

September 29, 2004

To: Terence K. Huwe, LAUC President

From: LAUC Committee on Professional Governance

Re: 2003/2004 Final Report

**Committee Charge**

In addition to fulfilling its standing charge (LAUC Bylaws, Article VIII. Section 1.j.2)

Linda Kennedy, LAUC President, requested that the committee address these additional topics:

- a. Review campus procedures and answer the following questions: Are there separate review procedures for represented and non-represented librarians? If so, how do the procedures differ?
- b. Do local campus procedures incorporate additional criteria language beyond the language in the APM for appointments and advancement? Do local campus procedures make reference to or incorporate any LAUC position papers? If so, please list and characterize each instance.
- c. What is the role of the University Librarian in the review process at each campus? Who is the final decision-maker? At which points does the final decision-maker have the opportunity to comment on the candidate under review?
- d. Following the completion of the review cycle, does the peer review committee on each campus report to the divisional membership and/or executive board? If so, what types of data and information do such reports contain?

**Action Items:** The Committee had no action items for Spring Assembly 2004.

**Report:** The committee members provided responses from their campuses on each of the questions within the charge. The final report was submitted to the membership at Spring Assembly, April 2004, and can be found on the LAUC website:

<http://www.ucop.edu/lauc/committees/pg/report-spring-2004.pdf>

This report is also included here as an attachment.

Respectfully submitted,

Sherry DeDecker, UCSB, Chair  
Ron Heckart, UCB  
Terri Malmgren, UCD  
James Crooks, UCI  
Keri Botello, UCLA  
John Bloomberg-Rissman, UCR  
Rob Melton, UCSD  
Min-Lin Fang, UCSF  
Kerry Scott, UCSC

**Attachment: LAUC COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL GOVERNANCE REPORT  
APRIL 2004**

[rev. 5/2/04 to include revisions to UCD review procedure, page 12]  
rev. 5/11/04 and 5/15/04 to include revisions to UCI's review procedure as described in the  
summary]

TO: Linda Kennedy, LAUC President  
FROM: LAUC Committee on Professional Governance  
RE: 2003/2004 Report on Campus Review Procedures

**Committee Charge and Summary of Campus Responses:**

In addition to our standing charge, the LAUC President asked the Committee on Professional Governance to address four questions regarding campus procedures for librarian reviews. Below is a summary of the campus responses; individual reports are contained in the Appendix.

*a. Review campus procedures and answer the following questions: Are there separate review procedures for represented and non-represented librarians? If so, how do the procedures differ?*

There are no separate review procedures at the campuses, although some contain references to the APM and MOU. We note that UCLA has found potential for confusion without these references, and has been attempting to identify areas in the APM, MOU, local Peer Review Manual and the CALL where language differences occur.

*b. Do local campus procedures incorporate additional criteria language beyond the language in the APM for appointments and advancement? Do local campus procedures make reference to or incorporate any LAUC position papers? If so, please list and characterize each instance.*

Most campuses do not incorporate additional criteria language for appointments and advancement. Exceptions are UCB, for appointment and advancement; UCI, for distinguished step, advancement, and other actions; and UCLA, for appointments, advancement and other actions.

Local campus procedures reference LAUC Position Papers 1 and 5 at UCLA, and 1 at UCSC. Several of the other campuses include them in the review materials for peer review committees.

*c. What is the role of the University Librarian in the review process at each campus? Who is the final decision maker? At which points does the final decision maker have the opportunity to comment on the candidate under review?*

The University Librarian is the final decision maker for UCB (except affiliated libraries), UCSB (except termination), UCSC (except librarian managers), UCI, UCSD, and UCLA. At UCSF, it is the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; at UCR, the AEVC. At UCD, the Vice Provost Academic Personnel is the final decision maker for all actions except merit increases, the latter handled by the University Librarian.

At which points does the final decision maker have the opportunity to comment on the candidate under review? For UCB, UCSB, and UCSF, at the end of the review process.

For UCI, Review Initiators discuss their reviews with their supervisor, so Review Initiators who report directly to the UL discuss the reviews of their direct reports with the UL, both at the beginning of the process and at the point that a draft recommendation is written; consensus is not a goal of these meetings, but rather communication and discussion. Some LAUC-I members consider the review initiator's early discussion with the UL of reviews in which the UL is the first level above the review initiator to be a conflict of interest, since the UL is the final decision maker.

For UCR, opportunity to comment occurs when AEVC receives documentation and after CACLS forwards the recommendation to the AEVC. For UCSC, if CAPA cannot make a judgment or determines further review by an ad hoc committee is needed; on new information solicited by CAPA; and if deciding officer has made a decision different from that suggested by the review initiator. At UCD, before forwarding to APC for review; and at end of process. At UCSD, If UL's tentative conclusion differs from the recommendation of either CAPA or the Ad Hoc Review Committee, and again at end of process. At UCLA, at the point when Review Initiator & AUL meet.

