

# AGENDA

LAUC-SD Membership Meeting  
November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014  
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm  
Seuss Room

---

**Attendees:** Roger Smith, Adele Barsh, Alice Perez, Doug Spence, Maria Din, Amy Butros, Lia Friedman, Aislinn Sotelo, Mary Linn Bergstrom, Peter Rolla, Susan Shepherd, Dave Schmitt, Harold Colson, Kari Lucas, Marlo Young, Victoria Chu, Michael Smith, Reid Otsuji, Linda Barnhart, Martha Hruska, Arwen Hutt, Sue McGuinness, Nancy Stimson, SuHui Ho, Adolfo Tarango, Becky Culbertson, Mary Wickline, Catherine Friedman, Bie-Hwa Ma, Kathy Creely, Penny Coppernoll-Blach, Jenny Reiswig, Annelise Sklar, Deborah Kegel, Teri Vogel, Shi Deng, Lynda Claassen, Gayatri Singh

## ANNOUNCEMENTS / UPDATES / REMINDERS

- Call for voluntary contributions  
It's \$15 that will help with retirement and LAUC-SD socials. Gayatri will accept donations at membership meetings, or anywhere you happen to see her! ☺ Checks can be made out to LAUC-SD.
- Welcome new librarians Peter Rolla and Reid Otsuji
- Statewide Assembly will be April 23<sup>rd</sup> at UC Davis. More info to follow, especially travel grants.

## COMMITTEE UPDATES

- CAPA (Adele Barsh)

Teri Vogel has joined. CAPA met with Admin Team for annual debrief on 10/31. Annual report from last year is on LAUC-SD website--

[http://libraries.ucsd.edu/about/admin/lauc-sd/0\\_files/capa/capa1213report.pdf](http://libraries.ucsd.edu/about/admin/lauc-sd/0_files/capa/capa1213report.pdf). They're planning some review workshops. They're waiting on scheduling because they need to update materials. New MOU will have an impact on this review cycle. The details need to be worked out. CAPA will communicate with everyone involved on an ongoing basis.

- Diversity (Heather Smedberg)  
The Committee is helping sponsor one of the 2013 International Education Week's International Film Festival films. We're planning on continuing the cookie exchange/craft event from last year. More details will be sent by email.
- Mentoring (Dominique Turnbow, Kelly Smith) (added post meeting)  
The mentoring committee continues to make progress towards setting up the internship program with hopes to be ready to accept interns by Fall 2014. We are also currently updating parts of the Finding Community web site so that it is ready to share with new hires in the near future. We continue to facilitate matching mentors with mentees for

informal internships or conversations. Finally, we have created a listserv, MLIS\_Staff, for library staff that are currently enrolled in a library program.

- R&PD (Mary Linn Bergstrom)  
Conducted opt in/out survey for professional development funds distributed by R&PD. They were able to include Peter and Reid in the survey. They are providing training session on state-wide grants.
- Academic Senate Library Committee (Teri Vogel)  
They met last week for the first time this term. Most of the discussion was on UC-wide Open Access Policy and what the next steps are for us. UCSD wanted to set its own policy, but that has been set aside because campuses can't be out of step of the UC-wide policy. They spent time discussing next steps. In the coming year librarians and faculty will partner up to attend department meetings to spread the word. Sue McGuinness and Lisa Lampert-Weissig (Lit professor and chair of the Library Committee) are meeting to identify librarians (primarily in ALP) and faculty to do this. Lisa would like the bulk of the meetings to happen before the end of the academic year. They also discussed the UC San Diego Open Access Fund pilot (30 funded; 3 in process). We're out of funds until January. We're going to cap at \$1000 per article. We're going to limit to folks whose grants don't cover these fees and no hybrid journals. Brian Schottlaender wants to allocate modest amount to rest of academic year (\$7500), then start anew with 2014-15. He wants to spend half on this fund (\$15K) and other half (\$15K) on other OA initiatives that help non-science folks. Lisa wants to see the library more "in the loop" about new classes, programs initiatives, etc.
- Statewide Professional Governance committee (Mary Wickline)  
This Committee reviewed bylaw changes for 4 campuses: UCD, UCM, UCR and UCSB. Their local bylaws were reviewed and all were found to be consistent with statewide.
- Statewide Research & Professional Development (Shi Deng)  
The call for state-wide research grant proposal has gone out. Look for an email from Roger. More information will be provided in the upcoming workshop.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

- Climatequal Update  
Reminder of 3 upcoming Open Sessions on Compensation, Diversity, Supervision on November 20, December 4 and December 11. Please attend as your schedule allows.  
ClimateQUAL Implementation Team charge:  
<https://illiad.ucsd.edu:8443/display/CLIM/CQ+Charge>

## **NEW BUSINESS**

- Demystifying Local and System-wide LAUC Research Grants Programs Presentation (Aislinn Sotelo and Shi Deng)  
Materials from workshop: <http://libraries.ucsd.edu/about/admin/lauc->

- ARPM revisions feedback and discussion (Dave Schmitt and Adele Barsh)  
Late last year a subcommittee (Dave Schmitt, Adele Barsh, Tammy Dearie, Doug Spence, Roger Smith) was appointed to review language and make sure the ARPM reflected the needs of our new organization (multiple programs and reporting lines). In the attached documents, there are the proposed changes for this review cycle. There are simple semantic changes (ex. Department head to program director) as well as more substantial ones. This is still in draft mode. It has been reviewed by Admin Team. It's a document that is agreed upon by both LAUC-SD and Admin, so now is the time for feedback.

*8,9—3e and 3f*

Members were uncomfortable with the “optional” letter part. We believe if it's important enough to be a percentage of your job, it's important enough to get feedback on.

There was discussion on whether making it required would make the process tedious, but it was agreed that it's important to make the letters mandatory and stress that the letters don't need to be longer than a page. We want to streamline our process but we want to document our work as well. Program Directors would also like to provide feedback (good and not so good) about anyone working in their program. Hopefully we're not making it too laborious or prescriptive. The process is trying to set it up the way it was before but to match our new realities. By taking away the opt-out option, files will be more consistent in the long run.

There is still a section that says secondary evaluations shall be shown to and discussed with the candidate and initialed and dated by the folks who wrote the letter and the candidate.

There will still be some cases for which letters are optional (ex. Dotted lines)

The new program directors (or designated supervisors) will be the review initiators. Former Department Heads (or designated supervisors) are expected to write a letter for review packets. Candidates can respond to this letter. This will go away after everyone gets reviewed the first time under the new structure.

*14, 31*

Brian proposed taking out the Accelerated Promotion. For represented folks, under the MOU, this option is out of the picture anyway, but that leaves unrepresented folks hanging. Non-represented LAUC-SD members have had no chance to discuss these proposals separately which is problematic. Dave will remove new language and suggest that we look at this issue during the next review of this document. This means CAPA will get two lists-- one under new MOU and one under old APM

29,30 (*ad hoc* definition altered slightly to make it easier on ourselves)

Under the new guidelines, no people from your home program can be on your ad hoc. But we like the idea of Senior Librarians being present for higher level promotions, etc We're leaving that language as was. It did result in some people being on a lot of ad hocs, but they'll take one for the team!

37

"as appropriate, it should be announced at the national level," what does 'as appropriate mean'? The example given was a search limited to internal candidates. We would like to add more specific language.

### **Specific Edits to document:**

Make letters from secondary evaluators mandatory if the candidate has a percentage in a program.

Item 18: All the PDs (regardless of percentage they have of a position) should be notified when the review process starts for candidates

F2: suggest the word rare be stricken. It's not necessarily rare. We're going to need this supplemental information.

Add more specific language that you cannot opt out of writing a letter if it's requested.

Make sure language reflects that the Home PD may not be the review initiator (it could be a supervisor) or that secondary PDs can designate supervisor to write letter for review file.

Add language that candidate may request letters.

The language needs to change so it says if the program director leaves or the candidate moves to a different program, then the PD needs to write a letter for the candidate's review file.

Revise 14, 31 back to what they were in terms of Accelerated Promotions.

37, add more specific language—get rid of "as appropriate" and add "in cases not involving internal recruitments"

### **Action Items:**

Dave will make changes that were suggested during meeting. Dave will send a "vote for ratification" to the membership by email. If we approve, he will share with Admin Team.

They will send feedback in a timely manner because we hope to have this ratified and in place before the review cycle starts.

If it gets approved—

Doug will add all program directors to the notification process.

We need to revise the form for soliciting letters (include internal and external letters). LHR will handle this.

### **EMERGENCY MEMBERSHIP MEETING**

We've gone over time with this agenda topic. We'll schedule another Membership Meeting next week to talk about:

- [Administrative Travel, Career and Professional Development, Special Funding, and Training policy](#) has been revised (**20 minutes**)
- New Position Description (**20 Minutes**) (Adele Barsh and Linda Barnhart)

### **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

- UC Libraries Advisory Structure / Coordinating Committee Update (Marlo Young)

### **ADJOURNMENT at 4pm**

#### **Appendix:**

List of edits and changes to ARPM (Pages 6-9)

ARPM with track changes with proposed edits (Pages 10-41)

## List of edits and changes to ARPM

1. Many Sections: Changed the following terminology throughout the document:
  - o Department Head = Program Director
  - o Departmental = Program Level
  - o UCSD = UC San Diego
  - o Libraries = Library
  - o Director-Administrative Services = AUL of Enterprise Services
  - o Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs = Executive Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs
2. Many Sections: Added "home" before Program Director when applicable to differentiate from secondary PD assignments.
3. Section I.C.1: Edited words about APM/MOU for accuracy.
4. Section I.C.2: Changed "by the" to "for in" [grammar].
5. Section II.C: Changed "insure" to "ensure" [grammar].
6. Section III.C.1: Added phrase "home program" for the definition of initiating PD and words to clarify action recommendation responsibility.
7. Section III.D.1: Added phrase "within the home program" for clarity.
8. Section III.E (new): Added definition of a Required Secondary Evaluator. This is defined as PD of a program to which the candidate is assigned 20%, but is not the home program. The term "secondary program" was used and is also defined in this section.
9. Section III.F.1: Added definition of an Optional Secondary Evaluator. This role is analogous to a Coordinator from the past, but attempts to be more explicit regarding potential new organizational roles. Made numerous phrase deletions and additions for accuracy.
10. Section III.F.2: Added some instruction and emphasis regarding the rarity of the need for an Optional Secondary Evaluation.
11. Section III.L.1: Changed "principal" to "chief" in UL definition.

