



BERKELEY DIVISION

March 5, 2010

TO: Margaret Phillips, LAUC-B Chair
Lynn Jones, CAPA Chair

FROM: The 2010 CAPA Task Force on Special Issues
James Eason (Chair), Norma Kobzina, Shannon Supple, and Chris Tarr

RE: Revision of the Berkeley Procedures

We have attached herewith a report and a revised document for your review. Our charge was to revise the *Procedures for Review of Librarian Appointments, Promotions, and Advancements* (Berkeley Procedures) to better reflect practice in three specific areas: Distinguished Status, degree equivalency, and review periods affected by unusual circumstances. In addressing Distinguished Status, we were asked to “delineate various options and make a recommendation as to the whether the ‘distinguished’ step exists or should exist and if appropriate, . . . recommend the appropriate revisions to the Berkeley Procedures.” The complexity of this issue required lengthy explanation, which is attached as Part 3 of this report.

In addition to revisions to the Berkeley Procedures that are central to our charge, we have made other editorial changes to eliminate errors, improve clarity, and create a more logical document structure. Some of these changes were necessary to provide a logical place to insert new text required by our charge. Other changes were simply improvements that seemed sensible to make while the document was under review. All changes are enumerated in Part 2 of this report.

We recommend that the LAUC-Berkeley Executive Committee adopt the revised version of the *Procedures for Review of Librarian Appointments, Promotions, and Advancements*, attached as Part 4 of this report.

We further recommend that the LAUC-Berkeley Executive Committee determine a course of action and approve related procedures based on the options presented in our attached report on Distinguished Status. The course of action selected will require minor editorial changes to the Berkeley Procedures document, but the changes have been suggested within the reported options in Part 3 of this report.

We believe that the changes within the Berkeley Procedures document can and should be approved prior to any lengthy deliberations on Distinguished Status. The document as-edited can stand alone without specifics regarding Distinguished Status, and those specifics can easily be added (or removed) when approved.

The attached report is divided into four parts, consisting of

- 1) An overview of our substantive changes pertaining directly to our charge.
- 2) A summary of all editorial changes to Berkeley’s *Procedures for Review of Librarian Appointments, Promotions, and Advancements*, including a table that outlines added, deleted, or reorganized text.
- 3) A lengthy discussion “Distinguished Status” and several recommended options for LAUC-B action.
- 4) The revised draft of Berkeley’s *Procedures for Review of Librarian Appointments, Promotions, and Advancements*.

**Report of the 2010 CAPA Task Force on Special Issues
March 5, 2010**

Table of Contents

1. Overview of Charge-Related Changes to the Berkeley Procedures	pg. 1-2
2. Summary of All Editorial Changes to the Berkeley Procedures	pg. 2-5
3. Report on Distinguished Status	pg. 6-13
4. Revised Berkeley Procedures	paginated separately

Appendix: 2001 Revisions to 1993 Berkeley Procedures (for reference)

Report of The 2010 CAPA Task Force on Special Issues

Part 1: Overview of Charge-Related Changes to the Berkeley Procedures

A. Distinguished Status:

We have determined that the current interpretations of Distinguished Status are not the result of any documented decisions by LAUC, nor are they supported by the Academic Personnel Manual, the Memorandum of Understanding, or LAUC Position Papers. The establishment of Librarian, Step VI as a special step requiring distinguished status appears to have resulted from an editorial change to the *UCOP Salary Scale Notes: Librarian Series*. This change was made during conversion from the old scale to the new scale for librarian salaries in 2000-2001. There is no record as to what authority within UCOP determined or approved the text as it was translated from one scale to the next. In our opinion, this gives LAUC considerable latitude in deciding the future of Distinguished Status for Librarians. We have written a detailed report on this documentation history and have outlined several options, under Part 3 of this report. The revised draft of the Berkeley Procedures (Part 4 of this report) now contains very general text regarding Distinguished Status. When LAUC-B determines a course of action, the additional text recommended in Part 3 should be added to the procedures to clarify local practice.

Relevant text added under Berkeley Procedures VI.A.5 (Merit Increase, Promotion, and Career Status Review: Criteria).

B. The concept of degree equivalency:

We have attempted to document current CAPA practice rather than establish new policy. Practice was affected by some specific case decisions made in consultation with the APO and LHRD circa 2005-2006. Although the Berkeley Procedures stipulated a very strict adherence to the requirement of an ALA-accredited MLS for any career-potential appointee, there was more than one past incidence of Career Status being granted to candidates with degrees not accredited by ALA. Therefore, practice evolved toward a slightly less rigid interpretation of the terminology used in the APM. Degrees, to be considered acceptable equivalents, must be directly relevant to the administration of library research collections & resources. The ALA-accredited MLS remains the normal requirement, but other degrees relevant to the position and to specialized library resources are permissible in exceptional cases. The new text is more consistent with language in the APM, which states that qualifications for appointment as a librarian “will normally include a professional degree from a library school with a program accredited by the American Library Association. However, a person with other appropriate degree(s) or equivalent experience in one or more fields relevant to library services may also be appointed to this series.”

It should also be noted that in our informal interviews about practice on other UC campuses colleagues reported that the MLS was the norm, and in most cases there were no librarians on staff

who lacked the MLS. However, many thought degree equivalency would be left up to the hiring authority.

Text has been left in the Berkeley Procedures regarding appointments of candidates who do not have an acceptable equivalent degree but are required to earn one prior to gaining Career Status. This accommodates appointments to positions requiring difficult-to-find expertise, and keeps the requirement in place that such candidates cannot attain Career Status until an appropriate degree is completed. Additional text was added to clarify practice in reporting such requirements.

Relevant text added under Berkeley Procedures V.A.1 (Appointment Review: Criteria) and V.B.2 (Appointment Review: Procedures)

C. Adjustments to Review Cycles:

We have applied a simple concept to clarify practice. Periods under review shall be the period since the last advancement, not since the last review. This appears to be in line with practice at other UCs. Establishing this language clearly in the procedures required a separation of the concepts of the Review Period (and frequency of review) from the concept of the Period Under Review. The Period Under Review is not addressed in other documentation, such as the APM.

Relevant text added under Berkeley Procedures VI. B. 1. d-e (Merit, Promotion, Career Status: Schedule)
AND
VI. C. (Merit, Promotion, Career Status: Periods Under Review) [entirely new text]

Part 2: Summary of All Editorial Changes to the Berkeley Procedures

In undertaking the task of revision of the Berkeley Procedures, we identified some redundancies and confusing structural inconsistencies in the document and found we should recommend further revisions, generally structural and not substantive.