Notification to campus review committee in case of disagreement occurs at UCSB and UCLA. The UL normally meets with CAPA to discuss the cases. At UCI, the Library Review Committee sees the UL's notification of a tentative decision that disagrees with a lower level of review and has the opportunity to respond to it.

*d. Following the completion of the review cycle, does the peer review committee on each campus report to the divisional membership and/or executive board? If so, what types of data and information do such reports contain?*

Most campuses, except UCR and UCSF, report to the membership upon completion of the review cycle. Reporting campuses generally give statistics. UCI and UCSB report numbers of cases only; other campuses provide more detail and UCB, UCSD, and UCLA also report on any actions in which the review committee disagreed with the final decision maker. Additionally, UCSD and UCR discuss recommendations to modifications in review procedures.

The Committee on Professional Governance has no action items.

Respectfully submitted,

Sherry DeDecker, UCSB, Chair  
Ron Heckart, UCB  
Terri Malmgren, UCD  
James Crooks, UCI  
Keri Botello, UCLA  
John Bloomberg-Rissman, UCR  
Rob Melton, UCSD  
Min-Lin Fang, UCSF  
Kerry Scott, UCSC

## Appendix Individual Campus Responses

*Are there separate review procedures for represented and non-represented librarians? If so, how do the procedures differ?*

There are no separate review procedures at the campuses, although some contain references to the APM and MOU. We note that UCLA has found potential for confusion without these references, and has been attempting to identify areas in the APM, MOU, local Peer Review Manual and the CALL where language differences occur.

### ***Campus Responses:***

#### **UCB**

Berkeley does not have separate procedures for represented and non-represented librarians.

#### **UCR**

At present, there is one procedure for both.

#### **UCSB**

Not yet; in process of added language to reflect MOU for represented librarians. Procedures will be similar, but those for represented librarians will refer to appropriate sections of the MOU.

#### **UCSC**

No.

#### **UCD**

Davis doesn't have separate procedures for represented or non-represented librarians.

#### **UCI**

UCI's Academic Personnel Procedures for Librarians has two separate "editions" – 1) Managers and Supervisors and 2) Represented Librarians -- to reflect citations to APM and MOU respectively. Procedures are the same.

#### **UCSF**

SF doesn't have separate procedures for represented or non-represented librarians.

#### **UCSD**

Procedures for review of represented and non-represented librarians are the same at UCSD.

Question 1, P. 2

**UCLA**

Presently there exist no “separate review procedures” for the represented and non represented librarians at UCLA. Three person ad hoc peer review committees drawn from a larger peer review committee formed each year evaluate librarian documentation packets. What is different is the document containing language to cover each group. Represented librarians are in the collective bargaining unit and are covered by the *Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)* between the University of California and the University Council—American Federation of Teachers (UC-AFT). Non-represented librarians are not in the collective bargaining unit and are covered by the *Academic Personnel Manual*. The language covering the peer review process contained in the MOU does not duplicate the language addressing the peer review process contained in the APM. The language of the MOU is based upon the APM, but is not entirely duplicative. For the most part, review committees have applied the language of both documents to all review actions. The language of the APM is implied in the MOU, but without direct reference, inclusion or statement of exclusion, there is potential for confusion as to which is to be applied to reviews. Over the past peer review period, this non-duplication/non-alignment of language became evident. Our process last year varied from what it had been in previous years in tone and length. The LAUC-LA Professional Governance Committee has been examining the language of the APM, the MOU, the local Peer Review Manual and the CALL in an attempt to pinpoint where differences occur.

**2. Do local campus procedures incorporate additional criteria language beyond the language in the APM for appointments and advancement? Do local campus procedures make reference to or incorporate any LAUC position papers? If so, please list and characterize each instance.**

Most campuses do not incorporate additional criteria language for appointments and advancement. Exceptions are UCB, for appointment and advancement; UCI, for distinguished step, advancement, and other actions; and UCLA, for appointments, advancement and other actions.

Local campus procedures reference LAUC Position Papers 1 and 5 at UCLA, and 1 at UCSC. Several of the other campuses include them in the review materials for peer review committees.

***Campus Responses:***

**UCB**

“Additional criteria language” *re* appointment:

In Section V.A:

... In exceptional cases, persons without library degrees may be appointed to this classification and must be justified on the following grounds:  
the work they are assigned to perform in the library system will be such as is generally classified as librarian’s work; and (b) no candidates with librarianship degrees are available, either at the time of appointment or in the near future, who are qualified for the position. An appointee who is lacking a graduate library degree will be expected to secure a degree from an ALA accredited library school or to acquire appropriate alternate education within a specified time period as recommended by the appropriate administrator in consultation with CAPA.