12. Section III.L.2.b: Changed "insuring" to "ensuring" [grammar].
13. Section IV.A.7: Clarified Accelerated review to include an accelerated review for advancement only.
14. Section IV.A.9 {Removed}: Removed possibility of accelerated promotion.
15. Section IV.E.3.c.2: Changed "normally used only in" to "only requested for" regarding reference letters. New language is more prescriptive. Also removed sentence about Candidate's right to request letters not being diminished.
16. Section IV.E.3.d.2: Changed "s/he" to "they" [grammar].
17. Section IV.E.3.d.4: Changed "the opinion of" to "input from." New language is more formal.
18. Section IV.E.3.e: Changed request for coordinator evaluations to a request for evaluations from secondary evaluators (both required and optional). Made this a responsibility of the RI, and not to be made through LHR. Added requirement for initials from all parties.
19. Section IV.E.3.g: Changed "position in the library department" to "position in the library."
20. Section IV.E.4.c.3: Added requirement for secondary PDs consult on position description.
21. Section IV.E.4.d: Changed "Prepare" to "shall be prepared" for consistency [grammar].
22. Section IV.E.4.d.I.A: Removed "primary" and changed "consortia" to "groups" for accuracy.
23. Section IV.E.6: Changed section on coordinator evaluations to include all secondary evaluations. Defined different actions for mandatory and optional evaluators.
24. Section IV.E.7 {Removed}: Removed section on multiple reporting lines, as this is now covered in previous section.
25. Section IV.E.7.g: Removed words regarding annual review cycle.
26. Section IV.E.8.b: Explained the procedure of recommendation with multiple reporting lines, giving responsibility to the home PD, with the option to consult.
27. Section IV.E.9: Changed wording to allow for candidate request of redacted documents at any time during process.

28. Section IV.E.11.b: Added secondary evaluations to list of docs to review in conference.
29. Section IV.F.2.e.4: Changed restriction on ad hoc membership to shared home program librarians only.
30. Section IV.F.2.e.6.(a,b,c): Removed some restrictions to membership on Ad Hoc committees, with respect to rank.
31. Section IV.F.2.f.7.b: Removed accelerated promotion as option, added accelerated review to Ad Hoc responsibilities.
32. Section IV.F.2.f.7.c: Changed "explicit" to "specific" [grammar].
33. Section IV.F.3.g: Changed "and" to "or" [grammar].
34. Section IV.F.3.h.2: Removed accelerated promotion as option, added accelerated review list of actions.
35. Section IV.H.1.a: Added sentence about inclusion of CAPA report.
36. Section IV.H.1.b: Added sentence about all PDs getting notified.
37. Section V.D.1.d: Added "As appropriate" to announcement language.
38. Section V.D.2.a: Removed AUL requirement for screening committees.
39. Section V.D.4.d.2: Changed LMG to Library Council.
40. Section V.D.5.b: Changed "It is desirable that" to "should" [grammar].
41. Section V.G.2.a: Changed "AUL" to "line AUL" for clarity.
42. Section V.I.1.b: Changed language to be more flexible regarding extended appointments.
43. Section V.I.2.a: Removed phrase regarding scope of advertising as unnecessary.
44. Appendix 1: Added #5 under "Furnished by PROGRAM DIRECTOR" = secondary evaluations (if applicable)
45. Appendix 2: Added #5.d = Secondary Program Director's evaluation (required if applicable)

# ACADEMIC REVIEW PROCEDURES, LIBRARIAN SERIES, [UCSDUC San Diego](#)

Revised [11/10/2007](#)[2013](#)

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. BACKGROUND/HISTORY

1. Although Librarians' status in the University of California changed from that of staff employees to non-Senate academic employees in the 1960's, until 1970/1971 their initial appointments and subsequent performance reviews continued to be carried out through a hierarchical, administrative process.

That year a process which incorporated a peer review component into the evaluation of proposed appointments and performance reviews was introduced for the Librarian Series. This process was described in chapters introduced for the first time into the University's [Academic Personnel Manual \(APM\)](#). The [Librarians' Association of the University of California \(LAUC\)](#) played an instrumental role in drafting those University-wide policies, as well as the related procedural documents on each campus, and has remained actively involved in the revisions and updates of those documents.

2. A key principle inherent in the peer review component of this process is the concept that appointees in the Librarian Series participate in, and share responsibility for, evaluation of the qualifications of proposed new appointees to the Series and for their subsequent professional performance. The Librarian Series is the only non-Senate academic series in the University that uses a peer review component in the evaluation of proposed appointments and professional performance.

### B. PURPOSE

1. These guidelines are designed to provide procedural details for conducting appointment and performance reviews of [UCSDUC San Diego](#) Librarians.
2. Objective and thorough reviews of the qualifications of Candidates for appointment, merit increase, promotion, and career status are conducted at specific intervals. The review process, in addition to its value as a means of commending demonstrated individual growth and sustained excellence, serves to ensure the high quality of library service provided to the [UCSDUC San Diego](#) community by Librarians in the Librarian Series.

### C. AUTHORITY/CRITERIA

1. The review procedures for Librarians ~~are~~ governed by two documents: the [University of California and University Council-American Federation of Teachers Memorandum of Understanding \(UC-AFT MOU\) for represented librarians](#) and the University of California [Academic Personnel Manual for non-represented librarians](#). ~~Specifically, these~~ This procedures ~~are~~ consistent with the provisions of [UC-AFT MOU Articles 4, 5, 6 and APM Sections 360 and 210-4](#) and with the criteria described in detail in Sections 360-10 and 210-4-e. This procedure is consistent with the provisions of Article IV, "Process for Merit Increase, Promotion and Career Status" of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU): University of California and University Council-American Federation of Teachers.
2. In accordance with an option provided ~~for in by the~~ APM Sections 360-6 and 360-24, the Executive Vice Chancellor-Academic Affairs at [UCSDUC San Diego](#)

has delegated to the University Librarian responsibility for appointing review committees and authority for approving final personnel actions for incumbents in the Librarian Series. As stated in [APM 360-6](#), it is the function of the review committees to advise the officer who makes the final decisions. At [UCSDUC San Diego](#), review committees are advisory to the University Librarian. (There is variation among the UC campuses in the Chancellors' practices of delegating authority for approving actions affecting the Librarian Series.)

#### D. STAGES OF THE REVIEW

Each appointment or performance review is conducted in three stages:

1. ~~Departmental~~ Program level review, including the ~~Department Head~~Program Director's review and recommendation for personnel action. In cases of performance review, the Candidate's self review precedes this.
2. Peer review by the LAUC-SD Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Advancement (CAPA) and, in specified cases, an Ad Hoc Committee;
3. Administrative review, including the University Librarian's final decision for action.

## II. BASIC PRINCIPLES

### A. OBJECTIVITY

The review shall be based on an objective appraisal of the documentation in relation to the criteria stated in the [Academic Personnel Manual](#). The documentation shall be in sufficient detail to make an objective appraisal possible. All decisions and recommendations shall be based solely upon materials within the review packet. The file shall not include documents that are not pertinent to the evaluation of professional performance (e.g. medical records, records of political activity, or other personal information).

### B. CONFIDENTIALITY

It is the responsibility of all involved in the peer review process to scrupulously respect the confidentiality of their deliberations and the records and documents they examine. All personnel records, reports, and documents relating to a Candidate's case shall be kept in [Library Human Resources](#) when not in use by an authorized reviewer. All documents in transit shall be in sealed envelopes marked "Confidential."

### C. TIMELINESS

It is the responsibility of all involved to ~~ensure~~ insure that assignments are performed with the greatest possible care and promptness. Adherence to [calendar deadlines](#) is in the best interest of all participants.

### D. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

It is a professional responsibility for each Librarian at [UCSDUC San Diego](#) to serve on Ad Hoc Committees. Some Librarians may serve on several such committees each year. A person may disqualify himself/herself, but only if s/he questions his/her ability to make an objective judgment in a particular case.

### E. NONDISCRIMINATION

The review process shall be applied equally to all Librarians at [UCSDUC San Diego](#) within the limits imposed by law or University regulations without regard to race, color, religious belief or non-belief, marital status, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, physical or mental handicap, medical condition (according to the [California Fair Employment and](#)

[Housing Act](#)) political affiliation, union activity, status as a Vietnam-era veteran or disabled veteran, age, or citizenship. [See also *MOU* Article II, "Nondiscrimination", as appropriate.]

### III. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PARTICIPANTS

#### A. CANDIDATE FOR APPOINTMENT

1. Defined as: An applicant for a position who has been recommended for appointment.
2. Roles:
  - a. Submits letter of application, resume and list of references.
  - b. Makes himself/herself available for an interview.

#### B. CANDIDATE FOR REVIEW

1. Defined as: A currently employed Librarian for whom a personnel action (e.g. advancement, career status, promotion) is being considered.
2. Roles:
  - a. Examines and reports on the significance of his/her accomplishments and contributions during the review period, evaluating progress toward achieving established goals and identifying performance strengths and weaknesses.
  - b. Furnishes required documents for the review file.
  - c. Develops performance goals for the next review period. [See [Appendix X](#) for goals guidelines.]
  - d. Maintains open and regular communication with Supervisor during the review period, adjusting and revising goals in response to changing opportunities.

#### C. ~~DEPARTMENT HEAD~~PROGRAM DIRECTOR

1. Defined as: The individual who has primary responsibility for the ~~department home program~~ to which the position is assigned. Will also be referred to as the Review Initiator. In some cases, the ~~Department Head~~Program Director may choose to delegate the review process to the Immediate Supervisor. In this case, the Immediate Supervisor will be referred to as the Review Initiator and shall work closely with the ~~Department Head~~Program Director throughout the course of the review period. The recommended personnel action remains the responsibility of the ~~Department Head~~ Program Director to whom the candidate reports to as the ~~home program of the candidate's home program~~.

~~1.2.~~

#### 2. Roles:

- a. Participates in the recruitment and screening of applicants and recommends the appointment of Candidates to positions within the ~~Department~~program.
- b. Assesses and reports on the value of the Candidate's accomplishments and contributions, identifying strengths and weaknesses, and recommending measures to be taken to improve performance.

