Welcoming Remarks: Beth Dupuis

Introductions – RM

- Jeff MacKie-Mason, University Librarian
- Elizabeth Dupuis, Associate University Librarian
- Ramona Martinez, CAPA Outgoing Chair
- Susan Xue, CAPA Outgoing Member
- Susan Wong, Library Human Resources Department
- Penny Hines, Academic Personnel Office

General Overview - RM

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.

- Official guidance for review
  - Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
  - Academic Personnel Manual (APM 360 and 210-4)
  - Berkeley Procedures (June 2015)
• **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

• **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.”
  - Review MOU Appendix B handout.

• **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. For 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 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 – SX

- Review “Calendar” handout and online calendars:

  Merit and Special Reviews
  [http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LHRD/timtbla.html](http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LHRD/timtbla.html)

  Promotion and Career Status
  [http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LHRD/time.html](http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LHRD/time.html)

**Problems and Exceptions.** Each librarian is ultimately responsible for knowing when she or he is 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. If you think your call letter is incorrect, talk to your RI immediately. She or he will correct it with LHRD or APO.
- If you did not get a letter, talk to your RI.
- New hires should talk with your RI in the fall to find out when you are eligible for your first review and your time line for career status.
- If you plan a review outside the normal calendar, including:
  - Off-cycle Review initiated by your RI: Let LHRD (for The Library) or APO (for Affiliated Libraries) know 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 - SX

- **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, book reviews, blogs, columns; creating exhibits or online tools (if not directly required by your job); presentations at conferences, 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 steps of the full Librarian rank, increasing attention is paid to impact in the wider library, institution and profession.

- **What kind of service is expected at different Librarian ranks?**
  - **Assistant** – excellence in primary job; beginning to be involved in at least one of the following: professional organizations, library or campus-wide committees, or writing and research.
  - **Associate** – excellence and growth in primary job; evidence of contributions and involvement in professional organizations, library or campus-wide committees, or writing and research.
  - **Librarian** – excellence, creativity, and/or leadership activities in the primary job [managerial assignments are not necessary]; evidence of increasing involvement, excellence, and/or leadership in the wider library, institutional, professional and research settings.

**Flexibility:** The APM clearly states that “reasonable flexibility shall be exercised in weighing the comparative relevance of these criteria.” That means that 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.

- **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
    **Length of the document:** preferably no more than 4 pages for merit and special review, and no more than 6 pages for promotion and career status review.
    **Recommended language for the opening paragraph of self-evaluation:** I am a [rank] with a current salary of $________. This self-evaluation supports a standard [or greater than standard or whatever type] review.
  3. RI evaluation and/or AUL/Director comments
    Review Initiators’ letters must highlight the impact of candidate’s accomplishments. They bring a comprehensive view of candidate’s performance together from personal knowledge, letters of reference, candidate’s documentation and other sources as appropriate. 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.
4. 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.

5. Letters of support (if appropriate)

6. 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 2016 Review.

   Your 2-yr cycle = January 2014- December 2015
   Your 3-yr cycle = January 2013- December 2015

   Be mindful that CAPA cannot consider anything that is not included in the dossier.

### Self-evaluation tips

- Describe your job duties briefly (not everyone on CAPA knows you or what you do).
- Cover the four criteria as appropriate for you; emphasize your work in your primary job.
- 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 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

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 lots of thank you emails from students and faculty unless they 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

Confidential Letters of support are appropriate for greater than standard, off-cycle, career status, and promotion reviews. Mid-level or higher Librarian-rank candidates (formerly Librarian III and above) may choose to include confidential letters in their review files.
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 can request redacted copies of confidential letters after the review.

Physical Presentation of the Dossier – RM

1. Binder
2. Format
3. Proofreading

- Organize your materials with tabs or dividers. For example, include a table of contents and make tabs for all required and relevant documentation in your dossier such as self-evaluation, RI evaluation and AUL/Director comments, confidential external letters of support, biography for academic personnel and/or CV, forms, documentation checklist, and certification statement.
- Use a minimum of 11-point font and single-sided printing.
- Select a binder with a transparent cover and a pocket inside the binder for CAPA to insert an Ad Hoc Committee evaluation letter if applicable.
- Include your full name, your rank and step, type of review, and review period on the binder cover and your name on the spine. This helps CAPA manage big piles of dossiers without opening the binders.
- Certification statements and documentation checklists may be inserted by LHRD or the candidate.
- Save a copy of everything that you submit in your dossier for your future reference.
- Proofread everything in the dossier before submission.

Where to Go for Help – RM

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

After the Review – RM

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 Interim Berkeley Procedures VI.B.d., “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. Interim 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.

**Closing Remarks**

Jeff MacKie-Mason, Susan Wong, Penny Hines