Nichols (Documents) in early 1979 addressing a number of union concerns, including the effect of workload considerations in promotion and merit reviews, and a proposal for an optional 10-month year, similar to what was now provided librarians in the CSU system. At the suggestion of Acting UL Rosenthal, the LAUC-B Executive Committee, CAPA, ACUL, the LAUC Ad Hoc Committee on CAPA Guidelines, the AULs and department heads, and the Library Personnel Officer, held a joint meeting that March to discuss the issues raised with UFL representatives Bill Whitson, Anne Lipow, Betty Todd,

Charles Shain and Mary Blackburn.

Statewide UC administration at this time began to work on several librarian perquisites which would later be incorporated into the MOU. In 1980, in response to the initiative from the librarian's union at Berkeley, it began exploring a 10-month appointment option. More significant, in 1981/82, it allotted \$30,000 in funds for librarian research, two-thirds to be distributed by the campuses and one-third by a statewide LAUC committee. Workshops on grant writing were to be held on each campus, and proposals were to be evaluated by both the UL (or provost) and a LAUC committee. \$3,525 was given to UCB. Catherine Cortelyou (ITS) and Tom Alexander (Public Health) began working on guidelines, and in 1980/81 a Committee on Research was established, with Annegret Ogden (Bancroft) as Chair, along with Barclay Ogden (Conservation), John Emerson, Catherine Cortelyou, and Yuki Ishimatsu (East Asiatic)..

The three workshops on writing grant proposals were held, and three Berkeley librarians received funding for their research proposals: John Emerson (Music), who was one of the earliest proponents of support for librarian research, Edward Kasinec, newly appointed Slavic Bibliographer, who left for another position at Harvard before spending his funds, and Charles Martell, a doctoral student in the School of Library & Information Studies who worked for periods of time in the Librarian's Office and in the Education-Psychology Library, and served as LAUC-B Chair in 1980/81.

In 1983/84, the LAUC-B Chair, Don Williams, even undertook to investigate the possibility of publishing a LAUC research journal—a proposal originally made by Charles Martell. After other campuses proved lukewarm, the idea was dropped.

LAUC-B continued to present programs to support professional development. In 1980/81, there were programs on work enrichments, library services to the disabled, stress management, a speech by Richard Dougherty on "The Impact of Technology on the Roles of Academic Librarians," and workshops on the peer review process.

A major, morning-long "Peer Review Workshop" was held at the beginning of the 1981/82 review cycle, and later that year, three additional programs were given dealing with the faculty peer review, one of them with Archie Kleingartner from UC administration. Anne Lipow gave a program that same year on "Principles of the Online Catalog." Annual forums presenting staff members' reports on national meetings they attended, begun under the ACUL Program Committee in 1978, were made a responsibility of SDC beginning in 1982.

In 1981/82, SDC reviewed 91 leave/funding requests, recommending a disbursement of \$10,745.

Programs in 1982/83 concerned the issue of the "natural stopping place" on the salary ladder, the new Library Development officer speaking on library fund raising, and an exhortation by State Librarian Gary Strong for LAUC to become active in the political process, lobbying for legislation supporting libraries.

There was an October 1982 letter from the Chair of the Program Committee, Rebecca Mason (later Lhermitte) (Executive Library), to the LAUC-B Chair Don Williams, inquiring on behalf of the committee whether the "brown-bag" lunch programs on peer review could be conducted on "work time," if they spilled over the one-hour lunch period. This was indicative of the fact that, even though librarians had been academic employees for twenty years, most still felt as constrained as any staff employee to adhere to a strict eight-hour schedule, and viewed participation in such informal LAUC activities during regular working hours to be something that was still questionable and had to be justified. In the view of the union, one of the most important gains reflected in the Memorandum of Understanding, in 1984, was the omission of any definition of the normal work week, and the establishment of the concept of the professional "discretion" in the "flexible use" of one's time.

In the 1982/83 cycle, funding for research dropped to \$10,000, and all was allocated on a statewide basis. Four of five proposals were funded, three of them from Berkeley. In 1983/84, Vice Chancellor Maslach provided \$4500 for UCB research grants, but only two proposals were received (one after the deadline was extended). Committee on Research Chair Maryly Snow reported concern that there seemed to be so

little interest in the program, and proposed “encouraging or assisting” librarians in applying for paid leaves in conjunction with research grants. UL Rosenthal and the Executive Committee advised against this course, however, advising the Committee on Research to simply point out to individuals the APM section dealing with Leaves of Absence.

In 1983/84, the Staff Development Committee still administered the leave/funding requests. Chair Judith Levy reported receiving 154 requests during the year ending March 31, 1984. The Committee generally awarded air fare or registration for one meeting per year. When funds proved insufficient, they limited funding to those attending the ALA annual conference, or those with a formal role.

In June 1984, Myra Kolitsch, first Chair of LAUC-B, Library In-Service Training Officer and “god-mother” of SDC, having been instrumental in its creation, Chair until 1976 and a member ever since, retired.

LAUC-B assumed responsibility for a Mentoring Program for new librarians developed by the General Library in late 1984. An article about the program in CU News triggered a mention in *Library Journal* (July 1985) and some national attention.

The Executive Committee met with UL Joe Rosenthal, Vice Chancellor Roderic Park and University Council-AFT President Phil Hoehn in June 1984, to discuss LAUC’s future role in peer review and professional development, given the evolving separation of “Tier 1” and “Tier 2” issues in the nearly completed contract negotiations.

Ivan Argüelles (Catalog) led the Executive Committee in the transition year, 1984/85. The LAUC-B Committee on Research (Gail Nichols, Chair) expanded its role to take responsibility for allocating moneys provided under the MOU (for unit members) and by the campus (non-unit members) for both research and professional development, including travel and conference attendance. SDC gave over its remaining funds, together with responsibility for the 1984/85 allocations, in January 1985. The Committee on Research followed SDC’s guidelines for the remainder of the year.

