

***UCLA LIBRARIANS' CALL:
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL PROCEDURES
FOR THE LIBRARIAN SERIES***

**2023-2024
PEER REVIEW CYCLE**

UCLA Library

Table of Contents

I. PREFACE	5
II. INTRODUCTION	6
III. STAGES OF THE REVIEW	7
IV. BASIC PRINCIPLES OF THE REVIEW PROCESS.....	8
A. Overview of Criteria for Advancement.....	8
B. Fairness and Objectivity.....	9
C. Confidentiality.....	9
D. Timeliness	9
E. Professional Responsibility	9
F. Nondiscrimination.....	10
V. PARTICIPANTS IN THE REVIEW PROCESS	10
A. Candidate under Review.....	10
B. Review Initiator (RI)	10
C. Candidate for Appointment.....	11
D. Recommending Officer	12
E. Unit or Department Head	12
F. Referee.....	12
G. Supervisory Assistant/Associate University Librarian (AUL).....	12
H. Committee on Appointments, Promotions & Advancements (CAPA).....	13
I. Ad Hoc Committees	15
J. Assistant Director of Academic Human Resources (ADAHR)	15
K. University Librarian (UL)	16
VI. CRITERIA FOR MERIT INCREASE, PROMOTION, AND CAREER STATUS.....	16
A. General Criteria Applicable for Advancement.....	16
B. Weighing the Contributions in Criteria 1-4.....	18
C. Quality of Criteria 2-4 Contributions	20
D. Goals and Planning.....	20
E. Specific Types of Actions.....	21
1. Merit Increase.....	21
2. Promotion.....	21

3.	Exceptional Performance	22
4.	Career Status	23
5.	No Action	24
6.	Termination	25
7.	Off-Cycle Review.....	25
8.	Self-Initiated Actions	26
9.	Extension	26
10.	Deferred Review (<i>MOU</i> , Article 4.e.2; <i>APM</i> 360-80.a.2)	26
F.	Candidates in Temporary Appointments.....	27
G.	Criteria in Relation to Advancement through the Librarian Series	27
1.	Assistant Librarian – Movement through the Rank and Promotion	27
2.	Associate Librarian – Movement through the Rank and Promotion	29
3.	Librarian – Movement through the Rank.....	30
VII.	THE PROCESS FOR MERIT INCREASE, PROMOTION, AND CAREER STATUS	31
A.	Notice of Eligibility for Review	31
B.	The Candidate’s Documentation	33
1.	List of Names for Letters of Assessment on Performance	33
2.	Statement of Responsibilities (SOR).....	34
3.	Data Summary	34
4.	Statement of Professional Achievements (SOPA).....	36
5.	Librarian Goals Template.....	37
6.	Supplemental Documents	37
C.	Meetings between the RI and the Candidate.....	37
D.	Request for Confidential Letters.....	38
E.	Request for Non-Confidential Assessment from Supplemental Supervisor or Former RI	39
F.	RI’s Evaluation & Recommendation	39
G.	Meetings between the RI, Department Head, and the Supervisory AUL.....	41
H.	Additional Documentation	41
I.	Rejoinder.....	42
J.	Self-Initiated Action	42
K.	Unit or Department Head’s Comments.....	43
L.	Supervisory AUL’s Comments.....	44
M.	Final Certification of the Process	45
VIII.	PEER REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR MERIT INCREASE, PROMOTION, AND CAREER STATUS.....	46

A.	Assistant Director of Academic Human Resources (ADAHR)	46
B.	Committee on Appointments, Promotion & Advancements (CAPA)	46
C.	Ad Hoc Committees	49
IX.	ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW FOR MERIT INCREASE, PROMOTION, AND CAREER STATUS.....	52
A.	University Librarian’s (UL) Review and Decision	52
B.	Request for Reconsideration/Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR).....	53
C.	Administrative Review of the Final Decision (Grievances)	54
X.	CRITERIA AND PROCESS FOR RECRUITMENT AND APPOINTMENT	55
A.	Definition of Librarian Series (MOU, Article 4.A; APM 210-4.e and 360-4)	55
B.	Appointment to the Series.....	56
C.	Recruitment	57
D.	Recommendation for Appointments.....	57
E.	Documentation for Appointments	58
F.	Formal Offer.....	60
XI.	PEER REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT	60
A.	Appointment.....	60
B.	Types & Conditions of Appointments in the Librarian Series.....	60
C.	CAPA’s Review of Appointments	61
XII.	ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW FOR APPOINTMENT	64
XIII.	APPENDICES TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	66
XIV.	FORMS TABLE OF CONTENTS	67