- c. Furnishes required documents for the Candidate's review file.
- d. Recommends a personnel action based on the documentation in the file relative to the criteria for Librarians' performance stated in the *Academic Personnel Manual*.
- e. Assists the Candidate, including new appointees, to formulate goals for the next review period, clarifying expectations. [See Appendix X for goals guidelines.]
- f. Maintains open and regular communication with the Candidate during the review period, discussing progress toward goals and any need for goal modification.

D. IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR

- 1. Defined as: The individual within the home program to whom the Candidate reports directly, if other than the Department Head/Program Director.
- 2. Roles:
  - a. Assumes the role of Review Initiator in conducting the review if the Department Head/Program Director chooses to delegate the responsibility. In this case, the Immediate Supervisor will be referred to as the Review Initiator and shall work closely with the Department Head/Program Director throughout the course of the review period. The recommended personnel action remains the responsibility of the Department Head/Program Director.
  - b. If the Department Head/Program Director does not delegate the responsibility for conducting the review, s/he prepares an evaluation of the Candidate's performance for the Candidate's review file.

E. REQUIRED SECONDARY EVALUATOR

- 1. Defined as: A Program Director of a secondary program to which the Candidate is assigned. A secondary program is defined as one to which the Candidate officially reports for a significant percentage (20% or more) of his/her job assignment, but is not the Candidate's home program.
- 4-2. Role: Within the functional area for which s/he has responsibility, evaluates the Candidate's performance for the review file. This evaluation should not exceed one page in length.

FE. OPTIONAL SECONDARY EVALUATOR COORDINATOR OF LIBRARYWIDE FUNCTIONS

- 1. Defined as: An individual outside the Candidate's reporting line who has administrative responsibility for one or more of the Candidate's major functional assignments.

May be, but is not limited to, one of the following:

- a. A Program Director or Work Leader of a program to which the Candidate officially reports for less than 20% of his/her job assignment.
- b. A Work Leader within the Candidate's home program who is not his/her immediate supervisor, but who oversees a function of the candidate's job.

c. A Program Director or Work Leader within a program to which the Candidate does not have an officially assigned percentage of time, but for which the Candidate performs some function.

4.

2. 2.—Role: Within the functional area ~~coordinated~~for which s/he has responsibility, evaluates the Candidate's performance for the review file. This evaluation should not exceed one page in length.

Optional Secondary Evaluations are suggested only in rare instances in which the Candidate's Review Initiator feels that s/he does not have sufficient knowledge of the Candidate's performance in a specific area not already evaluated by another Evaluator.

GF. REFEREE

1. Defined as: Any individual who is knowledgeable about the Candidate's performance and responds to the Library's formal request for comment.
2. Role: In response to a formal request, provides confidential statements for the file evaluating the Candidate's work.

HG. CAPA (Committee on Appointment, Promotion, Advancement)

1. Defined as: A review group elected by the membership of LAUC-SD.
2. Roles:
  - a. Oversees and coordinates the peer review component of the review process.
  - b. Acts as a standing committee to review all personnel actions.
  - c. Acts as the sole review committee for cases that are not referred to an Ad Hoc Committee.
  - d. Nominates eligible persons to serve on Ad Hoc Review Committees.
  - e. Reviews and comments on the draft of the University Librarian's final letter to the Candidate.
  - f. Evaluates the review procedure document and recommends changes to LAUC-SD and to the University Librarian.
  - g. Advises LAUC-SD and/or the Library Administrative Team on academic personnel matters.
  - h. Plans and presents the annual academic review writing workshop in the Fall Quarter.

IH. AD HOC COMMITTEE

1. Defined as: A review group formed expressly to review the file of an individual Candidate.

2. Role: Reviews the documentation in a personnel action file and reports its findings and recommendations to CAPA.

~~J.~~ ASSISTANT OR ASSOCIATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN (AUL)

1. Defined as: A Library administrative officer who reports to the University Librarian.
2. Roles:
  - a. Assumes the role of the ~~Department Head~~Program Director in conducting the review of a Candidate who reports directly to him/her.
  - b. Advises the University Librarian in the administrative portion of the review process.

~~K.~~ LIBRARY HUMAN RESOURCES (LHR)

1. Defined as: The Library Officer(s) with administrative oversight for academic human resource matters.
2. Roles:
  - a. Maintains a centralized file of all personnel files, controlling access to confidential material.
  - b. Coordinates the application of the review procedures.
  - c. Is available to all participants to interpret and advise on application of these procedures.
  - d. Insures the supply and distribution of all documents and forms required to implement these procedures.
  - e. Maintains liaison with the campus Academic Personnel Office to insure that these procedures and their implementation meet University requirements.

~~KL.~~ UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN

1. Defined as: The Library's ~~principal~~chief administrative officer.
2. Roles:
  - a. Assumes ultimate responsibility for defining performance standards for Library academic personnel, communicating expectations, stimulating discussion, promoting common understanding and consensus.
  - b. Assumes ultimate responsibility within the Library for ~~insuring~~ensuring that these procedures, as approved by University Administration, are implemented and adhered to.
  - c. Appoints members of each Ad Hoc Committee from lists of nominees supplied by CAPA.
  - d. Reviews the documentation in personnel action files and makes final decisions regarding recommendations.
  - e. Reports the final decision in a letter to the Candidate, or extends an offer to a Candidate for appointment.

#### IV. REVIEW PROCEDURES: MERIT INCREASE, PROMOTION, AND CAREER STATUS

##### A. DEFINITIONS

1. MERIT INCREASE ([APM 360-8.c](#) and [MOU IV.B.2](#))  
A merit increase is an advancement in step within rank in the Librarian Series.
2. PROMOTION ([APM 360-8.d](#) and [MOU IV.B.1](#))  
A promotion is an advancement to a higher rank within the Librarian Series, normally the next higher rank.
3. CAREER STATUS ([APM 360-8.e](#) and [MOU IV.B.3](#))  
Career Status is a continuing appointment, achieved only after successful completion of a suitable trial period in Potential Career Status.
4. POTENTIAL CAREER STATUS ([APM 360-17](#))  
Potential Career Status refers to a trial period for new appointees. An appointee whose appointment is not explicitly temporary, and who is at the rank of Assistant Librarian or a new appointee at any rank, is in Potential Career Status for a trial period. If, after careful and thorough review, the appointee is not placed in Career Status within the time limit specified for that rank, the appointment is terminated after due notice. An appointee with Career Status making an intercampus transfer retains Career Status.
5. DEFERRED REVIEW ([APM 360-80.a \(2\)](#) and [MOU IV.C.2.a-b](#))
  - a. A deferral of a review for an one-year period may be requested by the Candidate or the [Department HeadProgram Director](#), but may be initiated only with the written agreement of the Candidate, and may be approved only when there is insufficient evidence to evaluate performance due to prolonged absence or other unusual circumstances since the last personnel review.
  - b. Reasons for the review deferral must be in writing and must be submitted for written recommendations in the following sequence: Candidate, [Department HeadProgram Director](#), CAPA and then to the University Librarian for decision.
6. OFF-CYCLE REVIEW ([APM 360-17.b \(5\)](#))  
If there is reason to doubt that an appointee in the Series is performing satisfactorily, a review shall be conducted. If such a review does not coincide with a regularly scheduled review, a review not at a regular interval shall be conducted. An off-cycle review may be initiated at the request of the Candidate, [Department HeadProgram Director](#), line AUL or University Librarian.
7. ACCELERATED REVIEW ([APM 360-80.d](#) and [MOU IV.C.5](#))  
A Candidate who is not normally eligible for a review during a particular review cycle may request an accelerated review ~~for advancement, during that cycle.~~ The [Department HeadProgram Director](#), Line AUL or University Librarian may exercise this same option.
8. ACCELERATED ADVANCEMENT (See Appendix VII)  
A two or more step advancement within rank, recommended at either a regular or an accelerated review.

~~9. ACCELERATED PROMOTION (See Appendix VII)~~

~~A two or more step advancement in conjunction with promotion, recommended at either a regular or an accelerated review.~~

910. DISTINGUISHED STEP (See Appendix XI)  
Advancement to Librarian VI.

B. CRITERIA

See Sections [360-10](#) and [210-4-e](#) of the *Academic Personnel Manual*.

C. ADVANCE PREPARATION FOR ACADEMIC REVIEWS (Related policies: [APM 360-17-c, d](#), [APM 360-80-a, d](#) and [MOU IV.C.1, 4](#) as appropriate)

1. DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR REVIEW

a. Each year prior to the beginning of the review process, each Librarian shall be notified in writing of his/her eligibility for review.

b. Eligibility is determined according to the intervals for academic reviews stated in [APM 360-80-a \(2\)](#) and [MOU IV.C.1.a-b](#), as appropriate; the policy for calculating periods of service is found in [APM 360-17-d](#).

2. NOTIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR REVIEW

Approximately one month before the review process begins, all Candidates for review and their [Department Headhome Program Directors](#) shall be provided with a written list of the personnel actions for which the Candidate is eligible in the upcoming review. Both parties shall be asked to review the summary of options for accuracy.

3. PREPARATION OF THE REVIEW PACKETS

Packets shall be prepared by Library Human Resources and distributed to all Candidates for review and their [Department Headhome Program Directors](#) (for distribution to Immediate Supervisors acting as Review Initiators if appropriate). [See [Appendix I](#) for lists of the forms and documentation included in the review packet.]

D. THE CALL (Related policies: [APM 360-80-c](#) and [MOU IV.C.3](#), as appropriate)

1. DISTRIBUTION OF PACKETS, INSTRUCTIONS AND CALENDAR

All Candidates for review and their [Department Headhome Program Directors](#) will receive from Library Human Resources a complete review packet, including a call for recommendations for academic merit increases, promotions, and career status actions and the calendar of due dates for the appraisal and review process no later than 30 calendar days prior to the first required action following the issuance of the call. Packets will be distributed to the Candidate's home [departmentprogram](#).

2. CALENDAR

All parties shall adhere to the [calendar](#), and the Candidate shall be notified of the decision within six months of the first required action. If necessary, in individual cases, provisions for reasonable extensions shall be developed in consultation with the campus [Academic Personnel Office](#).