Below we summarize changes to the document, which consist of four types of editorial work undertaken by the task force: 1) additions to or revisions of text to document the areas of concern presented in our Charge; 2) corrections to formatting, capitalization, etc.; 3) revisions to document structure, hierarchy, and order; 4) changes to previous text to improve clarity or update internal and external references.

- 1) Additions to or revisions of text to document the areas of concern presented in our Charge.
Changes resulting from our Charge are discussed in Part 1 of the report, above, and are noted in the table of document changes, below.
- 2) Corrections to formatting, capitalization, etc.;
Edited silently. Most corrections were clear errors that could be tracked to conversion from the approved 2001 revised procedures to HTML format.

3) Revisions to document structure, hierarchy, and order;

Some errors resulted from conversion of the 2001 document to HTML and were silently corrected. We made several more substantive changes to the document structure to provide logical places to insert text relevant to our charge, and to eliminate some redundancy and illogical structure introduced during the 2001 revision. In short, all of former Section VII was added in 2001, but was approved by the Executive Committee when the document consisted of un-numbered text. Designation as “Section VII” appears to have happened between approval and HTML mark-up, and that decision caused confusing redundancy to some of the section headings. Our current revision folds the 2001 “Section VII” text back in Section VI, as we believe was intended.

The other major change made in 2001 was the elimination of a large and redundant portion of Section VI. This elimination (VI.B.2, VI.C.1-2 in 1993 version) removed important references to standard Merit reviews and left portions that only referred to Promotion and Career Status. The current revision generalizes all Review Schedule information, regardless of review type and, under that, refers to variations in schedule for specific types of review.

These changes have been recorded in the table below.

4) Changes to previous text to improve clarity or update internal and external references.

These changes have been recorded in the table below.

New Version Section	2001 Version Section	Edited text	Explanatory Notes
III.	III.	...only librarians of demonstrated ability and achievement be employed...	Added “demonstrated”
IV.B.1.a	IV.B.1.a	Librarians Association of the University of California, Berkeley	Corrected “Librarians Association, Berkeley” to full version of name.
IV.B.1.a	IV.B.1.a	The names of the appointees to CAPA shall be published.	Removed obsolete ref. to CU News.
IV.B.1.b.3 (e)	IV.B.1.b.3 (etc.)	...with the Vice Provost for Affiliated Library units...	Replaced stray references to Vice Chancellor with Vice Provost (throughout document). Most occurrences were changed in 2001. Also, capitalization restored to Vice Provost, throughout.
V.A.1.b.	V.A.1 [a-b]	...they possess an advanced degree directly relevant to the administration of library research collections and resources; and...	Charge-related: new text to emphasize acceptable degrees must be relevant to administration of libraries
V.A.1.c.	V.A.1.b.	... no candidates with librarianship degrees are available who are as qualified for the position.	Charge-related: softened requirement to hire MLS-holding candidate over more qualified candidate with a different relevant degree
V.A.1 [after	V.A.1 [after “b.”]	In the event that no qualified candidate is available who has an MLS or equivalent degree relevant to the administration of library research collections, an otherwise qualified appointee will be expected to secure a degree	Charge-related: wording revised to retain possibility of appointing a candidate w/ no acceptable Masters degree due to rare expertise, but require completion of degree.

V.A.1.	V.A.1 [after “b.”]	The employee will not attain Career Status until the requirement is fulfilled and peer review has been successfully completed.	Removed obsolete & unnecessary internal reference and deleted confusing reference to changes taking affect July 1, which is a standard date documented elsewhere.
V.A.2.	V.A.2.	In addition to a graduate degree in librarianship or accepted equivalent degree	Charge-related: reiterated concept of “accepted equivalent degree.”
V.B.1.	V.b.1.	Documentation relating to prospective appointments (e.g., the position posting) is reviewed by CAPA.	Clarification, Added ref. to “the position posting”, as it is the only documentation CAPA reviews.
V.B.2		If CAPA determines that a candidate lacks...	Charge-related: entirely new text to address procedures should CAPA find that a candidate’s degree does not qualify them.
VI.A.1	VI.A.1	... or Career Status...	Added Career Status: text is generally applicable to all review types. This detail was missed in 2001 revision when 1993 version’s subsections on Merit Reviews were removed
VI.A.1 [followed.]	VI.A.3	An explanation of these criteria is set forth in the Academic Personnel Manual (“APM”), section 210-4(e)(3).	Moved this text: formerly was numbered as a “Criteria”, but is obviously only a reference relating to the Criteria listed.
VI.A.1 [followed.]	VI.A.1 [following d.]	...the document titled, Guidelines for Preparing Self-Evaluations...	Title of referenced document corrected.
VI.A.4.	VI.A.5.	Deleted: Failure of any participant in the peer review timetable as permitted in APM 360-80(a)(2), shall be explicitly cited in the participant's own review as a negative reflection on professional judgement and competence.	Deleted confusing, nonsensical sentence. Reference appears to be incorrect, and possible intent of holding participants other than the candidate responsible for their contributions is impossible to enforce.
VI.A.5.		A distinguished career history and significant achievement since attaining their current step are required of Librarians seeking Distinguished Status.	Charge-related: completely new text added as first-ever reference to Distinguished Status. Wording intentionally separates Status from the Step system to permit maximum flexibility. See report on Distinguished Status for suggested further revisions & additions, to be determined by ExComm’s decision on the issue.
VI.B.	VI.B.1 and VII.A	Schedule of Reviews	We generalized Section VI.B to be about Schedule of all types of review. Formerly “B” was dedicated to “Promotion and/or Career-Status Review” and prior to the 2001 version there was a Section “C” for Merit Reviews. Deletions in 2001 reduced redundancy but caused omissions and confusing redundancy of sections on “Schedule” under VI and VII. We have now placed all “Schedule” considerations in VI.B.
VI.B.1.	VI.B.1	Promotion and/or Career-Status Review	Heading edited (to make it about Schedules) and hierarchical levels changed to rationalize content and structure and better accommodate new text related to our Charge.
VI.B.1.a-c	VI.B.1.d-f	Text moved.	No substantive changes, but text moved to fit logically in new generalized “Schedule” section. Prior to 2001 text was repeated in VI.C. also (for Merit Reviews.)