Document History

In 2005, the Ad Hoc Task Force on the Peer Review Process was charged with reviewing and revising the peer review procedures for UCLA librarians. The resulting reorganized and revised document, the *UCLA Librarians' CALL: Academic Personnel Procedures for the Librarian Series* (hereinafter *CALL*), has served as the basis for subsequent revisions to the *CALL* since the 2005-2006 peer review cycle. In 2014 and 2019 the *CALL* was brought up-to-date to reflect changes in the UC-AFT *Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)* and the *Academic Personnel Manual (APM)*, two official documents which govern the peer review process for librarians in the University of California and at UCLA.

2023-2024 Version

This 2023-2024 version of the *CALL* includes revisions completed in September 2023 by the Committee to Review the *CALL*:

Anna Chen, 2022-2023 CAPA Chair (Committee to Review the *CALL*, Chair)
Paromita Biswas, 2023-2024 CAPA Chair
Sharon Benamou, 2023-2024 CAPA Chair Elect
Lilia Valdez, Assistant Director of Academic Human Resources

Changes are outlined in the *What's New in the CALL* documents available at:
<https://uclalibrary.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/PR/overview?homepageld=22937640>

I. PREFACE

The *CALL* serves as the official guide for the peer review process for the Librarian Series at UCLA. It outlines standards and procedures and is designed to assist individuals involved in the peer review process in considering appointments, merit increases, promotions, career status, and termination actions in the Librarian Series.

Other relevant documents include:

- A. *Memorandum of Understanding, University of California and University Council—American Federation of Teachers, PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIAN UNIT* (hereinafter *MOU*)

Librarians in the University of California system are exclusively represented by the University Council-American Federation of Teachers (hereinafter UC-AFT).

The collective bargaining agreement is available on the Web at:

<https://ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/labor/bargaining-units/lx/contract.html>

- B. *Academic Personnel Manual* (hereinafter *APM*)

The *APM* includes policies and procedures pertaining to the employment relationship between an academic appointee and the University of California. For librarian appointees covered by the *MOU*, the *APM* applies only to the extent provided for in the *MOU*.

Pertinent sections of the *APM* are available on the Web at:

APM Section 210 – <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-210.pdf>

APM Section 360 – <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-360.pdf>

C. *Librarian Salary Scales*

The current salary scales for the Librarian Series are accessible on the website of the University of California Office of the President (UCOP) at the following links:

Non-Represented Librarians:

<https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/2023-24/july-2023-acad-salary-scales/t26-a.pdf>

Represented Librarians:

<https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/2023-24/july-2023-acad-salary-scales/t26-b.pdf>

D. *Bylaws of the Librarians Association of the University of California—Los Angeles* (hereinafter *LAUC—LA Bylaws*)

The Bylaws of the Librarians Association of the University of California—Los Angeles (hereinafter *LAUC—LA*) are available on the Web at:

<https://guides.library.ucla.edu/lauc-la/bylaws>

Changes to the *CALL* are proposed by the outgoing Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Advancements (hereinafter *CAPA*). The Committee to Review the *CALL* meets after the incoming Chair Elect is elected to review and revise the *CALL* as necessary pursuant to *LAUC-LA Bylaws*, Article VI § 7.

Membership on the Committee to Review the *CALL* is defined in the *LAUC-LA Bylaws*. The Assistant Director of Academic Human Resources (hereinafter *ADAHR*) works with the leadership of *CAPA* to facilitate the process of reviewing and revising the *CALL*.