E. [DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAM LEVEL](#) REVIEW PROCEDURES

1. NOTIFICATION

Early in the course of a personnel review, the ~~Department Head~~Program Director (in conjunction with the Immediate Supervisor in the role of Review Initiator, if applicable) shall notify the Candidate of the impending review. In conference(s) with the Candidate, the ~~Department Head~~Program Director (in conjunction with the Immediate Supervisor in the role of Review Initiator, if applicable) will make certain the Candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process, including the criteria specified in Section 210-4 of the *Academic Personnel Manual*. The Candidate shall be given the opportunity to ask questions and to supply pertinent information and evidence to be used in the review. In cases of promotion from the rank of Associate Librarian to Librarian, or advancement to Librarian VI (the Distinguished Step), discussion of the Candidate's entire relevant professional career history is required. It is the responsibility of both the Candidate and the ~~Department Head~~Program Director (in conjunction with the Immediate Supervisor in the role of Review Initiator, if applicable) to work together to present a thorough picture of the entire career history in the review file.

2. CHECKLIST A

At each of the steps above and at each subsequent step of the review process, the Candidate shall initial and date "Checklist A" (Appendix II) to certify that these obligations have been fulfilled.

3. ~~DEPARTMENT HEAD~~PROGRAM DIRECTOR INITIATES ~~DEPARTMENTAL~~PROGRAM LEVEL REVIEW

a. RESPONSIBILITY FOR ~~DEPARTMENTAL~~PROGRAM LEVEL REVIEW

- 1) The ~~Department Head~~Program Director in the Candidate's home ~~department~~program shall initiate the review. If s/he assembles the review file, the ~~Department Head~~Program Director assumes the role of Review Initiator.
- 2) The ~~Department Head~~home Program Director may request that the Immediate Supervisor prepare the review file. In that case, the Immediate Supervisor assumes the role of Review Initiator. Ultimately, however, it is the responsibility of the ~~Department Head~~home Program Director to assure that items b-g below are carried out and is responsible for making the recommended personnel action.

b. ~~DEPARTMENTAL~~PROGRAM LEVEL CALENDAR

The Review Initiator and the Candidate shall establish an internal calendar in keeping with the general review calendar.

c. REQUEST FOR LETTER OF REFERENCE LIST FROM CANDIDATE

- 1) The Review Initiator shall request from the Candidate a list of names of persons from whom letters of reference might be solicited. The Candidate may also list names of persons who, for reasons set forth in writing, might not objectively evaluate, in a letter or on a committee, the Candidate's qualifications or performance.
- 2) Letters of reference are ~~normally used~~ only ~~requested for in~~ reviews for promotion, acceleration, career status, advancement to Librarian VI (the Distinguished Step), or in those cases in which the ~~Department Head~~home Program Director and/or Review Initiator does not have firsthand knowledge of the individual's performance

in a certain area. ~~However, the Candidate's right to request letters of reference is in no way diminished by the above.~~

d. REQUEST TO LHR TO SOLICIT LETTERS OF REFERENCE

- 1) The Review Initiator shall submit to Library Human Resources the names of persons from whom Library Human Resources shall request letters of reference. For each letter of reference to be solicited, the Referee shall be asked to address specific aspects of the Candidate's performance with which s/he is familiar.
- 2) When the letters of reference have been received by Library Human Resources, ~~they/s/he~~ shall transmit them to the Review Initiator for inclusion in the review file.
- 3) Letters of Reference may be requested from colleagues, faculty, library or other University staff, or library users who are familiar with the Candidate's performance.
- 4) A reasonable number of letters of reference must be from the list of names supplied by the Candidate. Although there is no set limit, usually not more than four letters shall be requested. As provided in the [UCSDUC San Diego Policy and Procedure Manual \(PPM\), Section 230-29 D.1.c \(4\)](#), and [MOU Article IV.C.8.a](#), as appropriate, the ~~Department Head~~[home Program Director](#) and/or Review Initiator should decide whether or not to solicit letters from those persons whom the Candidate has named as persons who, for reasons set forth by the Candidate, might not objectively evaluate the Candidate's qualifications and performance. If such named reviewer is used, the ~~Department Head~~[Program Director](#) and/or Review Initiator should explain the reasons for consulting the named individual so that the file will show not only the Candidate's reasons for the exclusion, but also the reason for the ~~Department Head~~[Program Director's](#) and/or Review Initiator's decision to seek ~~the opinion of input from~~ the named person. Both the Candidate's list and the final list shall become part of the review file.
- 5) The ~~Department Head~~[Program Director](#) and/or Review Initiator shall insure that the Candidate will not know the name of any person from whom a letter has been requested. The Candidate may request in writing from Library Human Resources a redacted copy of each letter of reference in the file.<sup>1</sup>
- 6) The Review Initiator shall be informed by Library Human Resources of the names of persons from whom letters of reference have not been received within a reasonable period of time and a name may be substituted, if necessary, to complete the file.

e. REQUEST FOR EVALUATIONS FROM SECONDARY EVALUATORS

- 1) When the Candidate has official assignments in secondary programs of 20% or more, the Review Initiator shall request from the secondary Program Director(s) an evaluation of the Candidate's performance during the review period for the performance in that program during the review period.

---

<sup>1</sup> For a description of redacted documents, see [Appendix VI-UC Policy on Access to Personnel Records](#).

- 2) If appropriate, the Review Initiator shall request from an Optional Secondary Evaluator an evaluation of the Candidate's performance of the function(s) for which the Secondary Evaluator is responsible during the review period.
- 3) The secondary evaluation(s) shall be shown to and discussed with the Candidate and initialed and dated by all parties.

#### REQUEST FOR EVALUATIONS FROM COORDINATORS

~~The Review Initiator, through Library Human Resources, shall request from the Coordinator, when appropriate, an evaluation of the Candidate's performance during the review period for the activity being coordinated.~~

f. **REQUEST FOR UPDATED BIOGRAPHY FORM AND POSITION DESCRIPTION FROM CANDIDATE**

- 1) The Review Initiator shall request that the Candidate update the biography form and the position description. The position description is to be submitted to the Immediate Supervisor (who may also be the Review Initiator) for discussion; any problems with the description must be resolved at this time.
- 2) The homeDepartment HeadProgram Director should initial and date the position description to indicate agreement.

g. **UPDATED ORGANIZATION CHART**

The Review Initiator shall provide the Candidate with an organization chart that shows the Candidate's position in the library, department. This is a required form and shall include an indication of the Candidate's current rank and step.

4. **CANDIDATE'S SELF-REVIEW**

a. **CANDIDATE'S LETTERS OF REFERENCE LIST**

- 1) If letters of reference are to be requested for the review file, the Candidate shall provide the Review Initiator with the names of persons from whom such letters might be solicited, indicating which areas of the Candidate's performance the Referee should be asked to address.
- 2) The Candidate may also provide the names of persons who, in the view of the Candidate, for reasons set forth, might not objectively evaluate, in a letter or on a committee, the Candidate's qualifications or performance.
- 3) These lists shall be included in the review file.

b. **CANDIDATE'S BIOGRAPHY FORM**

The Candidate shall update, sign and date his/her biography form.

c. **CANDIDATE'S POSITION DESCRIPTION**

- 1) A position description shall be prepared for the first review or for any review during which the Candidate has changed positions. For subsequent reviews the Candidate has the option of submitting the previous job description, updating it with comments about any changes, marking it revised, and dating it.
- 2) A position description should consist of a concise descriptive statement (normally one page) outlining present responsibilities.

The approximate percentage of time spent in each major area of responsibility should be included. Such descriptive detail would not typically be repeated in the goals statement or in the Candidate's self-evaluation, which is an evaluative appraisal rather than a descriptive statement.

- 3) The position description shall be submitted to the Immediate Supervisor (who may also be the Review Initiator) for discussion. The Review Initiator shall send the position description to any secondary Program Director(s) for consultation. When any problems with the position description have been resolved, the Candidate, ~~and Department Head~~ the home Program Director and all secondary Program Directors should sign and date it.
- 4) An organization chart is required for inclusion in the review packet.

d. CANDIDATE'S SELF-REVIEW

~~Prepare a~~ A brief, concise self-review of "pertinent information and evidence," shall be prepared, consisting of a page or so of vita-style enumeration of accomplishments keyed to the four *APM* criteria outlined below, followed by a narrative discussion of approximately three of the most significant items within *APM* criterion I.A and approximately three of the most significant items within criteria I.B-I.D. Exceptions to these self-review guidelines are actions involving promotion, career status, acceleration, or advancement to Librarian VI (the Distinguished Step); in such cases, the review packet may be longer, if necessary.

In the case of new appointees undergoing their first review, the documentation relevant to criteria I.B through I.D should cover the same time period as that of other Librarians at their level. Candidates should also include "II. Professional Growth and Continuing Professional Education", and "III. Other Factors Related to Performance". The suggested length for an entire self-review should be no more than five pages.

In cases of promotion from the rank of Associate Librarian to Librarian, or advancement to Librarian VI (the Distinguished Step), discussion of the Candidate's entire relevant professional career history is required. It is the responsibility of both the Candidate and the ~~Department Head~~ home Program Director (in conjunction with the Immediate Supervisor in the role of Review Initiator, if applicable) to work together to present a thorough picture of the entire career history in the review file.

I. REVIEW OF PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

- A. Professional Competence and Service Within the Library.  
Encompasses achievement and service in areas of primary responsibility as well as other contributions to the library such as committee work and special assignments. Include here mention of substantive documents, such as reports and manuals, prepared for internal use. Library instruction goes here, including teaching and preparation of instructional materials. Also include here participation in UC-wide committees on which membership is required as part of the Candidate's ~~primary~~ responsibilities, such as collection development ~~consortia~~ groups. Include

management and supervisory responsibilities as relevant to the position.

B. Professional Activity Outside the Library.  
Includes service and contributions to professional and scholarly associations, e.g. committee work, program participation as panelist or discussion leader, offices held, consulting work, and editorial activity outside of primary responsibilities. [Note: Attendance at professional meetings, workshops, institutes, etc. should appear in Section II; formal papers delivered at meetings that result from research activities should appear in Section I.D.]

C. University and Library-Related Public Service.  
Includes teaching courses for credit through another academic department; service and contributions to LAUC, both locally and statewide; service and contributions outside the scope of the primary job responsibilities to [UCSDUC San Diego](#)-wide or UC-wide committees, working groups, etc. (including special contributions, such as chairing or undertaking special projects, that exceed the required participation in such groups mandated by the Candidate's primary responsibilities [see III.A]). Also includes professional service as a consultant, speaker, or expert witness to public service oriented groups, officials or associations.