The employee will not attain career status until the requirement is fulfilled and peer review as outlined in Section VI, B,2 has been successfully completed. Such change in status will normally occur on the following July 1.

In addition to a graduate degree in librarianship, an entering librarian may be required to possess competence in a specialized field as demonstrated by an additional advanced degree or experience in that field. Publications in the field of librarianship or in appropriate specialized areas, evaluations of the candidate by recognized specialists in his/her field, and activities in professional or scholarly societies may be considered in judging his/her competence.

Librarians appointed to Assistant Librarian rank step I may not have had any professional experience. New appointees with professional experience are normally appointed to one of the higher steps in this rank. Appointees with extensive previous professional experience who are appointed to demanding and responsible positions may be appointed to higher ranks of the Librarian series. Such appointments must be supported by appropriate documentation.

“Additional criteria language” *re* advancement:

In Section VI.A:

In addition to the evaluation based on the academic and professional criteria described above, librarians who have management and/or supervisory responsibilities will be judged on their ability to plan and maintain a well-organized, efficient department or unit, deal effectively with personnel needs and problems, and offer leadership in the area of staff development.

Question 2, P. 2 UCB contd.

One factor which will be considered in assessing the professional competence and judgement of individuals involved in the peer review process is their effectiveness in preparing and submitting documentation required as part of this process. Failure of any participant in the peer review timetable as permitted in APM 360-80(a)(2), shall be explicitly cited in the participant's own review as a negative reflection on professional judgement and competence.

The official "Procedures for Review of Librarian Appointments, Promotions, and Advancement..." do not explicitly refer to the LAUC position papers, but LAUC Position Paper No. 1 is prominently noted in the list of librarian review materials.

### **UCR**

Three additional documents are relevant here: our local PAMs, the MOU, and the Executive Vice-Chancellor's "Call".

While we are all aware of the position papers, there are no specific references to them in any of the other documents.

### **UCSB**

There is no additional criteria language regarding appointments or advancement. Our procedures do not mention the LAUC position papers, but will refer to position paper #1 when the revised procedures are completed. However, the instructions to peer review committees do instruct them to refer to position paper #1.

### **UCSC**

LAUC Position Paper 1 is referenced, verbatim, in the procedures under Merit Increases, Promotions and Career Status.

### **UCD**

Procedures don't make specific reference to any white papers since much of that language was incorporated into the relevant APM sections.

### **UCI**

- Academic Personnel Procedures for Librarians, noted in a. above.
- Further, in October 2003, LAUC-I and the UL approved the document, "Guidelines for Interpretation of the Criteria for Librarian Personnel Actions within the UCI Libraries." This purpose of this 14 page document, which underwent extensive review and revision over the past several years, is "to provide a framework for career planning that will help to guide each librarian toward superior achievement and growth, foster successful advancement through the ranks of the Librarian Series, and ensure greater equity in the peer review process." It attempts to articulate key concepts and actions in the review process, including the interpretation of the criteria, career status, movement through the ranks and promotion, accelerated merit increase, and no action through the denial of merit or promotion. The full document is available on the LAUC-I web site and at <http://lauci.lib.uci.edu/0304/Criteria1203.pdf>
- Criteria for distinguished step is defined within the Academic Personnel Procedures for Librarians.
- There are no references to LAUC position papers.

Question 2, P. 3:

### UCSF

SF peer review procedures don't make references to any LAUC position papers since much of the language was incorporated into the relevant APM sections.

### UCSD

There is no formal reference at UCSD to review criteria language beyond that in the APM for appointments or advancement. LAUC position papers are included as a tabbed section near the back of the UCSD Libraries' *Academic Review Procedures Manual (ARPM)*, but there is no deliberate reference to them in the text of the procedures themselves.

### UCLA

The language of the *Academic Personnel Manual*, the *LAUC-LA By-Laws*, the *CALL for Recommendations for Academic Merit Increases, Promotions, and Career Status Actions for Represented Librarians*, and the *UCLA Peer Review Manual* are consulted during the peer review process at UCLA. The language in each has been used to clarify and amplify the criteria language contained in the *Memorandum of Understanding* for represented librarians and the APM for non-represented librarians. But as stated in the response to part (a) of the charge, absent a clear delineation of what APM language is to be included in peer review at UCLA, there is confusion, most notably following the 2002-03 process.