BACK TO TABLE OF CONTENTS

II. INTRODUCTION

Librarians play a critical role in the success of the UCLA libraries and consequently in the level of excellence achieved in the research and instruction conducted throughout the UCLA campus. In the

dynamic environment of higher education and scholarly communication, librarians must continually master a wide array of skills and tools so that they may initiate innovations and changes, as well as respond intelligently and reliably to new challenges.

The standards for librarians at UCLA are high and require superior performance, achievement, and growth and development throughout a career. Librarians and managers work together to recruit, develop, evaluate, promote, and retain the very best librarians. A decision to hire a librarian is a determination that the individual has the potential to qualify for a continuing career appointment. The procedures outlined in the *CALL* ensure that fair and objective reviews are conducted in a consistent manner throughout the UCLA libraries in order to establish that the appointee has the necessary potential and, after a suitable trial period, that the appointee has realized and continues to realize this potential to a high degree of excellence.

Librarians at UCLA are non-Senate academic appointees. The Librarian Series is used for academic appointees who provide professional services in the University Library and its affiliated units in support of the University's educational, research, and public service functions. The quality of the Librarian Series at the University of California is maintained primarily through objective and thorough review by peers and administrators of each candidate for appointment, merit increase, promotion, career status, and termination actions.

Peer review is a collaborative process through which high standards of performance and equity for all University of California librarians are maintained. It combines administrative and supervisory reviews with peer evaluation by one's own academic colleagues and is designed to encourage professional contributions and accountability as well as to safeguard professional autonomy. Librarian peer review focuses on the quality and impact of the librarian's performance.

Librarians are either represented or non-represented. Represented librarians are in the collective bargaining unit and are covered by the *MOU* between the University of California and the UC-AFT. Non-represented librarians are not in the collective bargaining unit and are covered by the *APM*. The *APM* includes policies and procedures pertaining to the employment relationship between an academic appointee and the University of California. For librarian appointees covered by the *MOU*, the *APM* applies only to the extent provided for in the *MOU*. Temporary appointments to the Librarian Series are subject to the same guidelines outlined in the *MOU* and/or *APM* as appropriate.

A key principle inherent in the peer review process is that appointees in the Librarian Series participate in, and share responsibility for, evaluation of the qualifications of proposed new appointees to the Series and for their subsequent professional performance. Fairness and confidentiality are central to this process. All participants have an obligation to maintain absolute fairness, impartiality, and open-mindedness in deliberations and recommendations.

[BACK TO TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

III. STAGES OF THE REVIEW

Each appointment or performance review is conducted in three stages:

- A. Appraisal Process includes the candidate's documentation, the review initiator's evaluation and recommendation, and other documentation.
- B. Peer Review includes review of the documentation by CAPA and, in specified cases, an ad hoc committee.
- C. Administrative Review, the final stage, includes the University Librarian's review and final decision regarding the action.

[BACK TO TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

IV. BASIC PRINCIPLES OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

A. Overview of Criteria for Advancement

Librarians are evaluated based on their activities in the first of the following criteria and, to the extent they are relevant, on one or more of Criteria 2-4:

1. Professional competence and quality of service within the library¹;
2. Professional activity outside the library;
3. University and public service;
4. Research or other creative activity.

([MOU Article 4.C.2](#); [APM 210-4.e](#) and [360-10](#))

There is no single recommended pattern of development and performance for advancement within the Librarian Series.

It is the responsibility of the individual librarian to determine the relevance of Criterion 2 (Professional activity outside the library), Criterion 3 (University and public service), or Criterion 4 (Research and other creative activity) to their development and the degree of participation in each of these criteria. The criteria for advancement in the Librarian Series stated in both the *MOU* and the *APM* are intentionally broad and flexible in order to accommodate great diversity in career paths and professional contributions.

All participants in the peer review process need to be respectful of an individual's career choices and mindful of the differences in career paths. In addition, all participants need to be aware of the differing professional structures and professional development opportunities in various branches of the profession and thus need to display requisite flexibility in evaluating professional activities beyond the primary job assignment.