D. Research and Other Creative Work.  
Includes research completed or portions thereof completed during the review period, research in progress and/or continuing projects. Grants and/or fellowships awarded to support such activities should be reported and the resulting publications cited. Includes scholarly and professional publications, addresses, formal papers and presentations, reports of research, and other creative activity including preparation of exhibits. Documents prepared for internal use or for library instruction should be included under Section I.A.

II. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION.

Includes attendance at conferences, workshops, institutes, and formal courses.

III. OTHER FACTORS RELATED TO PERFORMANCE.

Includes additional factors that may help Reviewers form an objective appraisal of the Candidate's performance, or a summary of factors important in weighing the evidence in the file.

e. COMPLETION OF SELF-REVIEW.

When the Candidate has completed his/her self-review, the documents shall be assembled and submitted to the Immediate Supervisor. [See [Appendix I](#) for a checklist of documents to be provided by the Candidate.]

5. IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR'S REVIEW

- a. If the ~~Department Head~~home Program Director does not delegate responsibility for conducting the review, the Immediate Supervisor shall provide the ~~Department Head~~Program Director with a thorough evaluation of the Candidate's work.
- b. The evaluation shall be shown to and discussed with the Candidate, initialed by both parties, and forwarded to the ~~Department Head~~Program Director for inclusion in the review file.

6. ~~COORDINATOR'S SECONDARY~~ EVALUATIONS

- a. ~~For a Candidate with (a) reporting line(s) consisting of 20% or more of his/her job assignment, each secondary Program Director (in conjunction with a Work Leader, if applicable) shall prepare an evaluation of the Candidate's performance in that program during the review period.~~
- a.b. ~~Upon receipt of a written request from the Review Initiator (as forwarded by Library Human Resources), the Coordinator~~an Optional Secondary Evaluator shall prepare an evaluation of the Candidate's performance ~~in the area being coordinated~~during the review period of the function(s) for which the Secondary Evaluator is responsible.
- b. The ~~Coordinator's secondary~~ evaluation(s) shall be shown to and discussed with the Candidate; ~~both the Coordinator and the Candidate shall initial and date it~~ and initialed and dated by all parties.
- c. The completed evaluation(s) shall be forwarded to the ~~Department Head~~home Program Director for inclusion in the review packet.

~~7. MULTIPLE REPORTING LINES~~

~~For a Candidate with a reporting line outside the home department, each Department Head (in conjunction with the Immediate Supervisor in the role of Review Initiator, if applicable) shall write a separate review based on the criteria as they relate to the functions s/he oversees.~~

~~Reviews from outside the home department shall be shown to and discussed with the Candidate, signed and dated by both parties, and forwarded to the home Department Head for inclusion in the Candidate's review file.~~

~~87. DEPARTMENT HEAD~~PROGRAM DIRECTOR'S REVIEW

- a. It is the responsibility of the ~~Department Head~~Program Director (in the role of Review Initiator) to thoroughly evaluate the work of the Candidate in relation to the criteria set forth in [APM 360-10](#) and [210-4-e \(3\)](#) and to make an appropriate recommendation for advancement, promotion, career status, or termination. Off-cycle, accelerated, and the Distinguished Step reviews should be clearly identified as such.
- b. The ~~Department Head~~Program Director may request that the Immediate Supervisor prepare the ~~departmental~~Program level review. The

Immediate Supervisor then assumes the role of Review Initiator. In this case, the Department Head Program Director need address only those points that have not been adequately covered by the Immediate Supervisor, or points of disagreement. If the Immediate Supervisor's review does not require elaboration, the Department Head Program Director may note, "I concur" (under Section 9.a below), sign and date it. The Department Head Program Director may not delegate the responsibility for making the personnel action recommendation.

- c. In preparing the written review, the Department Head Program Director and/or Review Initiator shall consider activities and documentation that relate to the period under review only. Reference to earlier events or projects, or to previous reviews, should not be made unless clearly essential to the current review.

In cases of promotion from the rank of Associate Librarian to Librarian, or advancement to Librarian VI (the Distinguished Step), discussion of the Candidate's entire relevant professional career history is required. It is the responsibility of both the Candidate and the Department Head Program Director (in conjunction with the Immediate Supervisor in the role of Review Initiator, if applicable) to work together to present a thorough picture of the entire career history in the review file.

- d. The Review Initiator shall thoroughly evaluate the Candidate's professional service to the Library, concentrating on performance in each major area of responsibility and on the Candidate's progress toward achieving goals established for the review period. S/he shall evaluate the quality and quantity of the Candidate's work, and acknowledge the Candidate's activities as reviewed by a Coordinator. Comments on the value of the Candidate's work to the department-program and the Library should be included. Specific aspects of the Candidate's work that are carried out exceptionally well or that need improvement should be commented upon. Mention should be made of activities that have contributed to the Candidate's professional growth. In the case of new appointees undergoing their first review, the documentation relevant to criteria I.B-I.D should cover the same time period as that of other Librarians at their level. In evaluating the Candidate's performance, the Review Initiator shall consider the Candidate's consistency of performance, grasp of library methods, command of subject area, continued growth in field, judgment, leadership, originality, ability to work effectively with others, including contributing to and working effectively in shared decision-making processes, and ability to relate functions to the general goals of the Library and the University. If the Candidate supervises the work of other library staff, the Review Initiator should comment on the quality and effectiveness of the supervision provided.
- e. Evidence of effective service may include the opinions expressed in the letters of reference, the effectiveness of the techniques applied or procedures developed by the Candidate, and relevant additional educational achievement.

- f. Reviews should be brief and concise. In preparing the documentation for the evaluation, the Review Initiator should follow the numbering and headings given below. Sections I.A and IV must be discussed. Sections I.B-III shall be discussed to the extent applicable.
- g. When a ~~Department Head~~Program Director leaves a ~~department program~~ during a review period, the ~~Department Head~~Program Director will be asked to write a letter prior to his/her departure for those Librarians that have been under his/her supervision for at least ~~three months in the case of those on an annual review cycle, or six months in the case of those on of the a longer review cycle.~~ The letter will discuss performance since the last review in all of the areas noted in Sections III.8.d (above). The departing ~~Department Head~~Program Director will discuss the letter with each individual supervised; each individual will also have the opportunity to respond in writing to the letter. The resulting documentation will be signed by both the ~~Department Head~~Program Director and the supervisee and then submitted to Library Human Resources for inclusion in the documentation for the next review.

#### I. REVIEW OF PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

- A. Professional Competence and Service Within the Library.  
Includes service in areas of primary responsibility as well as other contributions to the library such as committee work and special assignments. Include here substantive documents, such as reports and manuals, prepared for internal use. Library instruction goes here, including teaching and preparation of instructional materials. Also include here participation in UC-wide committees on which membership is required as part of the Candidate's primary responsibilities, such as collection development consortia. Include management and supervisory responsibilities as relevant to the position.
- B. Professional Activity Outside the Library.  
Includes service and contributions to professional and scholarly associations, e.g. committee work, program participation as panelist or discussion leader, offices held, consulting work and editorial activity outside of primary responsibilities. [Note: Attendance at professional meetings, workshops, institutes, etc. should appear in Section II; formal papers delivered at meetings that result from research activities should appear in Section I.D.]
- C. University and Library-Related Public Service.  
Includes teaching courses for credit through another academic department; service and contributions to LAUC, both locally and statewide; services and contributions outside the scope of the primary job responsibilities to UCSDUC San Diego-wide or UC-wide committees, working groups, etc. (including special contributions, such as chairing or undertaking special projects, that exceed the required participation in such groups mandated by the

Candidate's primary responsibilities [see III.A]). Also include professional service as a consultant, speaker, or expert witness to public service oriented groups, officials, or associations.

D. Research and Other Creative Work.

Includes research completed or portions thereof completed during the review period, research in progress and/or continuing projects. Grants and/or fellowships awarded to support such activities should be reported and the resulting publications cited. Includes scholarly and professional publications, addresses, formal papers and presentations, reports of research, and other creative activity including preparation of exhibits. Documents prepared for internal use or for library instruction should be include under Section I.A.

II. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Includes attendance at conferences, workshops, institutes, and formal courses.

III. OTHER FACTORS RELATED TO PERFORMANCE

Includes additional factors that may help Reviewers form an objective appraisal of the Candidate's performance, or a summary of factors important in weighing the evidence in the file.

IV. ~~DEPARTMENT~~ ~~HEADPROGRAM~~ ~~DIRECTOR'S~~ RECOMMENDATION

See below (E.9.a).

98. ~~DEPARTMENT HEADPROGRAM DIRECTOR'S~~ RECOMMENDATION

- a. The ~~Department HeadProgram Director~~ shall prepare a recommendation for personnel action for the Candidate, indicating the nature of the recommendation, (e.g. advancement, accelerated advancement, promotion, accelerated promotion, career status, promotion with career status, Distinguished Step, no action, or termination) and the proposed rank, step, and status in the Librarian Series.
- b. In the case of a Candidate with multiple reporting lines, the recommendation for personnel action will be made having taken into consideration the evaluations of all secondary Program Directors (or Work Leaders if the responsibility has been delegated). The home Program Director may choose to consult with secondary Program Directors regarding the recommendation if desired, but the recommendation will be made solely by the home Program Director. ~~made jointly and signed by both Department Heads. In cases of disagreement, each Department Head will prepare a separate recommendation. If the activity outside the home department does not represent a significant portion of the Candidate's responsibilities, the home Department Head will make the recommendation.~~