VI.B.1.b		... APM, section 360-80(a)(1),...	Updated obsolete reference
VI.B.1.c.	VI.B.f (and 1993 version: VI.C.d)	... Extensions of the Timetable will only be granted under unusual circumstances. Although the Timetable lists a number of deadlines...	Restored full text from 1993 version, VI.C.d. (A line had been deleted prior to 1993 in VI.B.f., making it nonsensical.)
VI.B.1.c.	VI.B.1.f.	unusual circumstances	Replaced “unforeseen” with “unusual”, as more consistent.
VI.B.1.d.		In the event... denied advancement...	Charge-related: new text to document procedures permitting full review since last advancement, rather than requiring “denied” candidates to wait several years before their next opportunity to seek advancement. This is in line with practice at other UCs.
VI.B.1.e		In the event... advanced outside of the normal review cycle...	Charge-related: new text to document procedures requiring a clock-reset if advancement outside the review process takes place. (Generally occurs in cases of internal candidates taking a new appointment in the Libraries, or Librarians receiving advancements to counter job offers elsewhere.)
VI.B.2	VII.A.2.	Deferred Reviews	Moved text from VII.A.2., as it pertains to Schedule.
VI.B.2	VII.A.2.	... the written agreement of the candidate.	Replaced “reviewee” with “candidate” (throughout document, to regularize.)
VI.B.3.a-c	VI.B.1.a-c	Schedule Considerations Specific to Promotion and/or Career Status Reviews	Moved text and created new heading to characterize text formerly in VI.B.1 and ONLY relevant to Promotion/Career Status (not Merit.) No substantive changes to text.
VI.C.		Periods Under Review	Charge-related: Entirely new text. The useful concept of “Period under review” was not previously documented, although it is used by CAPA. APM language is general and focuses on periods of service and frequency of review. Addition of this section helped us formulate language relevant to the “review clock” procedures we addressed.
	VII.A.	Schedule of Review	2001 version had 2 sections on Schedules. Old VII.A. text has been moved and merged into VI.B.
VI.D.	VII.B.	Procedures	Moved all Section VII.B (Procedures) text to VI.D, with no substantive changes to text. (Some capitalization changes, etc.) We believe this text should have been incorporated into VI in 2001, but a decision to make it a new section (VII) was made at the HTML mark-up stage.
		ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR LIBRARIANS REQUESTING A RECONSIDERATION OF A SALARY OR PROMOTION DECISION	Separate document long appended to the Berkeley Procedures. Outdated references & language have been updated. Updates were not made to this text in 2001. We avoided any substantive changes, but a change was required in II.B to correct internal references to the Berkeley Procedures and to eliminate outdated language about “action slips”

Part 3: Distinguished Status

Since the Librarian Series salary scale adjustment of 1999-2000, practices pertaining to Distinguished Status have been in question. Prior to 2000, all librarians seeking to advance from Librarian, Step IV to Librarian, Step V needed to earn distinction as a Distinguished Librarian in order to advance to this highest step in the series. At the time of the Salary Scale adjustment, Steps VI and VII were added to the series, and the placement or continued existence of a “distinguished step” was never clearly defined.

Documentation of Librarian Distinguished Status

LAUC Position Paper 1 and the *UCOP Salary Scale Notes: Librarian Series* are the only sources of documentation making reference to special distinction being required to achieve a step in the Librarian rank. While the language in these documents has not been identical in the past, they have diverged more significantly since 2001-2003.

LAUC Position Paper 1 formerly made reference to the Distinguished Step in a single sentence.

Advancement from Step IV to Step V of the Librarian rank should be predicated upon a career history of outstanding service, capped by significant achievement in the period since attaining Step IV.

<http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LHRD/lib1.html>

This text appeared in the 1989 revision of the position paper, and presumably in earlier versions. It was removed in the current version, adopted in 2003. Currently, the relevant text of *LAUC Position Paper 1* reads

Advancement to the top of the Librarian rank should be predicated upon a career history of outstanding service.

<http://www.ucop.edu/lauc/about/paper01.html>

The *UCOP Salary Scale Notes: Librarian Series*, which function chiefly to define periods of service within ranks and steps, were revised for the year 2000-2001. The earlier text stated:

Advancement to Step V will normally not occur with less than three years of service at Step IV, except in unusual cases. Advancement from Step IV to Step V is reserved for Librarians with a distinguished career history who have demonstrated significant achievement since attaining Step IV.

<http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/tab0001/notes.html>

The revised text introduced in 2000-2001 for the new scale states:

Advancement to Step VI will normally not occur with less than three years of service at Step V, except in unusual cases. Advancement from Step V to Step VI is reserved for Librarians with a distinguished career history who have demonstrated significant achievement since attaining Step V.

<http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/tab0001/notes.html>

There is no evidence that this was a policy advocated or approved by LAUC, and the source of the decision to associate this text with Step VI is unknown. LAUC minutes and annual charges to the Committee on Professional Governance make occasional reference to Step VI as the new Distinguished Step starting in October 2000, but never in the form of a policy recommendation, endorsement, or explanation. Conversations about the future of the Distinguished Step were ongoing throughout the conversion to the new salary scale, but never conclusive.

The concepts of Distinguished Status or special requirements for advancing to specified steps in the Librarian series do not appear in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) or the Librarian Unit's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), nor are they in the Berkeley Procedures. (The 2010 revisions propose inserting reference to distinguished status in the Berkeley Procedures, Section VI.A.5, pending LAUC-B's decision on this issue.)

There is a loose parallel to Distinguished Status in the faculty step system in which professors at Step VI undergo a more rigorous review by an ad hoc committee of peers from their department. This policy is in the APM in the section pertaining to the Professor Series; APM 220-18(b)(4). No parallel text for librarians is in the APM.

Recorded deliberations of LAUC suggest that the Librarians Association was not inclined to place the "distinguished step" at Step VI. At the Spring Assembly on May 1, 1998, the following resolutions were passed:

1. That LAUC shall officially request that the University administration add three more steps to the Librarian rank (steps VI, VII, VIII)
2. That LAUC shall develop criteria for these additional steps such that the highest step of the Librarian series shall be reserved for those librarians whose careers and continuing achievements shall be regarded as distinguished.

On December 11 1998, the LAUC Committee on Professional Governance submitted its report, which proposed advocating for three additional steps (VI-VIII) in the Librarian rank and concluded with the recommendation that

The Librarian series must be expanded to permit the advancement of the 41% of UC librarians who are at Librarian Step IV. Currently Librarian Step V is the top and distinguished step; under the suggested restructuring, Librarian Step VIII would represent the distinguished step.

