



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE  
ONE SHIELDS AVENUE  
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616-8502  
TELEPHONE: (530) 752-2231

May 13, 2015

**MARY GILLY, CHAIR**

UC Academic Council  
1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> floor  
Oakland, California 94607-5200

**RE: Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised (APM-360) and (APM-210-4) Sections**

The proposed revisions to Sections 360, Librarian Series (APM-360), and 210-4, Instructions to Review Committees (APM-210-4) were forwarded to all Davis Division of the Academic Senate standing committees, Faculty Executive Committees from the schools and colleges, and an Academic Federation Standing Committee. Responses were received from the Affirmative Action & Diversity (AAD), Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), Graduate Council (GC), Academic Federation Personnel Committee (AFPC), and the Library Committee.

The Divisional Academic Senate reviewed the proposed UC-wide amendment and revisions and has the following suggestions for the documents:

- Several sections of the proposed revisions retain or exacerbate inconsistencies in the terms and conditions that affect non-represented librarians and represented librarians.
- Differing expectations for promotion: The language regarding expectations for promotion in APM 210-4-e-2 / APM 360-10-c and MOU Article 4.C.1 differ in such a way that suggests promotional criteria for represented librarians may depend on both increased responsibility and professional competence and contributions. However, the promotional criteria for non-represented librarians must be based either on professional achievements, competence, contributions, etc., or the assumption of increased responsibility.
- Differing weighted criteria for advancement: The language regarding evaluative criteria for advancement in APM 210-4-e-3 / APM 360-10-b and MOU Article 4.C.2 differ in such a way that suggests mandatory promotional criteria for non-represented librarians are limited solely to professional competence and quality of service within the library, which is a lower standard than that specified for represented librarians. Furthermore, if a non-represented candidate does engage in such activity, it may or may not be considered relevant to the review. In contrast, the MOU language unequivocally requires represented librarians to engage in professional activities and clearly establishes parameters of relevance.
- Differing evidential criteria for evaluating professional competence and service: The language regarding evidential criteria for evaluating professional competence and service in APM 210-4-e-3 and MOU Article 4.C.2 (a) differ in such a way that suggests non-represented librarians as candidates for review may be required, under procedures laid out

in APM 360-80, to assemble "necessary additional letters and documents" that differ significantly in scope from those of represented librarians.

- Differing contextual guidance for evaluating research and creative activities: APM 210-4.e.3.d omits a sentence found in MOU Article 4.C.2 (d): "Librarian engagement in academic research enhances their ability to relate their functions to the more general goals of the university." Extramural (and intramural) reviewers may find this statement useful in evaluating academic research conducted by librarians, which may not necessarily involve library and information science.
- APM 360-6 c: change "the Chancellor may request the designation of additional names" to "the Chancellor may request additional nominations."
- APM 360-8 f (2): change "to improve that performance" to "for improvement" APM 360-17 (a) 3rd paragraph: change "judged" to "evaluated"
- APM 360-17 (1) (b): change "less" to "fewer"
- APM 360-80 (2) (g) paragraph 3: change "upon" to "on"
- It also appears a critical aspect is missing in the revisions, that of librarians' diversity activities, and their ability to service a diverse community. In the current APM for faculty, wording has been included that identifies rewards for research and other activities related to diversity in society and the campus community. For librarians, who likewise face an increasing level of culturally and self-identified gender diversity, among other aspects of augmented diversity, their value to the campuses must be tied to their ability to successfully service the diverse community; this entails forms of multi-cultural literacy.
- In addition, in parallel to the rewards for faculty engaged in diversity related activities, librarians should also have analogous reward structures specifically identified in the policy wording.

In conclusion, the Divisional Academic Senate feels that the revisions are a good start to updating the policies and are hopeful that the suggested revisions will continue to help with clarifications.

Sincerely,



André Knoesen, Chair  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate  
Professor: Electrical and Computer Engineering

c: Academic Federation Chair Van Winkle