- c. In all cases, the ~~Department Head~~Program Director supervising the Reviewee on the date at which the review file is due to Library Human Resources shall write the recommendation for personnel action (III.8.d above). In cases in which the Reviewee has changed ~~departments~~programs during the review period, and the recommending ~~Department Head~~Program Director has not been the supervisor during the majority of the review period, the recommending ~~Department Head~~Program Director will prepare the recommendation in consultation with the prior ~~Department Head~~Program Director(s). If there is any disagreement among these ~~Department Head~~Program Directors regarding the recommendation, that disagreement will be noted in Section IV (Recommendation) of the ~~Department Head~~Program Director's review.
- ~~409.~~ REDACTED COPIES OF CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS  
~~Before the departmental Program level recommendation is submitted to Library Human Resources, At any time during the review process~~ the Candidate may request, in writing, from Library Human Resources ~~redacted copies~~ of the confidential documents included in the record.
- ~~4410.~~ NON-CONFIDENTIAL MATERIALS AVAILABLE TO CANDIDATE  
 The final ~~non-confidential~~ contents of the review packet shall be given to the individual Librarian for examination before the packet is forwarded for peer review. The Librarian shall have the opportunity to make copies of any non-confidential parts of his/her review packet.
- ~~4211.~~ ~~DEPARTMENT HEAD~~PROGRAM DIRECTOR'S CONFERENCE WITH THE CANDIDATE  
 The ~~Department Head~~Program Director (with the Review Initiator, if applicable) shall review the following documents with the Candidate and each shall be signed and dated by the ~~Department Head~~Program Director and the Candidate (and the Review Initiator, if applicable):
- a. The Candidate's self-review.
  - b. The evaluation by the ~~home Department Head~~Program Director, secondary Program Directors (if applicable), other Secondary Evaluators (if applicable), and Immediate Supervisor.
  - c. Any redacted copies of the letters of reference requested in writing by the Candidate.
  - d. The ~~Department Head~~Program Director's recommendation for personnel action.
- ~~12.~~ CANDIDATE'S RESPONSE TO MATERIAL IN THE FILE  
 The Candidate may submit for inclusion in the file a written statement in response to or commenting upon material in the review file to which the Candidate has access.
- ~~4413.~~ ASSEMBLING ~~DEPARTMENTAL-PROGRAM LEVEL~~ REVIEW PACKET  
 The ~~Department Head~~Program Director is responsible for assembling the final review packet for transmittal to Library Human Resources. [See [Appendix I](#) for a checklist of documents to be assembled.] The ~~Department Head~~Program Director

shall review all documents, including "Checklist A" (Appendix II), for completeness and for appropriate signatures and dates.

F. PEER REVIEW PROCEDURES

On completion of the ~~departmental~~ Program level review procedures, the ~~Department Head~~ Program Director shall submit the Candidate's review file to Library Human Resources who shall transmit the file to CAPA. CAPA shall act as a peer review committee for all files. Depending on the nature of the review, an Ad Hoc Committee may also be formed to review the file.

1. COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND ADVANCEMENT (CAPA)
  - a. CAPA ELECTION

Members shall be elected at the annual LAUC-SD election for two years with terms staggered so that two members are elected each year. Of these four members, the Chairperson of CAPA shall be appointed by the Executive Board of LAUC-SD. If a vacancy occurs in CAPA, the method of filling it shall be determined at a general meeting of LAUC-SD. No Librarian shall serve consecutive terms as a member of CAPA.
  - b. CAPA COMPOSITION

Membership of CAPA shall consist of four members from the Librarian Series with Career Status. [See *MOU* Article IV.A.1, as appropriate.]
  - c. CAPA QUORUM

Three members of CAPA shall constitute a quorum when reviewing a file. When a quorum is lacking, previous CAPA members shall be called upon to constitute a quorum beginning with those who served most recently.
  - d. DISQUALIFICATION

A member of CAPA shall excuse himself/herself from reviewing a file when

    - 1) his/her own file is being reviewed.
    - 2) s/he has been responsible for compiling the ~~Department Head~~ Program Director's review.
    - 3) s/he questions his/her ability to make an objective judgment in a particular case.
2. INSTRUCTIONS TO CAPA FOR FORMING AD HOC COMMITTEES
  - a. PURPOSE AND DUTIES OF AD HOC COMMITTEES
    - 1) Each Ad Hoc Committee shall be separately constituted for the purpose of reviewing a recommended personnel action.
    - 2) Each Ad Hoc Committee shall review the documentation and shall be responsible for assessing an individual's performance during a given review period to determine if a merit, promotion, or career status action should be recommended.
  - b. SERVICE ON AD HOC COMMITTEES
    - 1) It shall be a professional responsibility for each Librarian at UCSDUC San Diego to serve on Ad Hoc Committees. It is anticipated that some Librarians shall serve on several such committees each year.
    - 2) A person may disqualify himself/herself, but only if s/he questions his/her ability to make an objective judgment in a particular case, and CAPA shall recommend an alternate.

c. FORMATION OF AD HOC COMMITTEES

Ad Hoc committees shall be formed under the following circumstances:

- 1) In all cases of promotion, career status, acceleration, advancement to Librarian VI (the Distinguished Step), or termination.
- 2) In cases where a request for formation of an Ad Hoc Committee has been made by the Candidate, ~~Department Head~~Program Director, AUL, University Librarian, or CAPA.

d. APPOINTMENT OF AD HOC COMMITTEES

- 1) CAPA shall obtain from Library Human Resources a current roster of academic staff in the Librarian Series that shall serve as the list of staff eligible to serve on Ad Hoc Committees.
- 2) CAPA shall submit its recommendation for the make-up of an Ad Hoc Committee to the University Librarian for his/her approval. Should the University Librarian decide that the membership of a committee is potentially inappropriate for a particular case, s/he shall request that CAPA recommend alternates for his/her consideration.
- 3) Assignments to these committees shall be distributed equitably among Librarians at UCSDUC San Diego.
- 4) The membership of Ad Hoc Review Committees is strictly confidential and shall be made known only to Library Human Resources (Coordinator or ~~Head~~Director), CAPA members, the AULs, and the University Librarian.
- 5) If CAPA determines that membership of an Ad Hoc Committee has become known to any unauthorized person, CAPA may recommend to the University Librarian that the appointed committee be disbanded and shall recommend a new Ad Hoc Committee. Additional documentation requested by the original Ad Hoc Committee will remain in the file with the members' names removed.

e. COMPOSITION OF AD HOC COMMITTEES [See *MOU* Article IV.A.2, as appropriate.]

- 1) Members of CAPA may not serve on an Ad Hoc Committee.
- 2) Former members of CAPA may not serve on an Ad Hoc Committee the year following their final year on CAPA.
- 3) Librarians who have contributed confidential documentation to a review file may not serve on the Ad Hoc Committee to review that Candidate's file for two years.
- 4) Librarians ~~who share in~~ the same ~~home department-program~~ shall not serve on each other's Ad Hoc Committee.
- 5) It is desirable that an Ad Hoc Committee for performance review include a Librarian whose functional area of expertise is related to that of the person whose performance is being reviewed.
- 6) Each Ad Hoc Committee shall consist of three members as follows:
  - a) For recommended promotion to Librarian, the Ad Hoc Committee shall be composed of at least two members holding the rank of Librarian. For each recommended

~~personnel action for Candidates holding the rank of Librarian, and for each Candidate whose list of personnel action options includes promotion from the rank of Associate Librarian to Librarian, each Ad Hoc Committee shall be composed of three Librarians, at least two of whom hold the rank of Librarian with Career Status, and the third the rank of Librarian or Associate Librarian with Career Status.~~

- b) For each recommended personnel action, except promotion, ~~for Candidates holding the rank of Associate Librarian, and for each Candidate whose list of personnel action options includes promotion from Assistant Librarian to Associate Librarian,~~ the Ad Hoc Committee shall be composed of three Librarians members holding the rank of Librarian with Career Status in the Librarian series, or Associate Librarian with Career Status.
- c) ~~For each recommended personnel action, except for those Candidates whose list of personnel action options includes promotion, for Librarians holding the rank of Assistant Librarian, the Ad Hoc Committee shall be composed of three Librarians, at least one of whom holds the rank of Librarian with Career Status, or Associate Librarian with Career Status.~~In all cases, when possible at least one member of the Ad Hoc Committee shall have direct knowledge of the candidate's duties and responsibilities.

f. INSTRUCTION TO AD HOC COMMITTEES FOR PERFORMING REVIEWS

- 1) Ad Hoc Review Committees shall convene as soon as possible after appointment by the University Librarian. Library Human Resources shall ask one member of the Committee to convene the first meeting, at which time the committee will elect its chair.
- 2) The review of the Ad Hoc Committee shall be based on an objective appraisal of the recommendation and documentation in relation to the criteria in [APM 210-4-e](#). The Ad Hoc Committee shall determine whether, in its judgment, the documentation supports the recommendation of the Department Head/Program Director.
- 3) The documentation shall be in sufficient detail to make an objective appraisal possible. Documentation shall include a statement of the Candidate's present rank and step within rank.
- 4) Documentation lacking in detail shall be returned for amplification, or additional documentation shall be requested, through Library Human Resources. Such documentation shall be added to the review packet after the Librarian under review has been given copies of any non-confidential material, and, upon written request to Library Human Resources, redacted copies of any confidential material added to the file. The Candidate and his/her Department Head/Program Director (in conjunction with the Immediate Supervisor in the role of Review Initiator, if applicable) shall be provided an opportunity to submit a written statement in response to the additions to the review record. The certification statement called

"Checklist B" ([Appendix III](#)) will be annotated to verify that these steps have been completed.

- 5) In reviewing recommendations for advancement, including early review and two or more step advancements within rank, the Ad Hoc Committee shall be provided with documentation covering only the period since the last review.
  - 6) Recommendations for promotion, career status, advancement to Librarian Step VI (the Distinguished Step), and termination shall be substantiated with documentation consisting of the Candidate's prior review files. Additionally, if a Candidate's list of personnel action options for the current review includes one of those actions, the retrospective review files shall be provided to an Ad Hoc Committee at its request regardless of whether the ~~Department Head~~Program Director or a review committee has indicated that any of these actions is being recommended or considered. In cases of promotion from the rank of Associate Librarian to Librarian, or advancement to Librarian VI (the Distinguished Step), discussion of the Candidate's entire relevant professional career history is required. It is the responsibility of both the Candidate and the ~~Department Head~~Program Director (in conjunction with the Immediate Supervisor in the role of Review Initiator, if applicable) to work together to present a thorough picture of the entire career history in the review file.
  - 7) The report of the Ad Hoc Committee (Appendix VIII) shall include the following items:
    - a) Name of the person reviewed.
    - b) Type of action recommended by the ~~Department Head~~Program Director (advancement, accelerated advancement, accelerated review, promotion, ~~accelerated promotion~~, career status, promotion with career status, advancement to Librarian VI (the Distinguished Step), no action or termination), and an indication of the current and proposed rank and step.
    - c) A summary report or statement that gives the ~~explicit~~specific reason(s) for agreement or disagreement with the ~~Department Head~~Program Director's recommendation. The report shall address each area of the criteria outlined in Section [210-4-e](#) of the *Academic Personnel Manual*.
    - d) The names and signatures of the Ad Hoc Review Committee members shall appear as the last item of the report, with the chairperson so designated.
    - e) In cases involving a minority opinion, the minority member of the Ad Hoc Committee shall also submit a written report.
    - f) The Ad Hoc Committee Chairperson shall add the Committee's report to the Candidate's review file and transmit it to Library Human Resources. The Chairperson shall insure that all preliminary drafts and notes of the Committee are destroyed.
3. INSTRUCTIONS TO CAPA FOR PERFORMING REVIEWS (Related policy: *MOU* Article IV.C.17.a-c, as appropriate)