Current Practice

It was not until 2007 that the first Librarians who had not achieved this Distinguished Status under the old scale came up for advancement from Step V to Step VI. (It was agreed that Librarians retained their status if they achieved Distinguished Status under the old scale. They would not be required to repeat a rigorous career-long review to advance through the newly added top steps.) At the outset of the Spring 2007 review cycle it was not clear whether a special Distinguished Status review was required, and if so, what it should involve. CAPA consulted with the Library Human Resources Department (LHRD) and the campus Academic Personnel Office (APO), and it was the opinion of the APO that the Salary Scale Notes for the Librarian Series required that advancement to Librarian, Step VI constitute achievement of Distinguished Status, and that progressing to this step required documentation of “a distinguished career history” and “significant achievement since attaining Step V.” Nowhere was it suggested that a single crowning achievement (or “capstone”) was required. Rather, the language was taken to mean that a career-long review was required, and that a case had to be made that demonstrated a distinguished history. “Significant achievement” was interpreted as the sort of continuing active engagement, leadership, or creative activity that would be expected of a senior librarian seeking a merit-based advancement.

The current status quo is based solely on the *UCOP Salary Scale Notes*, the APO’s opinion that they are authoritative, and CAPA’s past acceptance of that opinion. In short, Step VI is now considered a “distinguished step.” Any librarian advancing to it who does not already have Distinguished Status, must undergo a career-long review and present a case that demonstrated their distinguished career history. They must also demonstrate significant professional activity and achievement in the most recent review period. No single major “capstone” achievement need be documented. No librarian can move to Step VI without meeting the criteria for “Distinguished Status.”

The Task Force reviewed available online documentation for other UC campuses and had informal conversations with colleagues to get an understanding of interpretations of Distinguished Status throughout the system. These conversations were generally with a current or recent past chair of the local peer review committee. Most interviewees are only now becoming aware of the issues and had not, personally, had to interpret policy and carry out “distinguished” reviews. Those that expressed a sense of local practice settled on an interpretation based on the *UCOP Salary Scale Notes*, requiring a career-long review to advance to Step VI, but not requiring a “capstone” achievement. UCLA is the notable exception. A task force is currently convened there to address these issues, and their context is one in which a more rigorous review is being required by their library administration, and a career “capstone” is part of that requirement. Many UCLA Librarians see this as introduction of a significant “barrier step” and oppose the policy strongly. UC Davis also has convened a task force looking at the issue.

Recommendation

The 2010 CAPA Task Force on Special Issues notes that the most specific language and most rigorous requirements for attaining the rank of Librarian, Step IV (Old Scale) appeared in *LAUC*

Position Paper 1, prior to its 2003 revision. For example, this document is the only record of language suggesting a so-called “capstone achievement,” and this is only alluded to by the verb “capped.” The *UCOP Salary Scale Notes: Librarian Series* use more vague language and do not attempt to define procedures or dictate required levels of achievement. Based on these observations, and the absence of any documentation within the APM or the MOU, the Task Force believes that LAUC has authority to define or revise policy and procedures regarding this issue. This position is in accord with local procedures as recorded in the Berkeley Procedures, Section IV.A:

The Executive Committee of the Librarians Association of the University of California, Berkeley, has jurisdiction within the Association in all matters of policy governing the appointment, promotion, and merit increase review procedures, and shall make recommendations thereon to the appropriate administrator.

The Task Force recommends that the LAUC-B Executive Committee select one of the following four options and revise documentation in the Berkeley Procedures accordingly. Text has been suggested within each option, below, which should be added to the Procedures if that option is selected. The four options are followed by brief discussion of possible variations that could apply to several of the options. These variations have been discussed and rejected by the task force for the reasons recorded below.

Range of options:

- 1) Distinguished Status Required for Step VI (Current Practice)
- 2) Distinguished Status Required for Highest Step (Step VII)
- 3) Distinguished Status Independent of Merit Advancement
- 4) Eliminate Distinguished Status

The Task Force did not come to a firm recommendation among these options, nor was there contention. Options 2 and 3 were most highly favored in that they reduce rather than increase time demands in our complex review process and they remove or delay barriers to advancement.

Discussion of options:

1) Distinguished Status Required for Step VI (Current Practice)

Procedures

- “Distinguished Status” shall be a requirement for advancement above Step V.
- “Distinguished Status” shall be achieved by demonstrating a distinguished career history in a review that encompasses the entire career, akin to a Promotion Review, but without requiring an ad hoc committee.
- The career-long review shall be conducted as part of the normal review cycle.
- No single major achievement or “capstone” is required.

Discussion

Pros:

- Consistent with recent actions.
- In line with APO opinion.
- Appears to be in line with the shared understanding at other UC campuses, although there is no consensus.

Cons:

- Requirement introduces a barrier to advancement above Step V.
- Placement at Step VI is, arguably, illogical. Why not place it at the highest step, as it was formerly?
- Contrary to placement recommended by 1998 LAUC Committee on Professional Governance.
- Not required by the APM or MOU. Gives significant weight to the UCOP Salary Scale Notes, which are of questionable origin and authority.

If this option is adopted, append the following sentence to the Berkeley Procedures VI.A.6:

“LAUC-Berkeley requires documentation of this distinguished career history and continuing achievement for all librarians seeking advancement above Librarian, Step V.”

2) Distinguished Status Required for Highest Step (Step VII)

Procedures

- “Distinguished Status” shall be a requirement for advancement above Step VI.
- “Distinguished Status” shall be achieved by demonstrating a distinguished career history in a review that encompasses the entire career, akin to a Promotion Review but without requiring an ad hoc committee.
- The career-long review shall be conducted as part of the normal review cycle.
- No single major achievement or “capstone” is required.

Discussion

Pros:

- Delays barrier effect to the final step in the series.
- Placement at the highest step, Step VII, is more logical.
- Seems to be in line with intent of LAUC Position Paper 1: “Advancement to the top of the Librarian rank should be predicated upon a career history of outstanding service.”
- In line with intent of 1998 LAUC Committee on Professional Governance.

Cons:

- Not consistent with recent actions.
- Not in line with APO opinion.
- Appears to be out of line with general understanding at other UC campuses, although there is no consensus.
- Not required by the APM or MOU.

If this option is adopted, append the following sentence to the Berkeley Procedures VI.A.5:

“LAUC-Berkeley requires documentation of this distinguished career history and continuing achievement for all librarians seeking advancement above Librarian, Step VI.”

And

LAUC-B must seek revisions to the *UCOP Salary Scale Notes: Librarian Series*.

3) Distinguished Status Independent of Merit Advancement

Procedures

- “Distinguished Status” is established as an honorific designation that may be sought voluntarily by Librarians at Step V or above, but is entirely separate from advancement. The review would be undertaken by CAPA as part of the Merit Review process.
- Progress to Steps VI and VII shall be based on standard Merit Reviews.

Discussion

Pros:

- Removes barrier effect from the series.
- Makes recognition and distinction available to those who would like to pursue it.
- Saves time for candidates and reviewers as the number of Distinguished Status Reviews would likely be reduced.

Cons:

- Not consistent with recent actions.
- Not in line with APO opinion.
- Appears to be out of line with general understanding at other UC campuses, although there is no consensus.
- No substantive benefit to achieving distinction; only honorific.