The LAUC-B Committee on Research became the Committee on Research and Professional Development in June 1985, and developed new guidelines for awarding research and professional development funds. The Staff Development Committee’s charge was changed, so that it no longer dealt with librarian leave and funding requests, and a Staff Development Policy and Program statement, first drafted in 1983 but tabled because of uncertainties related to collective bargaining, was resurrected. This redefined charge made the Committee less relevant to librarians, who found it less and less satisfying. In May 1990, the number of librarian positions on the Committee was reduced from four to two. In 1989, the NGL’s recommended that their place on the Committee be filled by a support staff member from an Affiliated Library.

It is worth noting that the Staff Development Committee made a genuine effort to evaluate each leave/funding request, and make a recommendation based on the merits of the individual case and the criteria being applied at the time. There is no record of disagreement with Library administration, or of Library administration rejecting the Committee’s recommendations. There is occasional mention of the time-consuming nature of the process, even though requests were generally received and reviewed throughout the year (a few at each meeting).

When the LAUC-B Committee on Research and Professional Development assumed responsibility for the process, there was an implicit assumption, based on the requirements of the Memorandum of Understanding, that each librarian should be allowed the discretion to decide whether or not a particular professional activity was worthwhile. Since it would therefore have been inappropriate to deny a request, there was no need to evaluate each one on its merits. The work of allocating the funds became largely one of determining the criteria to be applied to relatively objective elements of each request (which types of expenses to cover, standard rates to be applied, extent of funding for various kinds of participation, the number of requests to be funded for a given individual, etc.) It is perhaps ironic that during the era when Library administration in fact delegated effective decision-making to a committee, librarians made up only half its membership, but when the process was delegated to a true “peer” committee, the effective

decision-making was left with the individual librarian.

The MOU allocated \$28,000 for unit librarians at UCB in 1985/86. Based on this, the campus allocated another \$17,300 to cover non-unit librarians, for a total of \$45,300. At the recommendation of the Committee on Research and Professional Development, \$5000 was earmarked for research projects, and the rest for travel. Although the MOU provided that the funds were to be allocated on the campus "according to the established procedures," with the understanding that this meant "by a LAUC committee," Vice Chancellor Park delegated to the University Librarian the authority to actually disperse the funds, in consultation with the LAUC-B Committee on Research and Professional Development.

While figures for 1984/85 are not available, the earlier record indicates that the money for professional travel was probably never more than \$10-15,000. The figure of \$10,745 in 1981/82 covered staff funding for workshops as well as professional travel, and the figure of 154 requests in 1984/85, while an increase from the 91 requests of 1981/82, also included the workshops requests. Thus the allocation in the MOU of \$28,000 and later \$31,000, especially when the amount necessarily provided to give non-unit librarians equivalent support is added, represents a very substantial increase in the funding available for professional travel. It may have been the most significant tangible gain attributable to collective bargaining.

By November 11, 1985, the Committee had received 153 requests for travel funding (16 from NGL's, representing 82 individuals (13 of them NGL's). The amount requested totaled \$79,000, with only \$40,300 actually available.

The following year, the amount allocated in the MOU was increased from \$28,000 to \$31,000. Vice Chancellor Park allocated a total of \$48,600. By May 1987, 91 persons had been funded for 164 activities.

This year four research proposals were received. One was rejected, one was referred to the statewide Committee on Research, and two were funded by LAUC-B: Walter Brem (Bancroft) received \$1445 for "Official Publications of Mexico," and Ann Basart (Music) received \$3,555 for "Publishing Opportunities in Music: A Guide."

An "Early Bird" (general forum) was devoted to LAUC research grants in August 1987. In May 1988, the statewide Research & Professional Development Committee reported that eight research projects had been funded on a statewide level in 1987/88, for a total of \$21,000. Half of the projects were from Berkeley. In February 1988, UC Press published a book by John Emerson, which was funded in part by a LAUC Research grant in the early 1980's: *Catalog of Pre-1900 Vocal Manuscripts in the Music Library*.

In 1985/86, Chair Patricia Kreitz (CDRS), wrote to UL Rosenthal on behalf of the LAUC-B Executive Committee to oppose the General Library's intention to develop separate "work rules" for Library employees that differed from those already covering all University employees. Later, LAUC-B was enjoined by University administration from discussing the issue, since it was deemed to fall into the domain of the union and the MOU. The proposed work rules, however, were eventually dropped.

LAUC-B that year also appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on Librarians Teaching in the Library School (Ivan Argüelles, Susana Hinojosa, Norma Kobzina) because of concerns that the Library was no longer reimbursing units for time lost when librarians were teaching in the Library School, thereby making it impossible for most units to allow librarians to engage in this very worthwhile professional activity. The matter was cleared up, and Library administration reverted to its previous practice of reimbursing the units affected.

The Committee on Research and Professional Development under 1988/89 Chair Cris Campbell (Public Health) proposed a number of changes in the criteria, designed to encourage the maximum number to professional development. The requests were now graded into 3 levels of participation (major role, participant, attendee), with the more important roles reimbursed for larger percentages of the expenses, and for those requesting reimbursement for more than one activity, progressively smaller percentages were supported for each one. In 1988/89, \$44,272 was budgeted, and 188 requests were received, totaling \$132,457.

In 1989/90, Chair Kathleen Vanden Heuvel reported slightly more funds available (\$48,000), and a similar amount in requests (\$133,000). For the first meeting, Category 1 recipients (president of an organization or new librarian attending first meeting) were granted 52% of expenses, Category 2 recipients (committee members or speakers) were granted 43%, and Category 3 recipients (just attending a meeting) were given 35%. For the second or third activity during the year, the percentages for each Category were further reduced, so that some requests, though supported, might only be reimbursed at a rate of 20% or less.