- a. When the Ad Hoc committee report is received, Library Human Resources shall notify CAPA that the file is ready for CAPA review.
- b. CAPA shall serve as the only peer review committee for those files that are not referred to an Ad Hoc Committee.
- c. The review of CAPA shall be based on an objective appraisal of the recommendation and documentation in relation to the criteria in Section [210-4-e](#) of the *Academic Personnel Manual*. CAPA shall determine whether, in its judgment, the documentation supports the recommendation of the ~~Department Head~~Program Director.
- d. The documentation shall be in sufficient detail to make an objective appraisal possible. Documentation shall include a statement of the Candidate's present rank and step within rank.
- e. Documents lacking in detail shall be returned for amplification, or additional documentation shall be requested through Library Human Resources. CAPA may name an individual from whom to request additional documentation, or CAPA may request the ~~Department Head~~Program Director (in conjunction with the Immediate Supervisor in the role of Review Initiator, if applicable) to name an individual to address a specific area of performance. Such documentation shall be added to the review packet after the Librarian under review has been given copies of any non-confidential material and, upon written request, redacted copies of any confidential material added to the review file. The Candidate and his/her ~~Department Head~~Program Director (in conjunction with the Immediate Supervisor in the role of Review Initiator, if applicable) shall be provided an opportunity to submit a written statement in response to the additions to the review record. The certification statement called "Checklist B" ([Appendix III](#)) will be annotated to verify that these steps have been completed. [See also *MOU* Article IV.C.15-16, as appropriate.]
- f. In reviewing recommendations for advancements, including early review and two or more step advancements within rank, CAPA shall be provided with documentation covering only the period since the last review. In the case of new appointees undergoing their first review, the documentation on criteria B, C, and D may include the period prior to the date of appointment.
- g. Recommendations for promotion, career status, advancement to Librarian VI (the Distinguished Step), ~~or~~ termination shall be substantiated with documentation consisting of the Candidate's prior review files. Additionally, if a Candidate's list of personnel action options for the current review includes one of these actions, the retrospective review files shall be provided to CAPA at its request regardless of whether the ~~Department Head~~Program Director or a review committee has indicated that any of these actions is being recommended or considered. In cases of promotion from the rank of Associate Librarian to Librarian, or advancement to Librarian VI (the Distinguished Step), discussion of the Candidate's entire relevant professional career history is required. It is the responsibility of both the Candidate and the ~~Department Head~~Program Director (in conjunction with the Immediate Supervisor in the role of Review Initiator, if

applicable) to work together to present a thorough picture of the entire career history in the review file.

- h. The report of CAPA (Appendix IX) shall include the following items:
  - 1) Name of the person reviewed.
  - 2) Type of action recommended by the ~~Department Head~~Program Director (advancement, accelerated advancement, accelerated review, promotion, ~~accelerated promotion~~, career status, promotion with career status, advancement to Librarian VI (the Distinguished Step), no action or termination), and an indication of the current and proposed rank and step.
  - 3) A statement indicating agreement or disagreement with the ~~Department Head~~Program Director's recommendation for personnel action.
  - 4) A summary report that gives the explicit reasons for CAPA's recommendation to the University Librarian. The report shall address each area of the criteria outlined in Section 210-4-e of the *Academic Personnel Manual*.
  - 5) The names and signatures of CAPA shall appear as the last item of the report, with the chairperson so designated.
- i. In cases involving a minority opinion, the minority member of CAPA shall also submit a written report. In the case of a divided opinion, two reports shall be submitted.
- j. The Chairperson shall add CAPA's recommendation to the Candidate's review file and transmit it to Library Human Resources. The Chairperson shall insure that all preliminary drafts and notes of the committee are destroyed.

## G. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

### 1. UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN'S REVIEW AND DECISION

- a. When the reports of the Ad Hoc Committee, if applicable, and CAPA have been submitted, the file is ready for review by the University Librarian who, in accordance with campus procedures, has authority for making the final decision for personnel action.
- b. Using the criteria provided in the *Academic Personnel Manual* (Sections 210-4-e and Section 360-10), the University Librarian shall review the documentation in each file.
- c. The documentation shall be in sufficient detail to make an objective appraisal possible. Documentation shall include a statement of the Candidate's present rank and step within rank.
- d. Documents lacking in detail shall be returned for amplification, or additional documentation shall be requested through Library Human Resources. Such documentation shall be added to the review packet after the Librarian under review has been given copies of any non-confidential material, or, upon written request, a redacted copy of any confidential material added to the review file. The Candidate and his/her ~~Department Head~~Program Director (in conjunction with the Immediate Supervisor in the role of Review

Initiator, if applicable) shall be provided an opportunity to submit a written statement in response to the additions to the review record. The certification statement called "Checklist B" (see [Appendix III](#)) will be annotated to verify that these steps have been completed. [See also *MOU* Article IV.C.15-16, as appropriate.]

- e. An AUL shall excuse him/herself from reviewing any file when
  - 1) s/he has contributed documentation as the recommending supervisor (a.k.a. ~~Department Head~~Program Director) during the current review period.
  - 2) s/he questions her/his ability to make an objective judgment in any particular case.
  
- f. The University Librarian, in consultation with the AULs, shall make a tentative decision after weighing each recommended action in relation to all others, and with regard to budgetary limitations. [Related policy: *MOU* Article IV.C.18-19, as appropriate.]
  - 1) In the event that any tentative decision of the University Librarian is contrary to the recommendation of CAPA and/or the Ad Hoc committee, the University Librarian shall prepare for the review committees in question a written report outlining the reasons behind the tentative decision and shall ask for any further information that might suggest a different decision. If an oral discussion supplements the written exchange, a written summary of the discussion will be prepared by the review committee and placed in the review file. Any documentation created by the review committees in this process shall be made available to the Candidate upon written request.
  - 2) If the report is addressed to the Ad Hoc Committee, the Ad Hoc Committee shall have the opportunity for further comment before the final decision is made. CAPA shall also have the opportunity for further comment before the decision is made.

2. CAPA'S REVIEW OF DRAFT LETTER TO CANDIDATE

A draft of the University Librarian's final letter to the Candidate shall be forwarded to CAPA (only) for review and comment.

H. NOTIFICATION OF FINAL DECISION [Refer to *MOU* Article IV.C.20, as appropriate.]

1. CANDIDATE IS NOTIFIED OF DECISION

- a. When the personnel action has been decided by the University Librarian, that decision shall be communicated to the Candidate in a letter that contains the University Librarian's decision and the reasons for that decision. The letter shall summarize the consensus of those who participated in the review. The CAPA report shall also be included with the University Librarian's letter to the Candidate.
  
- b. The University Librarian's final letter shall be submitted to each Candidate through his/her ~~Department Head~~Program Director. Program Directors of all programs to which the Candidate is assigned will be notified of the final review decision.

- c. Library Human Resources shall place a copy of the University Librarian's final letter in the Candidate's folder and shall make it available to any member of CAPA or the Ad Hoc committee who may ask to see it.
- 2. LHR NOTIFIES AD HOC COMMITTEE OF DECISION
    - a. The Chairperson of CAPA shall review the final letters with the other members of CAPA. Library Human Resources shall notify each Ad Hoc Committee member of CAPA's recommendation to the University Librarian and of the University Librarian's final decision.
    - b. Any Ad Hoc Committee member who wishes to read CAPA's report on the matter may request it through Library Human Resources.
- I. CANDIDATE'S OPTION TO REQUEST DOCUMENTS
    - 1. After the final administrative decision has been communicated to the Candidate in the University Librarian's letter, the Candidate shall have the right, upon written request, to receive redacted copies of the confidential documents (redacted copies of reference letters may have already been received by the Candidate before the ~~departmental~~ Program level recommendation was made to Library Human Resources) and complete copies of the non-confidential documents in the personnel review file.
    - 2. Unless otherwise specified by the Candidate, it shall be assumed that the Candidate's request pertains to the last completed personnel review file only. For files prior to the 1992-93 review cycle, the Candidate may request a summary of the substance of the confidential documents.
- J. APPEALS [Refer to *MOU* Articles IV.C.21.a-e and XXIV.A.2, as appropriate.]
    - 1. If the Candidate contemplates appeal of the decision made, s/he may request a meeting with Library Human Resources to discuss questions involving the review.
    - 2. Following the meeting with Library Human Resources, if the Candidate believes that either the documentation was not factual or the review was not objective, s/he may appeal through the University Librarian who shall notify CAPA.
    - 3. The Candidate shall submit an appeal in writing, which shall serve as a basis for CAPA's review. If CAPA believes that the Candidate's appeal is warranted, it shall recommend to the University Librarian that a new Ad Hoc Committee be appointed.
    - 4. The new Ad Hoc Committee shall not see the reports of the first Ad Hoc Committee, CAPA, or the University Librarian. Any additional documentation requested by one of the review committees shall remain in the file with Ad Hoc Committee members' names removed.
    - 5. Following the second Ad Hoc Committee review, CAPA shall review the file again and submit a report to the University Librarian.
    - 6. The membership and deliberations of all Ad Hoc Committees are strictly confidential and may not be revealed to the Candidate under any circumstances.

7. After using the appeal procedure stated above, if the Candidate still wishes to appeal the decision of the University Librarian, such appeal shall be in writing to the Executive Vice Chancellor-Academic Affairs and in accordance with the APM Section 140: Appeals Policy, and the PPM Section 230-5 when appropriate.

K. FILE COMPLETION

A photocopy of the completed file is forwarded to the Academic Personnel Office, which initiates processing for payroll instructions. The original file is retained by Library Human Resources in the confidential portion of each Librarian's personnel file.