In direct response to the question, the MOU language contained in Article 3- Professional Activities and Development, A.: *"Librarians are required to devote their time and energies to service on behalf of the University. Certain commitments established by the University will involve specific schedules and obligations that shall be met by the librarian. There shall be reasonable flexibility and reasonable individual discretion for librarians in the use of University time so that they may function as academic appointees of the University of California. Choice of other activities such as study, writing, research, public service, and requests to attend workshops, institutes, and conferences, as well as the choice of professional organizations in which to be active, are left to the discretion of the individual librarian;"*

AND Article 4- Process for Merit Increase, Promotion, and Career Status in its entirety;  
AND Appendix E, III. Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on the Appointment, Merit Increase, Promotion, Career Status Actions for Members of Librarian Series in its entirety;  
AND IV. Appointment and Promotion – Definition, Criteria, Terms of Service in its entirety.  
The UCLA *CALL* Section II Definitions and Guidelines for Determining Actions sets out additional criteria with regard to service eligibility, promotion, career status, advancement to Librarian VI, recommendation for no action, acceleration, deceleration, and deferred review. Following is the pertinent language for each:

A. *Service Eligibility*

*"Librarians holding part-time appointments are to be evaluated on the same review schedule and by the same criteria as those with full-time appointments.*

*For purposes of review, an appointee must have worked at least six (6) months of the period under review. A period under review is a calendar year or multiple thereof, in accordance with the review cycles defined in the MOU, Appendix E, IV, C, 7, h-i."*

C. *Promotion is an advancement to a higher rank within this series, usually the next higher rank. In addition to the criteria listed and described in the MOU:*

*Assistant Librarians who have demonstrated superior professional ability and attainment should, after a sufficient number of years, be recommended for a promotion to Associate Librarian. When an Assistant Librarian with potential career status reaches the top of the rank, one of several recommendations is in order: 1) promotion to Associate Librarian, 2) termination,*

Question 2: p. 4: UCLA contd.

*if the candidate has not earned promotion within the specified six (6) year limit, or 3) deceleration, if the six (6) year limit has not been reached.*

*Associate Librarians at Step VI or above should be considered for promotion to Librarian. Associate Librarians are promoted to the rank of Librarian on the basis of demonstrated superior professional skills and achievement and, in addition, demonstrated professional growth and accomplishment and/or the assumption of increased responsibility. The assumption of administrative responsibility is not a necessary condition of promotion.*

*D. Career Status is achieved upon successful completion of a suitable trial period in potential career status (MOU, Appendix E, IV, C, 4 – 5). Possession of career status guarantees that a review will be conducted before a librarian is terminated for unsatisfactory performance (MOU, Appendix E, IV, C, 5, e). It is also a factor, after other considerations, in determining the order of layoff for librarians covered by the Memorandum of Understanding. Both the criteria and procedures for a separate career status review are identical to those of a normal merit review.*

*Associate Librarians and Librarians may technically achieve career status at the earliest upon their two (2) year work anniversary. For practical purposes this is usually done during the peer review cycle so the career status date may be as early as the July 1 following their second anniversary. This might mean that the months worked prior to their review could be as little as a year and a half if they were appointed in June but the date of conferring career status would be a least two (2) years after the date of appointment.*

*Career status is awarded under the following procedures:*

- 1. Career status is automatically granted in cases where an Assistant Librarian is promoted to the rank of Associate Librarian.*

*A librarian appointed at the Associate level must be considered for Recommendation for career status during his/her trial period of not more than four (4) years and not less than two (2), unless promoted sooner to the rank of Librarian. Failure to attain career status during this period will*

- 2. result in termination.*

- a. If recommended, career status may be included as part of a review action for merit increase. The recommendation for career status must be explicitly indicated on the Academic Personnel Recommendation, the evaluation/recommendation statement, and other appropriate parts of the documentation.*

- b. Career status may be recommended as a separate action not tied to a normal review action.*

- c. Career status is automatically granted in cases where an Associate Librarian with potential career status is promoted to the rank of Librarian.*

- 3. A librarian appointed at the full Librarian rank must be considered for recommendation to career status during his/her trial period of not more than three (3) years and not less than two (2). Failure to attain career status during this period will result in termination.*

Question 2: p. 5: UCLA contd.