If this option is adopted, append the following sentences to the Berkeley Procedures VI.A.5:

“Librarians at Step V or higher may request a Distinguished Status review in conjunction with their periodic Merit Review. In addition to documenting significant achievements during the most recent review period, the candidates must document a distinguished career history.”

And

LAUC-B must seek revisions to the *UCOP Salary Scale Notes: Librarian Series*.

4) Eliminate Distinguished Status

Procedures

- No “Distinguished Status” for librarians is required or available.
- Progress to steps VI and VII shall be based on standard Merit Reviews.

Discussion

Pros:

- Removes barrier effect from the series.
- Saves time for candidates and reviewers with Distinguished Status Reviews eliminated.

Cons:

- Not consistent with recent actions.
- Not in line with APO opinion.
- Appears to be out of line with general understanding at other UC campuses, although there is no consensus.
- Some might resent that distinction is no longer available via the “Distinguished Status” avenue.

If this option is adopted, **delete** Berkeley Procedures VI.A.5: “A distinguished career history as well as significant achievement since attaining their current step are required of Librarians seeking Distinguished Status.”

Also: delete reference to “distinguished status” from the Procedures VI.C.4.

And

LAUC-B must seek revisions to the *UCOP Salary Scale Notes: Librarian Series*.

Variations on Options

The following variations may be considered for the options above, but are not recommended by the Task Force.

For Options 1-3:

A more rigorous review could be required, requiring an ad hoc committee.

“Significant achievement” in the current review period could be interpreted more rigorously than for a standard Merit Increase. A spectrum of requirements could be agreed upon and documented, ranging from “more than average” recent achievement up to a “capstone” such as publication of a monograph or presidency of a national organization.

A “capstone”, or something approaching it, could be required at some point in the librarian’s career, but not necessarily during the most recent review period.

Task Force’s reasons for rejection:

All of the variations on procedures listed above introduce more complexity to the review process and demand more time of candidates and review committee members. Some require significant additional documentation. As documented in

this report, there is no language requiring any of the more rigorous features listed above, and LAUC actions between 1998 and 2003 indicated a clear tendency to reduce barriers to advancement, not increase them. Furthermore, with regard to the “capstone”, we note that APM 220-18(b)(4) does not require a capstone achievement of faculty advancing to Professor, Step VI.

For Option 3 only:

Distinguished Status Review could be an entirely different process independent of CAPA’s annual review calendar.

Task Force’s reasons for rejection:

This would introduce more complexity by establishing a new review process and demand more time of candidates and a review committee. It would require significant additional documentation.

Part 4:

**Revised *Procedures for Review of Librarian Appointments,
Promotions, and Advancements.***

BERKELEY: Office of the Chancellor,
December, 1976
(Revised November, 1981)
(Revised September, 1989)
(Revised September, 1990)
(Revised November, 1992)
(Revised September, 1993)
(Revised April, 2001)
(Revision Proposed, March 2010)

PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF LIBRARIAN
APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS, AND ADVANCEMENT

AND

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW PROCEDURES
FOR LIBRARIANS REQUESTING
A RECONSIDERATION OF A SALARY OR PROMOTION DECISION

I. OBJECTIVES

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. The review process, therefore, requires, as specified below, a departmental evaluation and a peer review before final administrative decisions are made.

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

- A. The terms "appointment," "promotion," and "merit increase" which fall within the scope of this review process, are defined as follows:
1. An appointment occurs when an individual is employed in one of the three librarian ranks (Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, and Librarian) and when the individual's immediately previous status was:
 - a. not in the employ of the University (except in the case of an appointment specifically designated temporary*) or

* A position filled on a temporary basis will, if converted to a permanent position, be filled by open recruitment. CAPA will be notified of any position being filled on a temporary basis

- b. in the employ of the University but not with a title in this series.
(Transfers of academic staff from one position to another when a promotion is not involved are not reviewed, except when the transfer would be to a position which involves open recruitment.)
- 2. A promotion is an advancement to a higher rank within this series, usually the next higher rank as listed above. A change from a title in another series to a title in this series (possibly involving an increase in salary) is not defined as a promotion or merit increase but as an appointment as described above.
- 3. A merit increase is an advancement in salary within rank in this series.
- B. "Appropriate administrator" refers to the University Librarian in the case of librarians in The Library, or the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Welfare in the case of Affiliated Library units.
- C. "Review Initiator" refers to the immediate supervisor who may or may not be the Department Head.

III. POLICY:

It is the policy of the campus libraries to provide, through a fair, impartial, and appropriate system of review, that: (a) only librarians of demonstrated ability and achievement be employed, retained, and advanced, and (b) professional growth and accomplishment be rewarded and encouraged by merit increases and/or promotion.

A. Appointment Policy:

Present academic staff members shall be given careful consideration for any vacant position; however, the libraries maintain a policy of seeking qualified candidates for each position and recruiting librarians from outside the campus if such librarians are better qualified. Prior approval to recruit for a new or vacant position shall be obtained from the Vice Provost in accordance with the Academic Non-Senate Recruitment Policy, which provides prior consideration for librarians who have been laid off from any unit on the Berkeley campus.

B. Promotion and Merit Increase Policy:

- 1. Each librarian, whatever his/her area of activity, is eligible for merit increase and promotion through the ranks from Assistant Librarian to Librarian if he/she demonstrates professional growth and ability. A change in position need not be involved.
- 2. Promotions and merit increases shall be based upon a regular and continuing review and appraisal of the performance of each librarian. If a librarian's achievement does not demonstrate the necessary growth and development,

he/she is not guaranteed promotion or advancement. Conversely, outstanding achievement is grounds for accelerated advancement.

IV. RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE REVIEW PROCESS

A. The Executive Committee of the Librarians Association of the University of California, Berkeley, has jurisdiction within the Association in all matters of policy governing the appointment, promotion, and merit increase review procedures, and shall make recommendations thereon to the appropriate administrator. Additionally, the Executive Committee shall be consulted when general matters of interpretation of these guidelines arise and shall make recommendations to the appropriate administrator.

B. Review and recommendations for individual cases of appointment, promotion, merit increase, and establishment of Career Status shall be implemented by committees of two types.