LAUC-B first developed an idea for a Librarian's Special Recognition Award in 1986, and discussed it with the Vice Chancellor that summer. The following year, a committee was appointed [Ruth Tucker (Catalog), Terry Dean (IGSL), and Jim Spohrer (Collection Development & Reference Services)]. The Distinguished Librarian Award program was developed over the next two years, endorsed by Library Administration and approved by the Vice Chancellor and the campus Academic Council in June 1989. The Award would recognize excellence in librarianship, specifically as it furthered the teaching and research mission of the University, and would include prominent recognition and a cash payment. Nominations were to be solicited widely, from librarians, faculty, staff and students, with supporting documentation based on specific criteria and guidelines. The nominations would be kept confidential, and the award decided by a Distinguished Librarian Award Committee.

A Distinguished Librarian Award Committee was appointed in 1989/90, consisting of Ellen Meltzer, Chair, Terry Dean, Norma Kobzina, Carl Bengston and faculty member Alan Weinstein. The Committee received a satisfying number of nominations. The first to receive the Award were Milt Ternberg, Head of the Business and Economics Library, and Alison Howard, Head of the Optometry Library. They were presented with their awards in an elaborate and elegant ceremony and reception in the Morrison Library, following the Fall 1990 Assembly.

The 1990/91 Award recipients were Elizabeth Byrne, Head of the Environmental Design Library, and Tom Reynolds, of the Law Library.

The Committee on Programs for Professional and Career Development sponsored programs in 1991/92 on the NREN, with Clifford Lynch, on professional ethics in a time of retrenchment, with a panel of UCB librarians, and on the future of the School of Library and Information Studies, with Acting Dean Nancy Van House.

The increase in salary levels achieved during the restructure and inequity adjustments of 1972, and the substantially increased amounts available for professional travel are probably the most important improvements in the area of compensation and perquisites. An enormous amount of effort was invested in various kinds of orientation and career development activities and programs. For the most part, it is likely that these would have occurred without LAUC-B. There have always been a variety of similar programs over the years sponsored by other groups, or by Library administration. Furthermore, throughout the period of this history, staff and career development efforts always seemed most meaningful when they were directed toward staff personnel. On the professional level, it is more difficult to tell where simply "keeping up" leaves off and career development begins. Most of what we have thought of as career development could also be viewed as simply providing informative programs or orienting individuals to the review process. While useful, such programs may be difficult to distinguish from other new information we all receive through professional channels.

AFFILIATED LIBRARIANS

Berkeley is unusual in having a large number of campus libraries which are administered by schools, departments, institutes and centers, independent of the central library system under the jurisdiction of the University Librarian. The central system was called the General Library until the late 1980's, when it became simply The Library. Librarians working in independent libraries are members of LAUC, and the term Non-General Libraries was adopted to signify those independent libraries with one or more staff classed in the librarian series. The designation was changed to the more felicitous "Affiliated

Libraries” in 1988. The number of affiliated librarians was 37 in 1972, 40 in 1978, 34 in 1990. The Law Library always accounted for a large number (14 in 1990), and of the others, only the Institute of Governmental Studies and Institute of Transportation Studies have had three or more. There were 15 libraries for most of this period.

The group has always felt a common interest and identity, as outsiders vis-a-vis the General Library, and organized itself within LAUC-B from the beginning. In 1969, the Bylaws were amended to create two Sections within the Berkeley Division, each with its own Bylaws, officers, and activity, but joining through the Divisional Executive Committee to deal with common concerns. The number of NGL Section representatives on the Divisional Executive Committee was increased to two.

Early leaders of the NGL section were Tom Reynolds, who served on the first Executive Committee, Gwendolyn Lloyd, who was on the 1970 Executive Committee and chaired the NGL Section that year, and Laurel Burley, who was the second NGL member on the Executive Committee.

When Vice Chancellor Robert Connick agreed to recognize LAUC-B for a two-year trial period (7/71-5/73), one of his dictates was that the separate NGL section be dropped. The change was made, and the 1972 election held in December 1971 combined the General Library and Non-General Library sections into one LAUC structure. When LAUC-B was forced to abandon a separate NGL section, Jack Leister (IGSL) proposed a standing committee consisting of all NGL's, with a Subcommittee on NGL Peer Review, but no action was taken.

The group continued to meet informally to discuss common concerns. In 1977, the NGL's formed the Association of Non-General Librarians (ANGL/B) as a means of communicating separately among themselves. This evolved into an organization within LAUC-B headed by a five-member Committee on Non-General Library Affairs, which later became the Committee on Affiliated Library Affairs. The senior Affiliated Libraries representative on the LAUC-B Executive Committee serves as Chair of the Committee on Affiliated Library Affairs, and the alternate representative serves as Vice-Chair. The LAUC-B Vice-Chair serves ex officio, and there are two other NGL members. The Committee holds Fall and Spring assemblies of Affiliated Librarians, organizes programs on issues of common concern, and works as an organization on behalf of the interests of the Affiliated Libraries. Beginning in about 1986, at the initiative of Joan Howland (Law), a separate informal NGL Administrative Heads group was formed. Although it had no formal relationship to the Committee on Non-General Library Affairs, a report from the Administrative Heads was routinely featured on the agendas of the Fall and Spring NGL Assemblies from 1986 on.

The group published a *Directory of Non-General Libraries and Librarians* in 1977, with revised editions in 1978, 1982, 1985 and 1989. A brochure describing the Non-General Libraries was issued in 1984, and a revised edition “A Brief Guide to Affiliated Library Collections, University of California, Berkeley,” was published in 1988. During her year as Chair, in 1984/85, Nan Sand issued a regular NGL newsletter.

Two areas of LAUC-B activity from which NGL's were initially excluded were peer review and library advisory committees. Up to the time the CAPA Guidelines were accepted and officially adopted by the campus, in 1974, they were only in force within the General Library because University Librarian Skipper had chosen to follow them.

The exclusion of the NGL's from peer review caused a mini-crisis in late 1972, when the Law librarians decided to develop their own review process, under an elected CAPAL, which would review all merit increases as well as career status and promotion cases, with ad hoc committees which might include faculty members. The LAUC-B Executive Committee and CAPA met with the Law librarians in an emergency session to assure them they would be included in the campus librarian review process very soon, and persuade them that it was better to be part of a single system.