- a. *If recommended, career status may be included as part of a review action for merit increase. The recommendation for career status must be explicitly indicated on the Academic Personnel Recommendation, the evaluation/recommendation statement, and in other appropriate parts of the documentation.*
  - b. *Career status may be recommended as a separate action not tied to a normal review action.*
- E. *Advancement to Librarian, Step VI. Advancement from Step V to Step VI of the Librarian rank is reserved for those librarians whose careers and continuing achievements can be regarded as distinguished. It is based on the following:*
1. *Career history of outstanding service to the Library, the University, and the Profession.*
  2. *Significant achievement in the period since attaining Step V.*

*Advancement to Step VI will normally not occur with less than three (3) years of service at Step V, except in unusual cases. Librarians may remain at Step V of the full Librarian rank indefinitely, and without prejudice.*

F. *Recommendation for No Action. Associate Librarians at Step VII and Librarians at Steps V and VI may remain at these steps indefinitely without prejudice. However, to ensure that the appraisal process is regularly carried out for all librarians at UCLA, individuals at these steps are reviewed according to the review cycles of three years for both the Associate Librarians Step VII and the Librarians Steps V and VI. A librarian at Step VIII is also reviewed on a three year cycle for no action.*

G. *Acceleration is an advancement in step or rank, or both, beyond that indicated in the review schedule. While the salary scales are specific with regard to normal merit increments and promotion schedules, acceleration should be considered if warranted by unusual achievement, and exceptional promise of continued growth.*

*An acceleration may take one of two forms: 1) A candidate who is eligible for review may be recommended for a merit increase of more than one (1) step; or 2) A candidate who is not eligible for review according to the regular review cycle may be recommended for a merit increase or promotion. In either case, if the recommendation for acceleration is approved, the candidate's review cycle is adjusted to correspond to the normal length of service at the new step. When candidates are appointed initially to the Librarian series, appropriate ranks and salary steps are determined based on careful assessment of the nature and quality of their experience, academic preparation, and professional achievements. Continuation or advancement in the series is justified by continuing excellence in performance and achievement. Accelerated merit or promotion is possible if this expected achievement is surpassed.*

*Exceptional achievement may be evidenced by such accomplishments as extraordinary achievement in the performance of assigned responsibilities, successful completion of advanced degree programs, research and/or publications of recognized merit, and significant, influential professional leadership in library activities or efforts (on the local, state, or national*

Question 2: p. 6: UCLA contd.

*level). Such achievements are expected to be adjuncts to excellent performance in fulfilling library service responsibilities.*

*Whereas review for promotion consists of evaluation of the totality of a candidate's performance, review for merit is, for the most part, limited to evaluation of performance since the last merit increase or promotion. In this context, performance or achievement qualifying a candidate for acceleration shall have taken place within the period under review. The implication, therefore, is that simultaneous accelerated merit and promotion must be justified by*

*evidence spanning the years of service at UCLA, plus exceptional achievement in the period under review.*

*As there are obvious limitations as to how much exceptional achievement can be expected between review periods, more than a one-step acceleration would be most unusual. Conceivably, however, a candidate could qualify for more than one acceleration over a number of review periods.*

*H. Deceleration is the withholding of a merit increase after the librarian has served the normal period at a given step. In some instances, a librarian may not meet the challenges of his/her primary responsibilities in a productive or creative manner. A librarian may also fail to contribute in even a modest way to the library or to improve his/her own professional or academic skills. If a librarian fails to meet minimum expectations in his/her job assignment or if he/she fails to meet minimal expectations for librarians in other areas of professional, intellectual or creative endeavors, then that librarian should be considered for deceleration.*

*I. A Deferred Review may be requested only when there is insufficient evidence to evaluate performance due to prolonged absence since the last personnel review, or other unusual circumstances. A request for deferral should be prepared for transmission to the Peer Review Committee and will be reviewed by the Committee and the Administration in the same way that other actions are reviewed. If a request for deferral is denied, the documentation for the appropriate action must then be prepared and submitted.*

*A deferral is a neutral action, which can only be initiated with the written agreement of the reviewee. Deferral of review should be permitted for all appointees with career status in the Librarian series of the University of California. Reviews, if deferred, are deferred for a period of one (1) year. A deferral for an additional, consecutive year should be regarded as a new request and thus subject to the same procedure. It is important to note that a deferred review is not the same as an extension, which may be granted by the University Librarian in cases where documentation is not submitted by the required deadline.*

**Do local campus procedures make reference to or incorporate any LAUC position papers? If so, please list and characterize each instance.**

LAUC-LA traditionally has referred to and incorporated *LAUC Position Paper 1*, and *LAUC Position Paper 5* into the LAUC-LA Peer Review Manual and includes the document entitled *The Librarian Series in the 90's and Beyond* in the *CALL*.

3. ***What is the role of the University Librarian in the review process at each campus? Who is the final decision maker? At which points does the final decision maker have the opportunity to comment on the candidate under review?***

The University Librarian is the final decision maker for UCB (except affiliated libraries), UCSB (except termination), UCSC (except librarian managers), UCD (unless contested), UCI, UCSD, and UCLA. At UCSF, it is the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; at UCR, the AEVC.