1. The Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Advancement (“CAPA”)

a. Membership

CAPA is a standing committee of the Librarians Association of the University of California, Berkeley. It shall consist of seven librarians holding Career Status with the rank of Associate Librarian or Librarian who are appointed by the Executive Committee to terms of three years each. Five of these shall be librarians from The Library and two from Affiliated Library units. Appointments shall be staggered so that no more than three new appointments (except replacement for unexpired terms) are made in one year. No librarian shall have a second term on CAPA until three years have elapsed since the end of his/her last term of office. The names of the appointees to CAPA shall be published.

b. Duties

- 1) reviewing appointments to the Librarian series with recommendation to the appropriate administrator;
- 2) providing nominations to the appropriate administrator who shall appoint members of all ad hoc review committees; if there is a difference of opinion about the composition of the committee, the appropriate administrator shall consult with CAPA. The administrator may delegate to CAPA that authority to appoint if he/she deems it appropriate;
- 3) requesting additional documentation as needed for the ad hoc review committees, and assisting these committees where needed;

procedures for requesting additional documentation shall be worked out with the University Librarian for The Library, or with the Vice Provost for Affiliated Library units;

- 4) conducting all merit increase reviews; assessing parity and equity by:
 - a) reviewing all recommendations including recommendations of the ad hoc review committees;
 - b) consulting with the University Librarian in the case of The Library or the Vice Provost in the case of the Affiliated Library units about specific appointment and review cases.

CAPA shall guard the confidentiality of individual review cases.

2. Promotion and/or career-status ad hoc review committees

a. Membership

The ad hoc review committees shall consist of three members holding Career Status in the Librarian series.

Upon nominations provided by CAPA, ad hoc review committees shall be appointed by the University Librarian to review The Library cases or by the Vice Provost to review Affiliated Library cases. The ad hoc review committee for promotion to Librarian shall consist of at least two members holding the rank of Librarian. In all cases, when possible at least one member shall have direct knowledge of the candidate's duties and responsibilities.

For review of a Librarian in The Library, at least two members shall be from The Library. Names of members of the ad hoc review committees shall be known only to CAPA, the University Librarian, and the Library Human Resources Director.

For review of a Librarian in an Affiliated Library unit, two committee members shall be from Affiliated Library units. Names of members of these committees shall be known only to CAPA, the Vice Provost, and the Library Human Resources Director.

b. Duties

Review committees shall be ad hoc committees assigned (i) to consider one or more promotion and/or career-status cases, and (ii) to prepare reports and recommendations, after which the committee shall be

dissolved. Absolute confidentiality must be observed by review committees and their individual members.

V. APPOINTMENT REVIEW

A. Criteria:

1. The usual minimum requirement for persons appointed to the Librarian series is an MLS or equivalent degree from an ALA accredited library school. In exceptional cases, persons without library degrees may be appointed to this classification and must be justified on the following grounds:
 - a. the work they are assigned to perform in the library system will be such as is generally classified as librarian's work; and
 - b. they possess an advanced degree directly relevant to the administration of library research collections and resources; and
 - c. no candidates with librarianship degrees are available who are as qualified for the position.

In the event that no qualified candidate is available who has an MLS or equivalent degree relevant to the administration of library research collections, an otherwise qualified appointee will be expected to secure a degree from an ALA-accredited library school within a specified time period as recommended by the appropriate administrator in consultation with CAPA. The employee will not attain Career Status until the requirement is fulfilled and peer review has been successfully completed.

2. In addition to a graduate degree in librarianship or accepted equivalent degree, an entering librarian may be required to possess competence in a specialized field as demonstrated by an additional advanced degree or experience in that field. Publications in the field of librarianship or in appropriate specialized areas, evaluations of the candidate by recognized specialists in his/her field, and activities in professional or scholarly societies may be considered in judging his/her competence.
3. Librarians appointed to Assistant Librarian rank step I may not have had any professional experience. New appointees with professional experience are normally appointed to one of the higher steps in this rank. Appointees with extensive previous professional experience who are appointed to demanding and responsible positions may be appointed to higher ranks of the Librarian series. Such appointments must be supported by appropriate documentation.

B. Procedures:

1. Appointments are made by the appropriate administrator in consultation with the Department Head or Unit Head concerned. Documentation relating to

prospective appointments (e.g., the position posting) is reviewed by CAPA. When a candidate for a position in the Librarian series is being considered and is available for interview, CAPA will be given the opportunity to interview the individual. CAPA will then make its recommendation to the appropriate administrator.

Final authority for all academic appointments rests with the appropriate administrator.

2. If CAPA determines that a candidate lacks an ALA-accredited MLS or acceptable degree relevant to the administration of library research collections, CAPA shall inform the appropriate administrator of this in its written recommendation. The recommendation shall include the requirement that, if appointed, the candidate must complete an ALA-accredited MLS prior to receiving Career Status. The terms for fulfillment of this requirement must be stated in the offer letter to the candidate and also communicated to CAPA in all future review dossiers until Career Status is achieved.
3. For appointment cases in Affiliated Library units, CAPA and the Dean or other appropriate administrative officer shall be notified of the decision by the Vice Provost.
4. For appointment cases in The Library, CAPA and the Department Head shall be notified of the decision by the University Librarian.

VI. MERIT INCREASE, PROMOTION, AND CAREER STATUS REVIEW

A. Criteria:

1. A candidate for merit increase, promotion, or Career Status shall be judged on the basis of the first of the following criteria, and, to the extent they are relevant, on one or more of the last three:
 - a. professional competence and quality of service within the library;
 - b. professional activity outside the library;
 - c. University and public service;
 - d. research and other creative activity.

An explanation of these criteria is set forth in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM), section 210 4(e)(3).

Reasonable flexibility shall be exercised in weighing the comparative relevance of the latter three criteria. Specific directions for the development of

a self-evaluation may be found in the document titled, Guidelines for Preparing Self-Evaluations: <http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LHRD/revself.html>.

2. Demonstrated superior professional ability is an indispensable qualification for promotion to the ranks of Associate Librarian and Librarian. Promotion is justified by excellence of service, demonstrated professional growth and accomplishment, and/or the assumption of greater responsibility.
3. In addition to the evaluation based on the academic and professional criteria described above, librarians who have management and/or supervisory responsibilities will be judged on their ability to plan and maintain a well-organized, efficient department or unit, deal effectively with personnel needs and problems, and offer leadership in the area of staff development.
4. One factor which will be considered in assessing the professional competence and judgment of individuals involved in the peer review process is their effectiveness in preparing and submitting documentation required as part of this process.
5. A distinguished career history and significant achievement since attaining their current step are required of Librarians seeking Distinguished Status.

B. Schedule of Reviews

The performance of each appointee shall be reviewed periodically and the review shall include participation by a review committee.

1. Normal Intervals, Extensions, and Exceptions

The normal intervals for academic review of incumbents in the Librarian series are every two years in the Assistant Librarian rank, every two years in the first six steps of the Associate Librarian rank, and every three years beginning with Step VII of the Associate Librarian rank through Step VII of the Librarian rank. Service at Associate Librarian Step VII and Librarian Steps V, VI, and VII may be of indefinite duration. However, reviews must be conducted at least every three years at these steps unless an individual or review initiator requests an earlier review.