In the discussions with Vice Chancellor Christensen over the approval of the CAPA Guidelines in 1973, LAUC-B was instructed to revise the Procedures to incorporate the NGL's. Laurel Burley (Rhetoric Library), who had been an NGL representative on the Executive Committee in 1970 and 1971, rewrote the relevant sections, resubmitted them in November 1973, and in 1974 the revised CAPA Guidelines

were promulgated. CAPA was expanded by two. The first two NGL CAPA members, Beverly Hickok (Transportation) and Kent Schriefer (Law), took their places on the 1973/74 Committee.

The chief problem librarians in the NGL's were to have with the review process over the years is dealing with a supervisor or higher level administrator who is not a librarian. Such directors, deans, and department chairs are generally unfamiliar with librarians' work and review procedures. In a discussion of peer review confidentiality in 1977, for example, many NGL's reported that they were not even seeing their supervisory evaluations. Over the years, a variety of initiatives have been undertaken to improve supervisors' understanding of the librarian review process and insure adherence to established policies and procedures.

The first policy advisory committees, established in 1970, were concerned with operations of the General Library, and did not include NGL's, with the exception of the Committee on Staff Development, which included Gerald Giefer (Water Resources). When the committees were reconstituted under the Library Advisory Committee, in 1972, NGL representatives were invited to several of the committees as permanent guests: Gregg Atkins (Law), on the Staff Development Committee; Michael Kleiber (ITTE), on Reference Services Committee; Jack Leister (IGSL), on the Selection Committee. Gregg Atkins withdrew from SDC shortly after, however, and was not replaced, and participation on other committees was also eventually discontinued.

When the NGL's organized more formally in 1977, they urged that library advisory committees be made LAUC-B committees so that NGL's could participate as full voting members, in order to improve communication and cooperation between the General Library and NGL's in collection development, reference services, automation development and catalogs. In January 1979, Library administration agreed to appoint NGL's to Reference Services Committee, Selection Committee and Committee on Bibliographic Control on a one-year trial basis. This has continued for the most part, with NGL's serving on several of the Library advisory committees as regular members. In 1980/81, the LAUC-B Bylaws were revised to give the Committee on Non-General Library Affairs responsibility for recommending NGL appointees for LAUC-B and ACUL committees. This has been done through an NGL member on the LAUC-B Nominating & Elections Committee.

Automation was the critical dynamic driving the organizing effort of the affiliated librarians since 1977. Automation of the catalogs required both standardization in cataloging practices and closer working relationships with other campus and University libraries.

In 1977, discovering that LAUC-B was deferring to the General Library for a campus response to the Salmon Report, they formed their own Ad Hoc Committee on the Salmon Master Plan: Ron Heckart (IGSL), Beverly Hickok (ITTE), Gerald Giefer (WRCA), Becky Mason (later Lhermitte) (Executive Library). The Committee developed a statement articulating NGL's concern that they be more explicitly recognized as a distinct group which needed to be gradually integrated into the overall University library system (automation, inclusion in and access to the statewide catalog, interlibrary lending, systemwide reference directory, access to storage facilities) and given special support from systemwide resources for automation, cataloging, etc. The statement was sent to statewide LAUC in June.

In September 1978, the Committee to Integrate Non-General Libraries into the Statewide Library Plan, chaired by Michael Kleiber (Transportation) submitted a report to Assistant Vice-President Salmon entitled "Criteria for inclusion of non-General libraries in the University-wide automated union catalog." In 1979, the Institute of Transportation Studies Library began cataloging on OCLC and a retrospective conversion project, both subsidized by the Division of Library Automation.

In 1979/80, the Staff Development Committee, working with AUL/Public Services Elaine Sloane, sponsored a series of Public Services workshops. Some NGL's wished to attend, but since the workshops were funded by the General Library, and over-subscribed already, NGL participation was not allowed. LAUC-B requested that the NGL's be allowed to send a representative. In order to avoid the problem in the future, UL Rosenthal approved the appointment of an NGL to SDC. Marc Levin (IGSL) became a member in April, on a one-year trial basis. At the end of the year, he felt it had generally been valuable and should be continued.

Affiliated librarians also asked that support staff from the NGL's allowed to participate in advisory committees, but since this was not LAUC-B's purview, it referred them to Library administration. In 1982, a staff rotation program developed by SDC (with Marc Levin still a member) did include NGL staff.

In 1981, the Committee on NGL Affairs discussed a statement on "Resource sharing among Non-General libraries," focusing on rotational opportunities and automation. Workshops were held on RLIN and OCLC, and requests were sent to both the Chancellor and DLA for help with automation.

In 1982, the University Librarian was made the "central review person" for all library-related grant proposals emanating from the campus, including those from NGL's. Ron Heckart, Chair of the Committee on NGL Affairs, wrote to Provost Maslach expressing their concern that NGL's were excluded from General Library planning, and that there could be conflicts between what the UL and the NGL's thought were the most appropriate research projects. The immediate case in point was that both the General Library and the Asian American Studies Library had submitted Title IIC grant proposals, but only one could be accepted per institution, so the two were hastily combined, but rejected. Provost Maslach agreed to adjudicate future disagreements.

In October 1982, another conflict arose between the NGL's and the University Librarian, when UL Rosenthal denied NGL requests for MELVYL terminals and NRLF storage space. Chair Jim Larrabee (Law) wrote to Vice President Salmon to express NGL concerns about the potential conflict of interest involved, and the fact that the NGL's were not represented on Library Council and so had no role in policy decisions about allocations of resources such as MELVYL connections and storage. Vice President Salmon arranged a joint meeting in February 1983, bringing together NGL's, their deans and directors; the UL, the Library Systems Office head, and the AUL's for Public Services and Collections; the Head of NRLF; and the Head of DLA. All regarded it as a significant positive step.

An Ad Hoc Agenda Committee (Joe Rosenthal, Jack Leister, Becky Mason) was formed to arrange quarterly "General/Non-General Library Meetings" for NGL Heads and key members of the General Library staff.