At which points does the final decision maker have the opportunity to comment on the candidate under review? For UCB, UCSB, UCI, UCSF, at the end of the review process. For UCR, when AEVC receives documentation and after CACLS forwards the recommendation to the AEVC. For UCSC, if CAPA cannot make a judgment or determines further review by an ad hoc committee is needed; on new information solicited by CAPA; and if deciding officer has made a decision different from that suggested by the review initiator. At UCD, before forwarding to APC for review; and at end of process. At UCSD, If UL's tentative conclusion differs from the recommendation of either CAPA or the Ad Hoc Review Committee, and again at end of process. At UCLA, at the point when Review Initiator & AUL meet. Initiator & AUL meet.

Notification to campus review committee in case of disagreement occurs at UCSB and UCLA. The UL normally meets with CAPA to discuss the cases. At UCI, the Library Review Committee does not see the recommendation. Most librarians at UCI have some concern about potential conflict in the UL's early involvement in the review process.

***Campus Responses:***

**UCB**

The University Librarian is the final decision maker for The Library—i.e., the Doe/Moffitt complex and the subject specialty libraries. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Welfare is the final decision maker for the Affiliated libraries—i.e., administratively independent libraries which report to academic departments, professional schools and research units. The University Librarian serves as an administrative reviewer in Affiliated library cases.

After receiving the completed review files, which include CAPA's recommendations, the University Librarian normally meets with CAPA to discuss the cases. The Vice Provost does not normally meet with CAPA to discuss Affiliated library cases.

**UCR**

(A)The University Librarian is one reviewer in a chain of reviewers, said chain ending with the Associate Executive Vice-Chancellor, who is the "final decision maker". On this campus, the UL's role is evolving, now that we have a new UL. We expect that she will add working actively with the other reviewers to ensure that quality documentation goes to the AEVC to her other responsibilities.

(B)At two points. 1) when she receives the documentation, the AEVC can request clarification, additional documentation, etc. 2) after CACLS (the local peer review committee) forwards its recommendation to her, she forwards hers to the UL.

**UCSB**

UL makes the final decision for merit, promotion, career status or continuance, and informs the librarian of the decision in writing. For termination, the Executive Vice Chancellor makes the final decision.

Question 3: p. 2: UCSB contd.

From the LAUC Procedures for Appointment and Review,  
*The UL makes “a decision on the final action in cases where merit, promotion, career status or continuance are warranted; and formulates a recommendation for action to be forwarded to the Executive Vice Chancellor in cases where termination is considered” (III,D,7, a)*

*“The University Librarian forwards all necessary documents relating to termination actions to the Executive Vice Chancellor, who makes the final decision in these cases” (III, D, 7, c)*

The UL comments at the end of the review process, and notifies the librarian in writing of the decision.

### **UCSC**

The University Librarian initiates reviews for Librarian Managers and is a deciding officer for Represented Librarians. The Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor is a deciding officer for Librarian Managers.

The review initiator may comment on the candidate if CAPA cannot make a judgment based on the materials presented and requests additional information; when CAPA determines that an ad hoc committee is needed to further review a candidate’s packet, the review initiator may comment on any new information that is solicited by CAPA and the review initiator may comment if/when the deciding officer has made a decision that is different from what the review initiator suggested.

### **UCD**

The Vice Provost Academic Personnel makes decisions on librarian cases that are: 1) contested, 2) promotions, 3) career actions, 4) to the distinguished step. The Academic Federation Personnel Committee does not decide but recommends to the Vice Provost. The University Librarian makes the decisions with regard to one step, uncontested merit actions where none of the conditions above exist.

From our procedures manual on University Librarian’s role:”Reviews the recommendations of the Review Board and prepares a recommendation in cases of advancement to career statuses, accelerated merit action, Librarian VI and VII, promotion, and contested\* one-step merit actions. The University Librarian has the authority to approve uncontested, one-step (Asst. Lib.,I-Lib.V) merit actions or uncontested recommendation for no salary action for Assoc. Lib. VII, Lib., V, VI or VII, or to refer them with accompanying recommendation to the Office of the Provost for review and recommendation by the Academic Federation Academic Personnel Committee. The University Librarian may solicit further information from the Review Board. The Review Board shall notify the University Librarian within two working days of the receipt of communication if it wishes to submit additional comment.

\*a contested case is one where the librarian under review or any of the reviewing individuals or the Review Board is in disagreement with review initiator’s recommended action. “Then: “(UL) initials checklist indicating recommendation or decision is provided in the review packet, returns the recommendation packet to the Academic Personnel Coordinator.”If the action is uncontested or otherwise trouble-free, the UL forwards the review packet to the Vice Provost-Academic Personnel. The UL will transmit the final decision to the candidate at the end of the process.

Davis librarians’ packets are also reviewed by the Personnel Committee of the Academic Federation.