V. REVIEW PROCEDURES: APPOINTMENTS

A. DEFINITIONS (Source: APM 360-8.b and APM 360-8.f)

An appointment occurs when an individual is employed in one of the three ranks in the Librarian Series and when the individual's immediately previous status was

- (1) not in the employ of the University; or
- (2) in the employ of the University, but not with a title in this series.
- (3) in the employ of the University in the Librarian Series, but at another campus.

B. CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT

Refer to Sections 360-10 and 210-4-e of the *Academic Personnel Manual*.

C. POLICY

The Library shall conduct its own recruitment program for Librarians. Applicants will be considered on the basis of their experience, qualifications, skills, education and recommendations of previous employers evaluated within the context of the stated criteria and the University's ongoing academic personnel programs (for example, Affirmative Action). See also the statement on *Nondiscrimination* in Section II.E of this procedure and *MOU* Article II, as appropriate.

D. RECRUITMENT

1. ANNOUNCEMENT

- a. When a Potential Career or Career Status position in the Librarian Series is to be filled through open recruitment, the Recommending Officer (Department Head/Program Director or AUL as appropriate) and Library Human Resources (Head-Director or Coordinator) shall prepare the position description.
- b. The line AUL shall submit the position description to Cabinet for approval.
- c. The Recommending Officer and Library Human Resources (Head-Director or Coordinator) shall determine recruitment procedures consistent with University recruitment policies. The Library Human Resources Coordinator will prepare the Office of Academic Affirmative Action (OAAA) Recruitment Plan for the University Librarian's review and signature.
- d. As appropriate, -Aavailable positions shall be announced at the national level in sources selected to attract a wide and diverse pool of qualified Candidates. [See PPM 230-6 for related policies.]

2. SCREENING

- a. A Screening Committee shall be created comprising of the ~~Department Head~~ Recommending Officer, ~~(unless the Department Head is the AUL), the line AUL,~~ the Library Human Resources Coordinator, and others as appropriate
  - b. The Screening Committee shall identify the applicants for whom references shall be requested, conduct pre-screening, and select Candidates to be interviewed.
3. REFERENCE CHECKS
- a. The Screening Committee shall identify references to be contacted for selected Candidates.
  - b. The Recommending Officer shall solicit references for Candidates under consideration.
  - c. When telephone reference checks are conducted, the Library Human Resources Coordinator will coordinate the solicitation of references for Candidates under consideration. [[Appendix IV](#) contains guidelines for conducting reference checks.]
4. INTERVIEW
- a. The Screening Committee and others as appropriate shall identify the appropriate persons and groups to interview the applicants.
  - b. The Library Human Resources Coordinator shall prepare and distribute interview schedules and copies of resumes to all those listed on the interview schedule.
  - c. A LAUC-SD committee composed of a minimum of two members designated by the LAUC-SD Executive Board shall provide information to the Candidate including the role of LAUC.
  - d. When recruitment is at the Department Head Program Director level,
    1. CAPA shall recommend to the University Librarian a Special Interviewing Committee of three to five peers to participate in the interviews.
    2. The Library ~~Management Group (LMG)~~ Council shall interview the Candidate as a group. The University Librarian shall designate a leader who will be responsible for compiling interview questions and coordinating the report of the group.
  - e. Each individual or group who interviews the Candidate(s) shall assess the qualifications of each applicant in relation to the criteria in Sections 360-10 and 210-4-e of the *Academic Personnel Manual* and the requirements of the position and shall prepare a report for the applicant's file which is submitted to the Recommending Officer (~~Department Head~~ Program Director or AUL as appropriate) with a copy to the Library Human Resources Coordinator. The report will provide a thorough assessment of the applicant's qualifications, but shall not make a specific recommendation for hire. Additionally, the Recommending Officer may request each individual or group to submit a statement that ranks the interviewed

Candidates in relation to one another and outlines the reasons for the ranking.

5. INTERNAL CANDIDATES

- a. Librarians already employed in the Librarian Series at [UCSDUC San Diego](#) may apply for advertised positions and will be treated exactly as all other applicants for the position, except that the Recommending Officer will not provide a letter of reference or other documentation for the applicant's file.
- b. ~~It is desirable that if~~ Internal Candidates should be interviewed before outside Candidates.
- d. If the internal Candidate would normally participate in the interviews because of his/her current position, s/he shall interview the other Candidates but shall not provide any documentation for the file.

E. RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT

1. NOMINATING TOP CANDIDATE

- a. The Recommending Officer will review file and rank viable Candidate(s) with the line AUL (if the line AUL is not the Recommending Officer).
- b. The AUL shall provide the University Librarian with the name(s) of viable Candidate(s) identified and reason(s) for selection. A decision is made to pursue the top Candidate; that decision is communicated to the Library Human Resources HeadDirector.
- c. Library Human Resources (~~Head-Director~~ or Coordinator) will notify viable Candidates(s) that they are still under consideration and ascertain their continued interest. Library Human Resources (~~Head-Director of or~~ Coordinator) will provide feedback to the University Librarian, AUL, and Department HeadProgram Director via electronic mail.
- d. The University Librarian shall notify the Library Human Resources Coordinator, Library Human Resources HeadDirector, AUL and/or Recommending Officer of consensus to prepare the top Candidate's appointment file for CAPA's review.

2. RECOMMENDING OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT

- a. After reviewing the draft with the AUL (if the Recommending Officer is not the AUL), the Recommending Officer shall write a letter of recommendation and complete and sign the Office of Academic Affirmative Action (OAAA) Summary Statement. The Recommending Officer will forward both to the Library Human Resources Coordinator.
- b. The Library Human Resources Coordinator shall provide CAPA with advance notice of the upcoming appointment file.
- c. The Library Human Resources Coordinator will forward the appointment file to CAPA upon receipt of the Recommending Officer's recommendation letter.
- d. The Library Human Resources Coordinator will complete the Office of Academic Affirmative Action (OAAA) Compliance Report and forward it to the UL for review and signature. The Library Human Resources Coordinator shall submit the OAAA Compliance Report to the Office of Academic Affirmative Action.

F. CAPA REVIEW

1. CAPA shall review the appointment file and prepare a recommendation report for the University Librarian within three working days of CAPA's receipt of the file. [See Appendix V for document checklist.]
2. CAPA shall submit the recommendation report to the Library Human Resources Coordinator.
3. If CAPA requires additional information, a formal written request will be sent to the Library Human Resources Coordinator.

G. OFFER

1. APPOINTMENT APPROVAL

- a. Library Human Resources ~~Head-Director~~ shall convene a meeting with the Recommending Officer and/or line AUL, and ~~Director-Administrative Services~~AUL of Enterprise Services to reach agreement on rank, step, and level of compensation, to discuss employment issues (e.g. visa needs), and to consider alternative or contingency strategies.
- b. The Library Human Resources ~~Head-Director~~ will notify the Library Human Resources Coordinator of the recommended rank, step, and other employment issues.
- c. Once CAPA's report is received, the Library Human Resources Coordinator shall complete the appointment file by adding CAPA's report, and review the file to make sure the Recommending Officer's recommendation, recommended appointment level and salary, reference letters, comments, application packet, etc. are included for the University Librarian's review.
- d. The University Librarian shall notify the AUL and/or Recommending Officer, Library Human Resources ~~Head~~Director, and CAPA by email if the appointment is approved.
- e. The University Librarian, AUL and/or Recommending Officer will consult if the University Librarian does not approve the appointment.

2. FORMAL OFFER

- a. The Recommending Officer will extend an informal offer to the Candidate, and discuss proposed rank, step, compensation, start date, removal needs, and other applicable employment issues. The Recommending Officer will not agree to any terms that have not been discussed with the Library Human Resources ~~Head~~Director, ~~Director-Administrative Services~~AUL/Enterprise Services, and line AUL (if not the Recommending Officer).
- b. The Recommending Officer shall inform the Library Human Resources ~~Head~~Director if the Candidate has requested any exceptions (e.g. full removal expenses). The Library Human Resources ~~Head~~Director will consult with the ~~Director-Administrative Services~~AUL/Enterprise Services and line AUL.
- c. The Library Human Resources ~~Head~~Director shall consult with the University Librarian if an exception requires ~~Senior-Executive~~ Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs (~~SVCAA~~) approval.

- d. The Recommending Officer shall advise the Library Human Resources Coordinator and the Library Human Resources ~~Head~~ Director via electronic mail of the start date, rank and step, removal condition, and any other related issues.
- e. The Library Human Resources Coordinator will draft and finalize the formal offer letter with the above information for the University Librarian's review and signature. The offer letter must indicate a response date.
- f. The University Librarian shall forward the Candidate's written acceptance to the Library Human Resources Coordinator who will copy it for the Recommending Officer.

H. APPOINTMENT FILE COMPLETION

- 1. The Library Human Resources Coordinator shall inform CAPA of the final outcome.
- 2. The Recommending Officer will notify the Library Human Resources Coordinator of any changes (i.e. start date, etc.).
- 3. The Recommending Officer may make a public announcement only after the Candidate has formally accepted the offer in writing.
- 4. The Library Human Resources Coordinator shall organize moving arrangements in accordance with university policy and directly with the Candidate.

I. TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS (Related policies: *APM 360-20.a* and *MOU Article XVII*, "Temporary Appointees", as appropriate)

1. DEFINITIONS

- a. A temporary appointment is an appointment in the Librarian Series that has a specified date of termination.
- b. A given temporary appointment shall ordinarily be for a period of one year or less but shall not be for a period of more than two years unless the appointment is supported by extramural funds in which case, ~~if the funding permits,~~ the appointment may extend through the end date of the funding be renewed for up to 2 more years.

2. TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT REVIEW PROCEDURES

Review procedures as described in Section V apply to temporary appointments, with the following exceptions:

- a. Recruitment procedures as described in section V.D apply to temporary positions ~~except that advertising may be less than national in scope depending on the requirements for the position and the University's recruiting policies.~~
- b. Depending on the duties of the temporary position and the needs of the program with which it is affiliated, external recruitment may be bypassed entirely, as provided in *PPM 230-20 IV.A.1.e* and *f* for appointments that are for 50% time or less or six months or less.

- c. Normally, interviews will be more abbreviated than for Potential Career/Career Status positions.

3. **TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT PERFORMANCE REVIEWS**

Temporary appointees are expected to perform their duties with the same proficiency as Potential Career or Career Status appointees. When the length of appointment permits, temporary appointees are reviewed following the same procedures and review cycles set forth for reviews of Potential Career/Career Status appointees.