- a. At any time, a librarian or his/her Department Head may initiate a request for review ahead of the normally scheduled review period.
- b. All candidates shall be reviewed as scheduled, as required by APM, section 360-80(a)(1), except when a deferred request has been granted, as permitted by APM, section 360-80(a)(2). In the event that a candidate fails to supply the review initiator with a self-evaluation by the timetable deadline (or fails to have been granted an extension of the submission date

as allowed by local guidelines), the review initiator will complete his/her review and forward the review dossier without the candidate's documentation, in adherence to the normal timetable. The review initiator will discuss this evaluation with the candidate following normal procedures. The candidate's next review will be at the usual interval for the individual's rank and step, unless an accelerated review is requested.

- c. All participants in the review process, including the candidate, the review initiator, department head, administrative reviewer, etc., are expected to adhere to the Timetable for Academic Librarian Promotion/Career Status/Merit/Special Reviews. Extensions of the Timetable will only be granted under unusual circumstances. Although the Timetable lists a number of deadlines for gathering documentation, these guidelines concern the final deadline (date when formal recommendation for merit or promotion is due in the Library Human Resources Department or the Academic Personnel Office).

An extension of the Timetable will only be granted when a participant encounters unusual circumstances, such as health or family problems, or sudden loss of a key employee that results in a significant increase in job duties, or is faced with an exceptional work circumstance, such as a major move to a library or assumption of a new primary job assignment. The extension request must include a signed explanation of why the participant is unable to comply with the existing timetable, and this will be submitted as part of the candidate's file.

The request for extension should be directed to the next person in the review process (e.g., a candidate's request should be submitted to the review initiator; the review initiator's request should be submitted to the Department Head, AUL, UL, Dean or Vice Provost, as appropriate; if an AUL or Dean needs an extension, he or she should apply to the University Librarian or Vice Provost, as appropriate). This request should be made as early as possible in the review cycle. Authorization for extension must be secured no later than three weeks before the formal deadline. The individual granting the extension must notify LHRD or the Academic Personnel Office promptly. These two offices will keep track of the flow of documentation (including extension requests) and will provide CAPA or other participants in the review process with information regarding the status of the candidate's file upon request.

If a candidate fails to provide the review initiator with a self-evaluation or to secure an extension within two weeks of the final deadline, the review initiator will complete his/her review and forward the review dossier as usual. The maximum extension past the final deadline is thirty days.

- d. In the event that a librarian at any rank has been denied advancement, 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. The review shall not be considered accelerated.
- e. In the event that a librarian at any rank is advanced outside of the normal review cycle, the review clock is reset. The next review shall cover the period since this advancement. This will result in the librarian's review interval being longer than the standard two or three year interval. If a review is requested earlier than the normal interval since the last advancement it shall be considered accelerated.

2. Deferred Reviews

A deferred review is the omission of an academic review during a year when a review would normally take place. It is a neutral action which can only be initiated with the written agreement of the candidate.

- a. A review may be deferred if prolonged absence or other unusual circumstances have resulted in insufficient evidence to evaluate performance. Reasons for review deferral must be in writing and all proposed deferrals must be submitted for written recommendations to the designated University official.
- b. When a deferral takes place, the review is deferred for one year whether a person's review cycle is normally two or three years. Hence, deferral for an additional, consecutive year should be regarded as a new request and thus subject to the same procedure. After the completion of a review which has been deferred, the review cycle will resume anew at the two or three year interval.

3. Schedule Considerations Specific to Promotion and/or Career Status Reviews

- a. Assistant Librarian. An individual whose initial appointment is to the rank of Assistant Librarian is in potential Career Status for the period of appointment to this rank. He/she must be fully reviewed by an ad hoc review committee within four years of the date of appointment and every two years thereafter. If, after such reviews, the appointee is promoted to a higher rank in this series, the individual is moved to Career Status. An Assistant Librarian is subject to termination after due notice if, after thorough review and a reasonable trial period (not more than six years), he/she is not deemed worthy of advancement.
- b. Associate Librarian. Associate Librarians are customarily reviewed for promotion in the course of their second year at Step VI. Those wishing to postpone promotion review should advise their review initiator in writing.

An individual whose initial appointment is to the rank of Associate Librarian is in potential Career Status for not less than two nor more than four years unless promoted sooner to the rank of Librarian. Each Associate Librarian in potential Career Status must be fully reviewed by an ad hoc review committee before Career Status is granted. The first review shall take place in the course of the second year of employment in potential Career Status.

The trial period in potential Career Status for an Associate Librarian will end with one of the following decisions:

- i. place the appointee in Career Status with the rank of Associate Librarian;
 - ii. promote to the rank of Librarian with Career Status; or
 - iii. terminate the appointment after due notice.
- c. Librarian. An individual whose initial appointment is to the rank of Librarian is in potential Career Status for three years. Each Librarian in potential Career Status must be fully reviewed by an ad hoc review committee prior to being granted Career Status. The first review shall take place in the course of the third year of employment.

The trial period for a Librarian will end with one of two decisions:

- i. place the appointee in Career Status with the rank of Librarian; or
- ii. terminate the appointment after due notice.

C. Periods under Review

1. Periods under review coincide with calendar years (January-December).
2. The period under review begins at the calendar year of the librarian's last advancement, not the last review.
3. For Merit Reviews, periods under review are determined by the normal periods of service defined in APM, section 360-80(a)(1) and described in section VI.B.1, above.
4. For promotion reviews, Career Status reviews, and Distinguished Status reviews, periods under review encompass the entire professional career of the candidate, with emphasis on the most recent period of service.
5. For Special Reviews in which no advancement is sought the period under review is the period since the last review.