Question 3: p. 3

**UCI**

- UL is final decision maker.
- When the UL's preliminary assessment is to disagree with any level of review, the UL issues notification of a tentative decision to the lowest level of review with which the UL disagrees. The LRC sees the UL's tentative decision and any responses and has the opportunity to respond to it.
- UCI has an extensive document (currently 80 pages long) entitled "Academic Personnel Procedures for Librarians."  
[\[http://hr.lib.uci.edu/performance evaluations/Libperformance.htm\]](http://hr.lib.uci.edu/performance%20evaluations/Libperformance.htm) Section I.F.2.b. on the role of the Review Initiator, includes the following: "5) meet with the AUL or UL (whichever is first in the supervisory chain above the Review Initiator) to discuss the candidate's review....The discussion shall be focused on what documentation is appropriate and necessary to ensure that the full range of the candidate's performance is documented. Consensus is not a goal of this meeting, but rather communication and discussion..." Section I.F.10 includes the following: "c. Before the Review Initiator shares a draft of his/her letter with the candidate, the RI shall meet with the supervisor AUL (or UL as appropriate) to communicate the review actions he/she plans to recommend... Consensus is not a goal of this meeting, but rather communication and discussion."
- Some LAUC-I members consider the review initiator's early discussion with the UL of reviews in which the UL is the first level above the review initiator to be a conflict of interest, since the UL is the final decision maker.

**UCSF**

The role of the UL at SF campus in the UCSF Guide for Peer Review reads:

- Annually, the UC/designee shall send to the Chair of CAPA (Committee to Advise on Personnel Actions) a complete and accurate list of librarians and their status.*
- Annually, the UC/designee shall inform in writing, all review initiators and all librarians of their status, responsibilities and rights. A copy of the calendar will also be provided.*
- The UL will receive the review files from the review initiators and forward the files to CAPA.*
- The UL will respond to requests from CAPA for additional documentation by notifying the review initiator(s) and reviewee(s); such documentation is forwarded to CAPA.*
- Following CAPA's deliberations, the UL receives review files from CAPA with their recommendation. After adding his/her recommendation, the review files are forwarded to the chancellor/designee.*

At UCSF, the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (VCAA) is the one who makes the final decision for merit, promotion and career status. At very end of the review process, the VCAA has the opportunity to comment on the candidate under review.

The VCAA receives review files from the UL. If the VCAA's decision is contrary to that of the UL, the UL is requested to provide further information or commentary. If the VCAA's decision is contrary to that of CAPA, CAPA is asked to provide further information or commentary. The VCAA makes the final decision based on the recommendation from the UL and CAPA. Finally, the VCAA notifies the reviewee of the final decision.

Question 3: p. 4

### **UCSD**

The UCSD University Librarian has the final decision in matters of performance reviews; this authority has been delegated to him/her by the University's Chancellor. The UL does not formally comment on candidates for review until he or she has been sent recommendations on all candidates from the peer review committee. If, after reading the files and conferring with his/her administrative team, the UL's tentative conclusion differs from the recommendation of either CAPA or the Ad Hoc Review Committee (if there is one), he/she informs CAPA and asks for additional deliberation and feedback. This happens approximately 6 weeks before the end of the process.

The UL sends the review committee drafts of his/her letters to all candidates, about two weeks before the candidates receive them. Then, the UL (via the Library Human Relations Office) notifies CAPA and the Ad-Hoc Committee (if there was one) of the final decision at the same time that the candidates' department heads are given the letters addressed to the candidates.

### **UCLA**

According to the *CALL for Represented Librarians*, Appendix B.I., Authority and Responsibilities,

*“The Chancellor has delegated to the University Librarian authority to approve appointments, promotion and merit increases at within-scale salaries, and career status actions, after appropriate review.”*

The UL is the final decision maker on reviews at UCLA, but in extraordinary circumstances others might be involved, but those situations are not included here. Beginning in 2003-04 review cycle and only in extremely rare instances, the UL may be a librarian's RI and would comment directly on a candidate. It is practice at UCLA for the UL to write a letter to each candidate, informing him/her of the outcome of a review. In previous years these letters might include comments to the librarian. From the *CALL for Represented Librarians*, Appendix B.V. G., *“The University Librarian or Director Library Human Resources will inform each candidate and his or her Unit Head of the action taken.”* The three person PR Committees are not informed about individual decisions, EXCEPT in the event where the PR committee and the UL do not agree. In situations when the recommendation of the ad hoc peer review committee and the decision of the University Librarian differ, the University Librarian conveys his/her decision and reasoning for it in writing to the three person ad hoc review committee. The review committee has an opportunity to respond in writing. The review committee will be informed of the final decision. From the *CALL for Represented Librarians*, Appendix B. V. F, *“In cases where the recommendation of the University Librarian and that of the review committee differ, the DLHR will notify the Coordinator who will transmit the recommendation of the University Librarian and the reasons for it to the review committee. The review committee will have the opportunity to respond. The review committee will be informed of the final decision in these cases, together with the reasons for the decision in the case of an unresolved disagreement.”*

Question 3: p. 5: UCLA contd.

