Welcoming Remarks

Introductions – JL

- Jeff MacKie-Mason, University Librarian
- Julie Lefevre, CAPA Outgoing Chair
- James Eason, CAPA Outgoing Member
- Susan Wong, Library Human Resources Department
- Penny Hines, Academic Personnel Office

General Overview - JL

What is an academic review?

An academic review is not a performance evaluation like we do for library staff. It is not about your supervisor comparing your accomplishments to your responsibilities and making an administrative decision. Instead, an academic review is a peer review process. As the Berkeley Procedures state, “The review process is intended to ensure that professional as well as administrative considerations are taken into account in all matters of appointment, promotion, and merit increase within the Librarian series.”

It is a chance to develop the narrative of your career and set your path, an opportunity to establish goals and document your growth, and a chance to be evaluated and receive feedback from your peers.

It is also a process for maintaining equity, ensuring the professional integrity of the Librarian series, and encouraging contributions to the library, university and profession. Again, as the Procedures state, it is a process to provide that “(a) only librarians of demonstrated ability and achievement be employed, retained, and advanced, and (b) professional growth and accomplishment be rewarded and encouraged…”

- How should candidates approach academic reviews?
  - Be mindful of your entire career
    - Focus on the impact of your activities—don’t just describe them
    - Relate activities to your career goals and library priorities
  - Advocate for yourself at all stages
  - Make sure you have a current Statement of Responsibility (MOU Article 7)
  - Ultimately, your career is your responsibility
• Official guidance for review
  ○ Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
  ○ Academic Personnel Manual (APM 360 and 210-4)
  ○ Berkeley Procedures (June 2015)

• Types of reviews
  ○ Merit: advancement in salary within rank (aka salary point increase); includes standard merit reviews and greater than standard merit reviews; standard review period is 2 or 3 years; dossier covers the current period of review only.
  ○ Career status: transition from potential career status to career status after a reasonable trial period; dossier covers your entire career to date; maximum time to career status:
    ▪ Assistant – 6 years
    ▪ Associate – 4 years
    ▪ Librarian – 3 years
  ○ Promotion: advancement to higher rank; temporary librarians are now eligible for promotion; dossier covers your entire career with an emphasis on the period since last advancement; APM 360-10-c: “Promotion shall be justified by demonstrated superior professional skills and achievement and, in addition, demonstrated professional growth and accomplishment and/or the assumption of increased responsibility.”

An additional and anonymous ad hoc review committee of three career-status librarians provides a recommendation to CAPA for career status and promotion cases.

Review Salary Chart

Special cases

• Off-cycle: advancement outside the normal timeline by requesting a review earlier than scheduled; advancement requires “unusual achievement and exceptional promise of continued growth” above and beyond our already high standards. Under the current MOU, only a review initiator (RI) can request an off-cycle review. Self-evaluations and cover sheets must clearly state that the off-cycle review is being initiated by the RI. Although by definition it is difficult to achieve, accomplishments may warrant an off-cycle review. Supporting documentation: APM 210-4-d-(2); APM 210-4-e-(2); Berkeley Procedures III.B.2.

• Special: a review in which the candidate does not request advancement (i.e., intends to stay at the same salary point); occurs most often at top of the Associate Librarian and Librarian ranks, where service may be of indefinite duration but reviews are still required every two or three years (MOU Article 5.B).

Path of the Dossier
Review “Path of the Dossier” handout.
Calendar and Deadlines – JE

- Review “Calendar” handout and online calendars:
  - Merit and Special Reviews: http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LHRD/timtbla.html
  - Promotion and Career Status: http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LHRD/tme.html

Each librarian is ultimately responsible for knowing when they are up for review. Talk to your Review Initiator.

- Each librarian receives an annual call letter from LHRD (The Library) or from APO (Affiliated) regarding your review dates.
  - If you think your call letter is incorrect, talk to your RI immediately. She or he will work to correct it via LHRD or APO.
  - If you did not get a letter, talk to your RI.
  - New hires: talk with your RI in the fall to find out when you are eligible for your first review and your timeline for career status.

- The normal review calendar can be adjusted in several ways:
  - Off-cycle Review initiated by your RI: Inform LHRD (for The Library) or APO (for Affiliated Libraries) in early November.
  - Extensions: Request an extension in writing as soon as you think you need one; they are granted for 30 days only.
  - Deferrals: A one-year deferral may be granted with cause by the designated university official, that is, the UL, or Vice Provost for the Faculty for affiliated librarians. This is a neutral action. Supporting documentation: APM 360-80-a-2 & MOU 4.E.2.c.

Contents of the Dossier - JE

- Four criteria for advancement.

Dossiers, or academic review files, will be reviewed based on these four criteria:

1. **Professional competence and quality of service within the library**
   Examples: Duties and responsibilities of primary job (function, areas of service, nature and extent of resources and staff supervised); new or enlarged areas of responsibility; special projects or contributions.

2. **Professional activity outside the library**
   Examples: Membership and activity in professional and scholarly organizations, including participation in library and other professional meetings and conferences; awards, fellowships, and/or grants; teaching and lecturing activity (beyond library instruction); editorial activity.

3. **University and public service**
   Examples: University participation, such as an academic senate committee or a
special campus committee; LAUC-B and LAUC Statewide service; professional librarian services to community, state, nation.

4. **Research and other creative activity**
   Examples: Articles, books, conference presentations, book reviews, blogs, columns; creating exhibits or online tools (if not directly required by your job) and the like.

You might not have activity in all four areas, particularly at lower ranks; CAPA expects demonstration of increasing leadership and performance in more areas as you advance through the series; particularly in the higher points of the full Librarian rank, increasing attention is paid to impact in the wider library, institution, and profession.