D. Procedures

1. The call for merit increases, promotions, and Career Status actions and the calendar of due dates for the review process shall be issued and distributed each year to every member of the Librarian series no later than thirty (30) days prior to the first required action following issuance of the call. The librarian shall be notified of the decision normally within nine (9) months of the first required action. This deadline may be extended upon the mutual agreement of the parties.
2. All librarians will be informed in writing, on a yearly basis, of their eligibility for review.
3. A librarian who is not normally eligible for a review during a particular review cycle may request an accelerated review during that cycle. The decision regarding the librarian's request shall be made in accordance with campus guidelines.
4. The University shall notify the candidate of the impending review and shall inform the candidate about the review process, including the criteria to be used.
5. The candidate shall be given the opportunity to ask questions and to supply information and evidence to be evaluated in the review.
6. The University may solicit letters evaluating the candidate from qualified persons, including a reasonable number of persons whose names have been provided by the candidate.
 - a. The candidate may provide in writing to the review initiator, or other appropriate person, names of persons who in the view of the candidate, for reasons provided by the candidate, might not objectively evaluate in a letter or on a committee the candidate's qualifications or performance. Any such statement provided by the candidate shall be included in the academic review file.
 - b. In soliciting letters of evaluation or following the receipt of an unsolicited letter, the University shall include, attach, or send a statement regarding confidentiality of such letters.
 - c. All such letters used in the review, even if unsolicited, shall be included in the file.
7. An academic review file shall be prepared for each candidate who is being considered for a merit increase, promotion, or Career Status action. The review initiator is responsible for preparing the candidate's review file, which

consists of the review initiator's letter of recommendation together with pertinent additional letters, if any, including those letters solicited from individuals as provided for in section VI.D.6, above, and required documents.

8. The review initiator's letter of recommendation, without disclosing the identities of sources of confidential documents, shall discuss the proposed personnel action in light of the criteria and substantiated by supporting evidence contained in the file. The letter of recommendation shall provide a comprehensive assessment of the candidate's qualifications, together with detailed evidence to support the evaluation, including an up-to-date biography and bibliography. The letter may also present a report of consultation with appropriate members of the professional library staff and others in a position to evaluate performance and may include any dissenting opinions.
9. Before forwarding the academic review file to the next level of review, the review initiator shall provide the candidate an opportunity to inspect all documents to be included in the review file other than confidential academic review records. A copy of the review initiator's letter of recommendation shall be provided to the candidate.
10. The University shall provide to the candidate, upon written request, a redacted copy of the confidential documents included in the record.
11. The candidate may submit for inclusion in the record a written statement in response to or commenting upon material in the file.
12. Upon completion of the procedures described above, a statement shall be signed by the candidate certifying that the prescribed procedures have been followed. A documentation checklist listing the contents of the review file shall also be signed by the candidate. The certification statement and the documentation checklist shall be included in the review file.
13. Decisions and recommendations of the review committee(s) shall be based solely upon material within the review packet.
14. If, during subsequent review of a recommendation, the review file is found to be incomplete or inadequate by the reviewer or review committee, additional information shall be solicited through the designated University official who will inform the candidate that such new material is being added to the review file. The candidate shall have access to all non-confidential material added to the file and, upon request, a redacted copy of the confidential documents shall be provided to the candidate. The candidate shall also be provided the opportunity to submit a written statement in response to the additions to the review file. The review shall then be based upon the personnel review file as augmented.

15. No documentation other than the recommendation(s) of the review committee(s) may be added to the review file without annotation of the certification statement and the documentation checklist.
16. The review file shall be referred to a review committee. On the basis of all evidence in the review file including the report from an ad hoc review committee, if any, the review committee will submit a comprehensive report and recommendation for action to the designated University official.
 - a. In conducting its review and arriving at its recommendation concerning a candidate, each review committee shall be guided by the criteria.
 - b. The report of the review committee(s) shall be submitted to the University's deciding officer.
 - c. The deliberations and recommendations of the review committees are to be strictly confidential.
17. In cases of promotion, conferral of Career Status, or recommendation for termination of appointment, if the preliminary assessment of the University's deciding officer is contrary to the recommendations of the review committee, the University's deciding officer shall notify that committee with respect to the assessment. The review committee shall be given the opportunity for further comment before the final decision is made.
18. In cases of promotion, conferral of Career Status, or recommendation for termination of appointment, if the University's deciding officer's preliminary assessment is to terminate appointment or not to confer Career Status or promotion, the candidate shall be notified of the opportunity to request access to records in the academic review file. The candidate and review initiator shall then have the opportunity to respond in writing and to provide additional information and documentation.
19. The designated University official shall inform the candidate in writing of the final administrative decision. Upon request, a candidate may receive, from the University's deciding officer, a written statement of the reasons for his/her decision and, if requested, a redacted copy of the confidential documents in the academic review file. Such a statement shall not disclose the identities of persons who were sources of confidential documents.
20. The arbitrator shall have the authority to determine whether the University has violated a procedure set forth herein. However, in any grievance, the arbitrator shall not have the authority to review any decision to:
 - a. Initiate an academic review;
 - b. Award or deny a merit increase;

- c. Award or deny a promotion;
- d. Award or withhold Career Status; or
- e. Terminate a librarian following academic review.

If the arbitrator finds that the alleged violation had a material, negative impact on the outcome of the review, the arbitrator's remedy shall be limited to directing the University to repeat, to the extent practicable, the review process from the point at which the violation occurred.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR LIBRARIANS REQUESTING A RECONSIDERATION OF A SALARY OR PROMOTION DECISION

I. OBJECTIVE

A librarian who feels aggrieved by a decision concerning salary or promotion may petition for reconsideration.

II. PROCEDURES

- A. Prior to the submission of a formal petition, the petitioner may elect to discuss the decision informally with the petitioner's supervisor or, in the case of The Library, with the University Librarian or, in the case of Affiliated Library units, with the Dean or Director.
- B. The formal petition, which is to be submitted subsequent to the informal discussion if the petitioner elects to have one, shall be a written statement that contains all of the reasons supporting the merits for reconsideration and shall have attached to it any new submission that the petitioner wishes to have reviewed. The formal petition shall include, but need not be limited to, the issues presented by the decision letter from the designated University official as specified in section VI.D.19, above, of Procedures for Review of Librarian Appointments, Promotions, and Advancement.
- C. The formal petition for reconsideration shall be submitted within 60 calendar days from the date that the petitioner was informed of the action giving rise to the petition.
- D. The formal petition shall be forwarded, through proper administrative channels, to the University Librarian or, for Affiliated Library units, to the Vice Provost's office.

- E. The University Librarian or the Vice Provost's office shall forward the petition to CAPA, which shall make written comments and recommendations on the matters in the petition and shall return the petition, all supporting documents, and the written comments and recommendations to the University Librarian or, for Affiliated Library units, to the Vice Provost's office.
- F. The University Librarian or, in the case of Affiliated Library units, the Dean or other appropriate administrative officer(s) shall make written comments and recommendations on the matters in the petition and forward the complete dossier to the Vice Provost.
- G. The Vice Provost shall decide the petition for reconsideration on the written record unless the Vice Provost's inspection of the record gives substantial cause to believe that an oral presentation is necessary. It is not contemplated that an oral presentation will be necessary in most instances.
- H. The Vice Provost shall inform the petitioner by letter of the decision made on the petition within a reasonable length of time (not to exceed six months) after the petition was submitted.