

Appendix VII.

LIBRARIANS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA – SAN DIEGO Guidelines and Expectations for Merit Increases

Revised 11/2014

Evaluation Guidelines and Expectations

A Candidate who receives a positive review, which is predicated on a demonstration of high achievement and excellent performance, can expect an action of merit increase. Typically, a positive review results in a merit increase of two salary points on the applicable scale for Assistant and Associate Librarian ranks, and three salary points on the applicable scale at the Librarian rank. An individual who is promoted typically will receive an increase of two salary points above their previous salary at the Assistant Librarian rank, and three points above their previous salary at the Associate Librarian rank. The University is not precluded from granting merit increases of a greater number of points. (Summarized from *MOU Article 13.C.2*).

In accordance with *MOU Article 4.C* and *APM 360-10*, a candidate for a merit increase or promotion is evaluated on the basis of the first of the following criteria, and, to the extent they are relevant, on one or more of the last three:

- a) Professional competence and quality of service within the library;
- b) Professional activity outside the library;
- c) University and public service; and
- d) Research and other creative activity.

Reasonable flexibility is exercised in weighing the comparative relevance of these criteria. If a librarian has assumed new responsibilities in Criterion A but not relinquished his/her other responsibilities (often due to staffing reductions), and the increased workload “made it difficult to sustain or expand activities in one or more of the other three criteria,” then “candidates and review initiators should explicitly acknowledge constraints inhibiting outside professional activities, and other reviewers should demonstrate requisite flexibility when evaluating professional activities beyond the primary assignment.” Everyone involved in the review process should also “give due weight to accomplishments that involved mastering new and enlarged responsibilities in the primary assignment and in systemwide activities.”¹

Further, the APM specifies guidance helpfully relevant to Candidates and Review Initiators:

APM 210-4 e (3)

[Some portions of the APM text have been removed for brevity (...), and other text made **bold** to highlight relevant passages.]

- (3) The criteria as set forth in detail below are intended to serve as general guidelines and do not preclude consideration of other unique service to the University. In considering individual candidates, reasonable flexibility is to be exercised in weighing the comparative relevance of these criteria.

- (a) Professional Competence and Quality of Service Within the Library —
Although contribution in each of the following areas will vary considerably

¹ Language excerpted from UC Berkeley’s 2012 document “[Peer Review Standards in a Time of Increased Workload.](#)”

from person to person depending on each person's primary functions as a librarian,...., **librarians should be judged on consistency of performance, grasp of library methods, command of their subjects, continued growth in their fields, judgment, leadership, originality, ability to work effectively with others, and ability to relate their functions to the more general goals of the library and the University.** Evidence of effective service may include the opinions of professional colleagues, particularly those who work closely or continuously with the appointee; the opinions of faculty members, students, or other members of the University community...

- (b) Professional Activity Outside the Library — A candidate's **professional commitment and contribution to the library profession** should be evaluated by taking account of such activities as the following: membership and activity in professional and scholarly organizations; participation in library and other professional meetings and conferences; consulting or similar service; outstanding achievement or promise as evidenced by awards, fellowships, grants; teaching and lecturing; and editorial activity.
- (c) University and Public Service — Recognition should be **given to those who participate effectively and imaginatively** in library-wide and University service (including serving on campus or University-wide administrative or academic committees), and in professional librarian services to the community, state, and nation.
- (d) Research and Other Creative Activity — Research by practicing librarians has a growing importance as library, bibliographic, and information management activities become more demanding and complex. It is therefore appropriate to take it into account in measuring a librarian's professional development. **The evaluation of such research or other creative activity should be qualitative and not merely quantitative and should be made in comparison with the activity and quality appropriate to the candidate's specialty. Note should be taken of continued and effective endeavor.** Reports, handbooks, manuals, and similar documents may be considered under this heading only if they present new ideas or incorporate research; otherwise, they should be regarded solely as evidence of professional service.²

When applying the above guidelines, the Review Initiator should make the case for the candidate by discussing specific evidence that speaks to superior performance, including such parameters as:

- Effectiveness
- Quality
- Visibility
- Continued growth
- Measureable impact(s)
- Productivity
- Innovation.

² Source: <http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-210.pdf>, pp 21-22

These parameters are merely provided here as examples of the dimensions of performance that should be taken into account. Evaluators are not limited to only these features, nor are these parameters required.

--

Guidelines for Recommendation of Additional Salary Points

When a Candidate receives a positive review, his/her recommended merit increase may include additional salary points beyond the minimum levels described in the MOU (Articles 4.E.1.b and 13.C.2.d).

The recommendation of additional salary points is directly related to the degree of achievement greater than expected for normal advancement and should be reserved only for cases of unusual performance or exceptional contribution.

Sections of the APM discuss the possibility of accelerated advancement. While the UC San Diego Library no longer uses the term “acceleration,” the description in these documents of how to handle an accelerated action may provide some guidance as to when a recommendation of additional salary points is warranted. [Some portions have been removed for brevity (...), and other text made **bold** to stress importance.]

APM 210-4.d(2)

Assessment of Evidence: The review committee shall assess the adequacy of evidence submitted. If ... there is evidence of **unusual achievement and exceptional promise of continued growth**, the committee should not hesitate to endorse or propose a recommendation for accelerated advancement.

APM 210-4.e(2)

[A]ccelerated promotion is possible **if achievement has been exceptional**. An appointee will be eligible for promotion only if there are **demonstrated superior professional skills and achievement**.

A recommendation of additional salary points should provide detail that articulates clearly the Candidate’s extraordinary contributions, unusual achievement and/or exceptional promise of continued growth. Exceptional achievement should be evident in all aspects that would be considered for a normal merit increase, including *Criteria B, C, or D* as appropriate. As with standard merit reviews, reasonable flexibility is to be exercised in weighing the comparative relevance of these criteria.