**Flexibility**: The APM clearly states that “reasonable flexibility shall be exercised in weighing the comparative relevance of these criteria.” That means there are no set formulas and no individual is required or expected to perform significantly in all areas at all times, though as the librarian advances in rank, increasing attention is paid to activities in the wider library, institution and profession and to the scope of the impact of their activities.

**Elements of the dossier**

1. Forms (certification statement, documentation checklist)
   [http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LHRD/forms.html#review](http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LHRD/forms.html#review)

2. Self-evaluation
   a. Length of the document: preferably no more than 3-4 pages for merit and special review, and no more than 5-6 pages for promotion and career status review.
   b. First paragraph should state your current rank and salary, the type of review, and specify the period under review. RI evaluation and/or AUL/Director comments

   The Review Initiator's letter must highlight the impact of candidate's accomplishments. It should provide a comprehensive view of candidate's performance from personal knowledge, letters of reference, candidate's documentation and other sources. Guidelines for the Review Initiator's Evaluation are listed under the Library Human Resources Department website [http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LHRD/revreviewer.html](http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LHRD/revreviewer.html) and MOU Article 5.G.1.

3. Biography form and/or CV
   The Biography for Academic Personnel form or CV is highly recommended. This is the place to include your major professional, educational, and other achievements in chronological order. Please highlight achievements completed during the review cycle only.

4. Letters of support (if appropriate)

5. Judiciously selected supporting materials

**The dossier** must cover the entire time period for your review, based on calendar years. For example if you are eligible for a 2017 Review:

Your 2-year cycle = January 2015 - December 2016
Your 3-year cycle = January 2014 - December 2016
Be mindful that CAPA cannot consider anything that is not included in the dossier.

**Self-evaluation tips**

- Recommended language for the opening paragraph of self-evaluation: I am a[n] [rank] with a current salary of $_____. This self-evaluation supports a standard merit review [or greater than standard merit increase] or whatever type review.
- State your position title and describe your job duties briefly (not everyone on CAPA knows you or what you do).
- Cover whichever of the four criteria are appropriate for you; emphasize your work in your primary job. Omit discussion of criteria that are not applicable.
- Highlight important accomplishments during the time under review, clarify your role in joint projects or committee work, and emphasize the impact of your accomplishments (on patrons, the library, the campus, or the profession).
- Be succinct and use good judgment in selecting highlights (you can list other accomplishments in the biography form and/or supplemental CV).
- Discuss how you achieved your goals for this period under review.
- Address suggestions from UL, CAPA, or RI from last review, if any.
- Set goals for coming review period.

**Supporting materials** should enhance the reader’s understanding of your activities, be selective, judiciously chosen, and relevant to the period under review. Supporting materials should be included as appropriate for greater than standard, off-cycle, career status, promotion, and merit reviews in the Librarian rank. **Supporting materials need not be included with special reviews and standard merit reviews in the Assistant and Associate ranks**, with the exception of the full text of publications, which we ask be included for our review.

In addition to publications, supporting materials may include presentations, reviews, web pages, reports, unsolicited letters, and more. For publications in foreign languages, you must include at least a full citation and abstract in English; ideally the full article should be translated into English.

Do not include thank-you emails from students and faculty unless they are substantive and demonstrate the impact of your work interaction. Do not include letters of appointment to committees and groups – we are not looking for proof of your appointment, but rather discussion of your impact.

**Confidential Letters of support** are appropriate for greater than standard, off-cycle, career status, and promotion reviews. There is no need to include external letters for standard reviews, regardless of your rank. Give 3-5 names to your RI, who can request letters from anyone, but is expected to request a reasonable number from the list supplied by candidate; you can also indicate individuals who might not provide objective assessments of your work.

- Candidates will receive redacted copies of confidential letters.
Physical Presentation of the Dossier – JL

1. Binder – choose a binder with an inside pocket for ad hoc letters, if necessary
2. Put your name, rank, type of review on the cover and your name on the spine; this helps HR and CAPA manage large piles of dossiers without having to open each one to identify. Details about how to organize your dossier can be found on the LAUC-B website: http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LAUC/review

Where to Go for Help – JL

- Review Initiator
- LAUC-B mentor
- Former CAPA members http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LAUC/rosters/historiccapa.html
- Library Human Resources Department (LHRD) http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LHRD/academic.html
- LAUC-B web pages on Librarian Review http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LAUC/review

After the Review – JL

Always request a redacted copy of your dossier and read CAPA’s letter of recommendation. CAPA may make recommendations for the next review cycle. The redacted letters may shed light on any obvious conflicts in the file. If you'd like your RI or AUL to see your CAPA letter, you must request it and show it to them yourself.

If a librarian is denied a standard merit advancement, this is a "no action" decision. Per the Berkeley Procedures VI.B.1.d.i, “the candidate or review initiator may request a review as early as the next year. That review shall cover the period since the last advancement in which a standard-or-greater number of salary points were awarded. The review shall not be considered to be off-cycle.”

Reconsideration (Petition): An academic process to use when the candidate contests the final decision on the review. Berkeley Procedures Administrative Review Procedures.

Grievance: A union process to use when the candidate believes that specific MOU procedure(s) were violated, misapplied, or misinterpreted. MOU Article 24.

Arbitration: A union process to use only after Grievance Procedures have been exhausted. MOU Article 25.

Remarks
Jeff MacKie-Mason

Q&A
Jeff MacKie-Mason, Julie Lefevre, James Eason, Susan Wong, Penny Hines