In 1983/84, there were General/NGL meetings with Gloria Stockton on NRLF, with Barclay Ogden on disaster planning, with Joe Rosenthal, Rita Kane and Carl Bengston on GLADIS. In addition, Barclay Ogden spoke to an NGL program about the Library's preservation program, and to the NGL Spring Assembly on disaster planning. The following year, the General/NGL meeting focused on MELVYL terminal installations. Vice Chancellor Roderic Park spoke to the NGL Fall Assembly about the impact of campus academic planning on the NGL's, and the NGL Spring Assembly heard Gary Lawrence, from the office of the Academic Vice President for Library Plans and Policies.

In 1985, NGL's became eligible for NRLF and were allocated ten MELVYL terminals.

By 1986/87, with the General Library's introduction of GLADIS as the UCB online catalog, the NGL's chief concern became eventual inclusion in GLADIS and access to GLADIS terminals.

In 1988, two independent libraries, Pacific Film Archive and the Women's Center, petitioned for designation as affiliated libraries. Vice Chancellor Park referred the matter to the UL, who appointed two Ad Hoc Committees, chaired by AUL/Public Services Rita Kane, and AUL/Technical Services Sue Rhee, and involving faculty, personnel and library representatives. Terry Dean (IGSL) represented NGL's on both committees. Both petitions were denied, but in the process of formulating criteria they could use to evaluate the petitions, the committees developed a set of "Criteria for the Establishment of Libraries on the Berkeley Campus as Affiliated Libraries."

These criteria were more elaborate and exacting than anything which existed previously, and in effect, refined the definition of an affiliated library. The Criteria required a collection development policy, stable and adequate funding, cataloging to national standards, a circulation policy, the provision of access to the UCB community, reference service, staffing that includes at least one librarian, with recognition of the professional role and provision for adequate support for professional activity outside the primary job.

Although they were not adopted as official policy, the University Librarian would presumably rely on them in the event the question arises again. In Fall 1989, Ron Heckart discussed them with the Senate Library Committee, in his capacity as ex officio LAUC-B member, and the Committee endorsed the Criteria.

Relations with the General Library continued to improve. Members of the Library Administrative Group visited all library units in 1988/89, and included Affiliated Libraries. Meetings were held with Joe Rosenthal and Janice Burrows, the new Director of Human Resources. UL Rosenthal also spoke for the second year in a row to an Affiliated Librarians Assembly, pledging increased cooperation in collection development, management, preservation, patterns of referral and a unified database. He urged adherence to AACR2 and MARC format standards, and welcomed the inclusion of the ALs in GLADIS and NRLF. The Library's new AUL for Collection Development, David Farrell, was the featured speaker at the Spring 1990 AL Assembly.

The Affiliated Libraries Administrative Group met with Dorothy McPherson (DLA) and Bernie Hurley (Library Systems) in 1989 regarding problems involved in adding AL records to the CALLS (California Academic Libraries List of Serials) database, and to GLADIS. The Library agreed to cover costs of GLADIS terminals in ALs and the costs of inputting AL records into GLADIS, as soon as problems of data maintenance were solved, and two of the ALs, Institute of Industrial Relations and Chicano Studies, began loading records into GLADIS in Spring 1990. On the storage front, Joan Howland reported to the Spring 1990 Assembly that Law, Water Resources, IGS and Asian-American Studies were all being permitted to store the following year.

The 1990/91 Committee, chaired by Ginny Irving (Law), conducted a series of brown bag lunch programs dealing with the IMAGEQUERY system developed by the Architecture Slide Library, the Library's new "Primary Clientele" policies, a report from IIRL on loading records into GLADIS, the use of the campus network for e-mail, and campus parking.

Vice Chancellor John Heibron was the featured speaker at the Spring AL Assembly on April 12. Added to a list of topics he had been asked to address was an uproar among Affiliated Librarians and their campus constituencies over a March 28 letter written by UL Joe Rosenthal to the Vice Chancellor recommending much closer coordination of campus libraries in order to improve access and utilize resources more efficiently in the face of drastically reduced resources. Specifically, he recommended a goal of including all campus libraries in GLADIS and MELVYL, and integrating collection development, preservation activity, access policies, space planning and deployment of personnel in the Affiliated Libraries with that of the Library. To bring this about, he proposed placing all Affiliated Libraries under the University Librarian, effective July 1, 1991.

Since he had already announced his retirement, taking advantage of the first Early Retirement Incentive Program, some wondered how serious he was in making the proposal. In any event, there was a burst of outraged opposition from affiliated librarians as well as from faculty, administrators and others who rushed to defend the independence of their libraries and the high quality of specialized service they felt would be lost. Many felt the letter represented a kind of imperial arrogance on the part of Library administration, since UL Rosenthal had not consulted any of the Affiliated Libraries beforehand. There was even an article in the Daily Californian.

Ron Heckart, who was both an Affiliated Librarian and Chair of LAUC-B, wrote UL Rosenthal on behalf of LAUC-B to respond carefully to the various aspects of his proposal. While LAUC-B shared Rosenthal's concern about the fiscal problems, and agreed that closer coordination could be salutary in particular instances, the matter was complex and would have to be approached on a case-by-case basis, after establishing campus priorities regarding the value of the kinds of specialized collections and services represented by the affiliated libraries. UL Rosenthal thanked LAUC-B for its thoughtful comments, and welcomed LAUC-B suggestions for ways to achieve improvements. The matter was dropped.

In February 1992, the LAUC-B Executive Committee commented to Provost Carol Christ on the Report of the Committee to Review the Ethnic Studies Libraries, chaired by Associate Professor Alex M. Saragosa, supporting the Committee's recommendation that the three Ethnic Studies Libraries remain

independent of the central Library system, under the Ethnic Studies Department, but urged the importance of improved cooperation and coordination with The Library in the areas of collection development, acquisitions and bibliographic control, and that every effort be made to include their bibliographic records in the GLADIS and MELVYL catalogs.

