

Review of System Feedback and Rationale for By-Laws Recommendations

Matt Conner
LAUC President
for
The Committee on Professional Governance (CPG)

March 30, 2015

First, the CPG considered suggestions outside of Options A,B,C of the draft recommendations that were circulated. A proposal to retain the current language to pressure "Human Resources (HR)" to fix confusion in the LAUC membership was refused since HR is a broad category involving numbers of independent departments at the campus and system level; there are no individuals answering to this category who would feel pressure to respond. A proposal to change the definition of LAUC membership from APM title codes to a four part criteria based on the nature of librarian work was refused because it would deviate too far from the current language for UCOP to accept and because such a criteria was too indeterminate and unwieldy for administering the organization. A proposal to remove all administrators from LAUC membership, including AUL title codes, was rejected since this discussion already took place at the founding of LAUC with UCOP insisting on the inclusion of AUL title codes. There was also not enough popular support through the system for this idea.

The CPG then turned to consider the Options A,B,C in light of the feedback. Significant systemwide opinion favored expanding participation of non-members as affiliates or some other category (Option A). There was substantial resistance to admitting new title codes, reclassified administrators, and MLS holders as permanent new members (Option B). And there was support for allowing new title codes as exceptional members for divisions on request (Option C). In light of this feedback, the CPG undertook an exhaustive reconsideration of the three options and the current language by way of a series of single elimination comparisons (a.k.a. March Madness) to arrive at a recommendation.

Option A was favored over the current language because clarification of the title code criteria (Section 1) in place of the current ambiguous language was considered worthwhile. Specific language to expand the affiliate category and other types of non-member participation at the discretion of the divisions (Section 4) was considered a useful addition.

Option C and Option B were compared as alternative ways to extend official membership. Option B was dismissed because of a generally negative response. Even the favorable responses to Option B had no consensus on which of the three proposed categories should be admitted: new title codes, reclassified administrators, MLS holders. (There was particularly strong resistance to the final category.) In addition, the CPG found the prospect of standardizing campuses with deeply different needs in terms of title codes of varying and unpredictable relevance through the complex mechanism of the by-laws to be a hopeless undertaking. For Option C, the proposal to grandfather current reclassified administrators was rejected. There was no system support for the idea, and the CPG considered this to be a superficial response that did not address the future composition of LAUC. There were questions

about the need to extend official membership to new positions given that other staff would already have significant input through an expanded affiliate category (Option A) and given the additional work required to define a criteria for new positions and to adapt new positions to the by-laws.

The situation changed with the proposal to use APM 360-4, the APM's definition of librarianship, as the criteria for new membership. This criteria is ready-made and would merely need to be interpreted for admission. Furthermore, it gives librarians a degree of control in defining the profession that is absent from UCOP designated title codes and from the process of classifying new hires which remains poorly understood. There is no danger of a "slippery slope" for dispersing the membership since librarians would control the admission of new members and could remove exceptional new members through procedures in the Standing Rules as easily as they were brought in.

The CPG's final recommendation for revising the by-laws consists of a synthesis of Option A and Option C to provide the following four benefits to LAUC: (1) Clarify title codes as the basis of membership (2) Clarify membership privileges at the state and divisional level (3) Allow increased participation of non-members through an expanded affiliate category and other structures and (4) Allow new positions full membership privileges at the divisional level (subject to approval by the state executive board) with an option to remove them in future. The recommendations enable LAUC to adapt its membership to the foreseeable future without risk to its character or mission.