



Davis Division Academic Senate

Request for Consultation Responses

APM 210-4 and 360 (Librarians) Systemwide Amendment Review

May 6, 2015

A systemwide review of amendments to APM 360-Librarian Series and APM 210-4, Instructions to Review Committees has been initiated. Redline and clean copies have been provided for each policy.

Academic Federation Personnel Committee (Write-in)

May 6, 2015 4:56 PM

Response continued on next page.

May 6, 2015

RE: APM 210-4 and 360 (Librarians) Systemwide Amendment Review

The Academic Federation Personnel (AF) Committee has received the text of the Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 360, Librarian Series; and Section 210-4, Instructions to Review Committees which Advise on the Appointment, Merit Increase, Promotion, Career Status Actions for Members of the Librarian Series. These APM revisions are also being reviewed by the Librarians Association of the University of California (LAUC).

Some employees in the Librarian Series are represented by a union and some are not. According to the Council of University Librarians (CoUL) and its administrative arm, the Administrative Services Advisory Group (ASAG), the impetus for these revisions is to update the APM "to conform to the contract, effective October 1, 2013, between the University and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT)", to ensure that "for the most part, the terms and conditions affecting non-represented librarians should be consistent with those affecting represented librarians."

The Academic Federation Personnel Committee has reviewed the proposed revisions and makes the following comments:

Several sections of the proposed revisions retain or exacerbate inconsistencies in the terms and conditions that affect non-represented librarians and represented librarians.

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Margaret Durkin".

Margaret Durkin, Chair

Affirmative Action & Diversity

May 4, 2015 9:55 AM

AA&D Committee Response to Proposed APM 210-4 and 360 Systemwide Amendment Review

The committee feels that the goal of implementing consistent policies for represented and non-represented librarians is worthwhile. Not having been provided with a copy of the new contract or a summary of the differences between the new contract and the proposed APM, we do not feel adequately well-informed to assess the draft language. After consulting with some librarians, it is our understanding that some substantive differences remain, particularly surrounding the definitions and expectations of professional activities. In order to provide more meaningful feedback, it would be helpful to know exactly what these differences are, and what was the rationale behind leaving them as is.

CAP Oversight Committee

April 20, 2015 2:14 PM

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has reviewed the proposed changes systemwide to APM 210-4 and APM 360 dealing with librarians. In general, CAP finds that the proposed changes clarify the intent of the documents. However, CAP proposes a few minor changes:

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"

Graduate Council

April 29, 2015 1:58 PM

Response continued on next page.

April 29, 2015

RFC: APM 210-4 and 360 (Librarians) Systemwide Amendment Review

The Graduate Council, based on a memo from its APD Committee, forwards their recommendations for the aforementioned RFC.

The Academic Planning and Development (APD) Committee met on April 7, 2015, and considered the proposed systemwide amendment and revisions to the APM 210-4 and 360 regarding librarians' appointments, terms of service, merit increases, promotions, advancements, and personnel review processes.

Overall, the revisions are a good start to updating the policies. However, Graduate Council notes that 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.

Sincerely,



Kyaw Tha Paw U, Chair
Graduate Council

/vm

C: Gina Anderson, Academic Senate Executive Director

Library

May 5, 2015 8:41 AM

The Library Committee has read the draft revisions to the APM and the accompanying cover letter from UC Vice Provost Susan Carlson. The letter explains that the changes were motivated by a desire to bring the APM into conformity with a recently negotiated union contract and to maintain consistent terms and conditions of employment for unionized and non-represented librarians. The committee was not provided with a copy of the revised contract and so we cannot accurately evaluate how well the proposed revisions to the APM achieve the goal of consistency.