In March 1992, LAUC-B Chair Becky Lhermitte wrote to Dean Albert Fishlow, to express LAUC-B's "dismay and regret" over the decision to close the International Studies Library, and urged that he or Associate Librarian Colette Myles work closely with the Library to insure that, in dismantling the collection, unique materials, especially serials, be transferred to The Library.

EPILOGUE

Librarians at Berkeley have been relatively content with their gains over the last twenty-five years, and specifically with LAUC, peer review and the level of professional rewards and perquisites. Most discontent seems to derive from the perception of inept or unsympathetic management behavior, or from individuals feeling unfairly treated either in terms of advancement decisions or opportunities for professional growth.

Measured against the original goals of those who established LAUC, the achievements might appear to have fallen short. Perhaps the most genuine gains were the restructuring of the ranks and salary structure, which allowed the average librarian without major administrative responsibility to reach a much higher salary level than before, together with a shift upward in the salary structure in 1975 which left UC librarians near the top of ARL libraries in terms of both beginning and average salaries ever since.

Librarians certainly have not achieved the degree of autonomy in governance that is the normal expectation of Senate faculty. The only decisions which could be said to be delegated to a LAUC body are in the allocation of funds for travel and research, and even that delegation is ambiguous, since the University Librarian must authorize the actual expenditure of funds. In every other instance, especially in the areas of appointment, promotion and advancement decisions, LAUC bodies or other library advisory committees never do more than recommend, or provide input; decision-making is clearly reserved to Library or campus administration. In spite of the strong concern in the formative period of the 1960's for protections such as tenure and a grievance process ending in binding outside arbitration, neither of those was ever achieved either through LAUC or through collective bargaining.

Librarians certainly have been afforded ample channels for a "voice" in decision-making. While some of this has been through LAUC, most has simply been a result of changes in management style on the part of the University Librarian or others in management positions. Indeed, it is likely that such changes in organizational culture would have occurred naturally in response to thinking in higher education, business and librarianship during this period, even without LAUC. Because the openness to input from individuals was always a function of administrative policy, the effectiveness of such input has depended directly on the attitudes of the administrators involved—on their interest in soliciting comment, and their willingness to be influenced or persuaded by it.

Librarians and administrators have spent an enormous amount of time and energy over the last twenty-five years developing and applying procedures designed to insure that only librarians of superior ability and achievement are appointed, retained and advanced. These procedures were derived from those for Senate faculty in the UC system, and were applied to librarians because of the decision of the UC system (and our profession) that librarians should be classed as academic employees. Given this context, it is difficult to see how any other course was possible. Yet one might well question whether the average ability and achievement of librarians at Berkeley is demonstrably superior to that of any other academic libraries. It could be that there are so many other factors which account for the willingness of superior individuals to take positions at Berkeley, or for those librarians who are on the staff to excel professionally, that the meager instruments of meticulous review and the "carrot-and-stick" elements of the advancement process have at best a marginal impact. Some appreciation of this may underlie the general sentiment among librarians and administrators alike that our performance review process requires too

much time.

As for professional perquisites, librarians in the UC system never achieved full faculty status, membership in the Academic Senate, tenure, sabbaticals, salaries equivalent to those of the faculty, or recognition of the Library as a teaching department, which could offer a course for credit. All of these have been achieved by our colleagues in the California State Universities system, as well as by many others elsewhere in the country. On the other hand, UCB librarians no longer seem to consider any of those original aspirations to be very important, or even desirable. What UCB librarians appear to value in practice are flexibility in the use of one's time, office support in both staff and equipment, and financial support for professional activity. Even the money which is available to support research projects often goes begging, apparently because few librarians feel able or willing to detach themselves from their ongoing involvements long enough to carry out research projects.

The most meaningful achievement of LAUC at Berkeley has probably been the status it has provided librarians within the campus and UC administrative structures, as an official advisory body representing librarians. While LAUC-B is still working to develop more effective relationships with campus administration, the Academic Senate and with academic departments, it has made some progress over the years in gaining a regular place on campus and statewide committees—in being accepted as having a legitimate role in some areas of academic policy-making.

¹ Twenty-five years later, some have been superceded by automation, others are still relevant: exit control in all units, distribution of copies of the UCB book catalog to at least 4 units outside the Main Library, extension of hours in the Newspaper and Microcopy Room, inclusion of at least a main entry card in the author-title catalog for items in all branch, departmental and institute libraries, analysis of monographs in series, institution of a paging service for faculty, establishment of a Student Library Advisory Board, distribution of new book lists, connection of the Doe Library and Annex on the 3rd and 4th floors, provision of at least 100 square feet of office space for each staff member.

LAUC-B EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE & CAPA MEMBERSHIP CHRONOLOGY

[VC=Vice-Chair; S=Secretary;PC=Past Chair;NGL=Non-General Library representative, later
AL=Affiliated Libraries representative]

1968

Executive Committee

Myra Kolitsch (Chair), Eleanor Engstrand (VC), Beatrice Lukens (S), Marjorie Burr, George Davis, Jean Hudson, Catherine Moreno, Judith Morton, Thomas Reynolds (NGL), Margaret Studhalter, Eldred Smith (LAUC President)

1969

Executive Committee

George Davis (Chair), Frank Velek (VC), Ann Gilbert (S), Sheila Dowd, Eldred Smith, Myra Kolitsch, Geraldine Clayton, John Emerson, Judith McDonough (NGL)

1970

Executive Committee

John Emerson (Chair), Sheila Dowd (VC), Ann Gilbert (S), Eleanor Engstrand, Vincent Duckles, Frank Velek, Geraldine Clayton, Philip Hoehn, Gwendolyn Lloyd (NGL), Laurel Burley (NGL)

CAPA

Kimiyo Hom (Chair), Rudolf Lednicky, Sondra Shair, Naomi Held, Margaret Studhalter (2/70-9/71)

1971

Executive Committee

Eleanor Engstrand (Chair), Barbara Tandy (S) (to 9/71), Louise Eastland (VC) and (S) (9/71-), Linda Beaupré, Lois Farrell, James Gault, Simone Klugman, Virginia Pratt, Laurel Burley (NGL)

