

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)
(Revised March 2011)

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

Ad hoc review committees will (i) consider one or more promotion and/or career-status cases, and (ii) 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 management 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 management 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) and in the Agreement for the Professional Librarians Unit (LX) between the University of California and the American Federation of Teachers (the MOU).

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.

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) and the MOU, except when a deferred request has been granted, as permitted by APM, section 360-80(a)(2) and the MOU. 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), the MOU, and also described in section VI.B.1, above.
4. Promotion reviews and career status reviews 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.