One important feature of the UCLA peer review process is confidentiality. Neither the individual candidates under review, nor the University Librarian know the identity of the members of the three person ad hoc peer review committee selected for each packet. As covered in the LAUC-LA By-Laws, Standing Rule 4. Committee for Peer Review, number 9, *“The assurance of confidentiality is necessary for the peer review system to be effective. Individual identities of the three member peer review committees are kept confidential and permanently retained in seal envelopes by the vice Chancellor for Faculty Relations. In cases of grievances or similar actions relating to personnel matters, the sealed envelope may be opened by the Vice Chancellor for Faculty Relations.”*

**4. Following the completion of the review cycle, does the peer review committee on each campus report to the divisional membership and/or executive board? If so, what types of data and information do such reports contain?**

Most campuses, except UCR and UCSF, report to the membership upon completion of the review cycle. Reporting campuses generally give statistics, although UCB, UCSD, and UCLA report on any actions in which the review committee disagreed with the final decision maker. Additionally, UCSD and UCR discuss recommendations to modifications in review procedures.

***Campus Responses:***

**UCB**

The CAPA chair reports in writing to the LAUC-B chair and to the LAUC-B membership at the fall assembly. The CAPA chair notes the total number of cases reviewed, the number of cases by type (merit, career status and promotion), and the extent of agreement/disagreement between CAPA and the final decision maker.

**UCR**

Not at the end of the cycle. CACLS does not receive the AEVC's recommendations, the UL does. Therefore CACLS is not positioned to report the number of promotions, accelerations, etc. BUT - there is a meeting at the beginning of the next cycle, led by the past chair of CACLS, at which any problems encountered in the prior year are described, and strategies devised to avoid them "this time around." These meetings are often lengthy discussions that clarify the process for all involved.

**UCSB**

The Chair of CAP reports to the LAUC-SB Executive Committee, then to LAUC-SB membership at a membership meeting. The report contains number of cases reviewed, and the fact that reviews are completed.

**UCSC**

Yes, CAPA first solicits feedback from LAUC membership, reports feedback to membership, reports on the review process - how many advancements, deferrals, etc.

**UCD**

The Review Committee prepares a final report, numbers only on promotions, accelerations, career status, etc. at the end of the LAUC fiscal year.

**UCI**

LRC reports number of cases only to LAUC-I membership.

**UCSF**

LAUC-SF has a very small group of librarians. We only have few candidates under review every year. After the completion of the review, the review committee CAPA neither reports to the divisional membership nor to executive board.

#### Question 4, P. 2

##### **UCSD**

Each year, the peer review committee is expected to make a report to the full membership of LAUC-SD. This report typically includes the calendar that was followed; a summary of changes made to *ARPM* during the year; a listing of new appointment files reviewed (by position); the number of academic review files reviewed; a statistical summary reflecting the degree of agreement or disagreement between the candidates' review initiators and the peer review committee(s), between the two committees (in cases where an ad hoc review committee was also involved), and between the peer review committee(s) and the University Librarian; data on whether review materials were submitted on time to the Library Human Resources office and, later on, to the University Librarian; recommendations for modifications in procedures to the review process; and reminders to LAUC members about the review process. A summary of the report is entered into the minutes of the Membership Meeting (usually in the early autumn) at which it is presented, with a link to the text of the full report.

##### **UCLA**

In accordance with *LAUC-LA By-Law Standing Rule 4*, specifically, numbers 10 and 11 set out the mechanism for record keeping and reporting to the LAUC-LA membership. Number 10 outlines the records/statistics the Peer Review Coordinator keeps and for how long, and Number 11 specifies that the Peer Review Coordinator will include final statistics in a year-end report presented at the Fall membership meeting to LAUC-LA librarians, and posted to the LAUC-LA website. To summarize, the Peer Review Coordinator keeps confidential records of the composition of the three person review committee for each action reviewed; records of all individual librarians reviewed for any action during the review period; the results of all reviews and of all administrative actions. The report to the membership and posted to the website includes: total number of librarians reviewed; number of each type of action (merit increase, promotion, acceleration, appointments, special reviews, decelerations, deferred reviews), results of reviews by type subdivided by rank; number of actions in which ad hoc committee disagreed with the recommending officer, including the final administrative recommendation.