CAPA

Kimiyo Hom (Chair), Rudolf Lednicky, Sondra Shair, Naomi Held, Margaret Studhalter (2/70-9/71)

1972

Executive Committee

Sheila Dowd (Chair), Marjorie Burr (VC), Carlene Brown (S), Virginia Pratt, Elizabeth Cziffra, Marilyn Peri (NGL), Thomas Alexander, Margaret Studhalter, Linda Beaupré, Jack Leister (NGL)

CAPA

Rudolf Lednicky (Chair), Kimiyo Hom, Sondra Shair, Ann Gilbert, Arthur Waugh (10/71-9/72)

1973

Executive Committee

Elizabeth Cziffra (Chair) [to 5/73], Thomas Alexander (VC, Chair [from 5/73]), Laurel Burley (NGL) (VC after 5/12), Veronica Wakeman (S), Sol Behar, Helvi Bessenyei, JoAnn Brock, James Burch, Raymond Tang, , Gerald Giefer (NGL)

CAPA

Ann Gilbert (Chair), Kimiyo Hom, Louise Eastland, George Davis, Arthur Waugh (10/72-9/73)

1974

Executive Committee

William Whitson (Chair), Margaret Stern (VC), Alison Howard (S), Laurel Burley (NGL), Elizabeth Kislitzin, Rudolf Lednicky, Annegret Ogden, Ann Patterson (NGL), Carol Snyder, Margaret Studhalter

CAPA

Ann Gilbert (Chair), George Davis, Louise Eastland, James Gault, Beverly Hickok (NGL), Kent Schriefer (NGL), Arthur Waugh (10/73-9/74)

1975

Executive Committee

William Whitson (Chair), Geraldine Scalzo (VC), Simone Klugman (S), Alison Howard, Elizabeth Kislitzin, Suzanne Gallup, Dorothy Gregor, Kenneth Logan, Dorothy Simpson (NGL), Gregg Atkins (NGL)

CAPA

Kent Schriefer (Chair)(NGL), Thomas Alexander, George Davis, Louise Eastland, James Gault, Beverly Hickok (NGL), Elizabeth Todd (10/74-9/75)

1976

Executive Committee

Geraldine Scalzo (Chair), Richard Cooper (VC), Lee Petrusek (S), Grace Dote (NGL), Kenneth Logan, Dorothy Gregor, Suzanne Gallup, Julia Cooke (NGL), Ann Gilbert, Alan Dyson (LAUC President)

CAPA

James Gault (Chair), Beverly Hickok (NGL), Thomas Alexander, Elizabeth Todd, Jack Leister (NGL), Susan Martin, Virginia Pratt (10/75-9/76)

1977 (Jan.-Aug.)

Executive Committee

Richard Cooper (Chair), Arthur Waugh (VC), Joan Aliprand (S), Ann Gilbert, Lee Petrusek, Julia Cooke (NGL), Lila Chandra, Louise Eastland, PhilipHoehn, Kent Schriefer (NGL)

CAPA

Thomas Alexander (Chair), Elizabeth Todd, Jack Leister (NGL), Susan Martin, Virginia Pratt, Barbara Kornstein, Robert Starrs (NGL) (10/76-9/77)

1977/78

Executive Committee

Arthur Waugh (Chair), Linda Beaupré (VC), Ronald Heckart (S), Lila Chandra, Louise Eastland, Peter Evans, Gerald (Gerald) Giefer (NGL), Phil Hoehn, Janet Rudd, Kent Schriefer (NGL), Charles Martell (LAUC Secretary)

CAPA

Jack Leister (Chair)(NGL), Susan Martin, Virginia Pratt, Barbara Kornstein, Robert Starrs (NGL), Russell Gardiner, James Kantor (10/77-9/78)

1978/79

Executive Committee

Rudolf Lednicky (Chair)[to 11/78; resigned], Gail Nichols (VC)(Chair)[from 11/78], Mary Heath (S), Janet Rudd, Peter Evans, Gerald Giefer (NGL), Catherine Moreno, Susana Hinojosa, William Roberts, Catherine Cortelyou (NGL)

CAPA

Barbara Kornstein (Chair), Robert Starrs (NGL), Russell Gardiner, James Kantor, Julia (Judy) Cooke (NGL), Catherine Gordon, Simone Klugman

1979/80

Executive Committee

Gail Nichols (Chair), Charles Martell (VC), Ellen Meltzer (S), Susana Hinojosa, Catherine Moreno, William Roberts, Thomas Alexander, Virginia Pratt, Catherine Cortelyou (NGL), Alice Youmans (NGL), Jack Leister (LAUC VP/President-elect)

CAPA

James Kantor (Chair), Russell Gardiner, Julia Cooke (NGL), Catherine Gordon, Simone Klugman, Ingrid Peiffer (NGL), Geraldine Scalzo [1979-1980]

1980/81

Executive Committee

Charles Martell (Chair), Barbara Kornstein (VC), Peter Evans (S), Thomas Alexander, Ronald Heckart (NGL), James Kantor, Kenneth Logan, Jean Peck, Virginia Pratt, Alice Youmans (NGL), Jack Leister (LAUC President)

CAPA

Catherine Gordon (Chair), Julia Cooke (NGL), Simone Klugman, Ingrid Pfeiffer (NGL), Geraldine Scalzo, JoAnn Brock, Carlene Brown

1981/82

Executive Committee

Barbara Kornstein (Chair), Donald Williams (VC), Philip Hoehn (S), Ronald Heckart (NGL), James Larrabee (NGL), Jean Peck, James Kantor, Kenneth Logan, Elizabeth Myers, Camille Wanat, Ellen Meltzer (LAUC Newsletter Editor)

CAPA

Geraldine Scalzo (Chair), JoAnn Brock, Carlene Brown, Gerald Giefer (NGL), Dorothy Koenig, Ingrid Pfeiffer (NGL), William Whitson

1982/83

Executive Committee

Donald Williams (Chair), James Gault (VC), Terry Dean (S), James Larrabee (NGL), Camille Wanat, Elizabeth Myers, Virginia (Ginette) Polak (NGL), Victoria Hanawalt, Simone Klugman, Patricia Vanderberg

CAPA

Dorothy Koenig (Chair), Jo Ann Brock, Carlene Brown, Gerald Giefer (NGL), Norma Kobzina, William Whitson, Ronald Heckart (NGL)

1983/84

Executive Committee

James Gault (Chair), Ivan Argüelles (VC), Cristina Fowler (S), Victoria Hanawalt, Simone Klugman, Patricia Vanderberg, Faye Williamson, Patricia Maughan, Virginia Polak (NGL), Nanette Sand (NGL), Donald Williams (PC)

CAPA

Dorothy Koenig (Chair), Gerald Giefer (NGL), Norma Kobzina, William Whitson, Ronald Heckart (NGL), Gary Handman, Jean Peck

1984/85

Executive Committee

Ivan Argüelles (Chair), Patricia Davison (VC), Deborah Sommer (S), Patricia Maughan, Catherine Moreno, Alison Howard, Milton Ternberg, Charlene Kubota, Nanette Sand (NGL), Barbara Radkey (NGL), James Gault (PC)

CAPA

Ronald Heckart (Chair)(NGL), Gary Handman, Norma Kobzina, Jean Peck, Susana Hinojosa, Judith Levy, Rebecca Lhermitte (NGL)

1985/86

Executive Committee

Patricia Kreitz (Chair), Norma Kobzina (V-C), Grace Dote (S), Alison Howard, Catherine Moreno, Milton Ternberg, Thomas Alexander, Ellen Meltzer, Catherine Cortelyou (NGL), Alice Youmans (NGL), Ivan Argüelles (PC), Gary Handman (CAPA)

CAPA

Gary Handman (Chair), Jean Peck, Susana Hinojosa, Rebecca Lhermitte (NGL), Judith Levy, Raymond Tang, Virginia Polak (NGL)

1986/87

Executive Committee

Norma Kobzina (Chair), Patricia Maughan (V-C), Phoebe Janes (S), Thomas Alexander, Ellen Meltzer, Myrtis Collins, Gary Handman, James Spohrer, Alice Youmans (NGL), Terry Dean (NGL), Patricia Kreitz (PC), Rebecca Lhermitte (CAPA), Camille Wanat (LAUC President)

CAPA

Rebecca Lhermitte (Chair) (NGL), Susana Hinojosa, Judith Levy, Raymond Tang, Virginia Polak (NGL), Elizabeth Kislitzin, Catherine Moreno

1987/88

Executive Committee

Patricia Maughan (Chair), Ellen Meltzer (V-C), Ann Jensen (S), Myrtis Collins, James Spohrer, Gary Handman, Ruth Tucker, Dorothy Koenig, Terry Dean (NGL), Colette Myles (NGL), Norma Kobzina (PC), Virginia Polak (CAPA)

CAPA

Virginia Polak (Chair) (NGL), Raymond Tang, Elizabeth Kislitzin, Catherine Moreno, Alison Howard, William Roberts, Nanette Sand (NGL)

1988/89

Executive Committee

Ellen Meltzer (Chair), Peter Evans (VC), Rebecca Lhermitte (S), Patricia Maughan (PC), Dorothy Koenig [resigned mid-year], Ruth Tucker [resigned mid-year], Barbara Glendenning, Jeffrey Katz, Allan Urbanic, Colette Myles (AL), Ann Jensen (AL), William Roberts (CAPA)

CAPA

William Roberts (Chair), Catherine Gordon, Alison Howard, Catherine Moreno, Nanette Sand (AL), Barbara Kornstein, Wei-Chi Poon (AL)

1989/90

Executive Committee

Peter Evans (Chair), Ronald Heckart (VC), Diane Brown (S), Barbara Glendenning, Jeffrey Katz, Allan Urbanic, Yuki Ishimatsu, Armanda Mason, Ann Jensen (AL), Ginny Irving (AL), Ellen Meltzer (PC), Alison Howard (CAPA)

CAPA

Alison Howard (Chair), William Roberts, Rebecca Lhermitte (AL) (replacing Nanette Sand), Wei-Chi Poon (AL), Barbara Kornstein, Roy Ortopan, Kenneth Logan

1990/91

Executive Committee

Ronald Heckart (Chair), Becky Lhermitte (VC), Wendy Diamond (S), Armanda Boni, Yuki Ishimatsu, Ginny Irving (AL), Carl Bengston, Daniel Pitti, Andrea Severson, Joy Svihra (AL), Peter Evans (PC), Barbara Kornstein (CAPA), Ellen Meltzer (LAUC V-P/President-Elect)

CAPA

Barbara Kornstein (Chair), Wei-Chi Poon (AL), Kenneth Logan, Roy Ortopan, Elizabeth Sibley, Deborah Sommer, Alice Youmans (AL)

1991/92

Executive Committee

Becky Lhermitte (Chair), Gary Handman (VC), Ginny Irving (S), Daniel Pitti, Andrea Sevetson, Joy Svihra (AL), Wendy Diamond, Patricia Stewart, Kathleen VandenHeuvel (AL), Ronald Heckart (PC), Deborah Sommer (CAPA), Ellen Meltzer (LAUC President)

CAPA

Deborah Sommer (Chair), Carlene Brown, Kenneth Logan, Elizabeth Sibley, Alice Youmans (AL), Lillian Castillo-Speed (AL), Milton Ternberg

NAME CHANGES:

Marilyn Peri, later Lewis

Suzanne Gallup, later Calpestri

Linda Beaupré, later Cain

Mari Wilson, later Mari Miller

Ellen Jacobstein, later Ellen Gilmore

Rebecca Mason, later Lhermitte

Patricia Davison, later Kreitz

Cristina Fowler, later Campbell

Armanda Mason, later Boni, later Barone

Susan Rhee, later Rosenblatt

Terry Dean, later Langer, later Dean

Patricia Jemerson, later Patricia Abalos, later Imani Abalos