Although there is no single recommended pattern of development and performance for advancement within the Librarian Series, there is an expectation of increasing and significant contributions, which extend beyond the performance of immediate job responsibilities. It is also understood that the level of competence and the scope of

¹ Where appropriate, librarians within affiliated units may consider service within their affiliated unit as equivalent to service within the library.

contribution required for advancement becomes greater as the librarian advances through the series.

“If, on the basis of a review, the individual does not meet the criteria for continuation or advancement, there is no obligation on the part of the University to continue, advance, or to promote.” ([MOU Article 4.C.1](#); [APM 210-4.e.2](#))

B. Fairness and Objectivity

The review shall be based on an objective appraisal of the documentation in relation to the criteria stated in the *MOU* and the *APM*. The documentation shall be in sufficient detail to make a fair and objective appraisal possible. The review file shall not include documents that are not pertinent to the evaluation of professional performance (e.g., medical records, records of political activity, or other personal or confidential information).

All decisions and recommendations shall be based solely upon materials within the peer review file.

C. Confidentiality

It is the responsibility of all involved in the peer review process to scrupulously respect the confidentiality of their deliberations and the documents they examine. Confidentiality must be maintained both during the peer review process and after the peer review process is complete.

D. Timeliness

It is the responsibility of all involved to ensure that assignments are performed with the greatest possible care and promptness. Adherence to recruitment timeframes and peer review calendar deadlines is in the best interest of all participants. CAPA will consider participants' timeliness in preparing and submitting required documentation, as well as the quality of the documentation, as part of its assessment of the professional competence and judgment of individuals involved in the review process. Additionally, packets must be complete before submission. It is imperative that CAPA and ad hoc committees receive a complete packet to ensure their evaluations and recommendations are properly informed. Refusal to submit a complete packet, or a candidate's failure to adhere to deadlines or approved extensions of deadlines, may also affect the UL's assessment of the packet (see also VIII.B.2.e). If a participant is unable to meet a given deadline, they must contact the ADAHR to discuss possible extensions and other options.

E. Professional Responsibility

It is a professional responsibility of each librarian at UCLA to participate in the peer review process through service on ad hoc committees or CAPA. Librarians shall disqualify themselves if they question their ability to make a fair and objective judgment in a particular case or in the case of a possible conflict of interest.

F. Nondiscrimination

The review process shall be applied equally to all librarians at UCLA within the limits imposed by law or University regulations without regard to age, citizenship, race, color, religious belief or non-belief, marital status, national origin, ancestry, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, pregnancy (including pregnancy, childbirth, and medical conditions related to pregnancy and childbirth), physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer-related or genetic characteristics), political affiliation, union activity, or service in the uniformed services (including membership, application for membership, performance of services, application for service, or obligation for service). ([MOU Article 2](#); [APM 035](#))

[BACK TO TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

V. PARTICIPANTS IN THE REVIEW PROCESS

A. Candidate under Review

It is the role of the candidate under review to examine and report to their review initiator (hereinafter RI) on the significance of their accomplishments and contributions during the review period, to provide information about their progress toward achieving established goals, to assist in identifying performance strengths and weaknesses, and to furnish documents required to be submitted by the candidate for the review file in a timely manner.

In conjunction with the RI, the candidate is responsible for developing performance goals for the next review period, for maintaining open and regular communication during the review period, and for adjusting and revising goals in response to changing opportunities or circumstances.

B. Review Initiator (RI)

It is the role of the RI to assess and report on the value of the accomplishments and contributions of a candidate under review, to identify strengths and weaknesses, and to recommend measures to be taken to enhance and/or improve performance. Normally, the RI should be someone with the professional training appropriate to review a librarian's activities and contributions. In cases where a librarian reports to someone without such background, the ADAHR will be available to work with the librarian's department head and/or supervisory assistant/associate university librarian (hereinafter AUL) to provide appropriate review of Criteria 2, 3, and/or 4 contributions.

The RI recommends a personnel action based on the documentation in the file relative to the criteria for performance as stated in the *MOU* and the *APM*, as appropriate. The RI assists the candidate under review, and new appointees upon appointment, to clarify expectations and formulate goals for the next review period. In addition, for a candidate who has not yet achieved career status, the RI and candidate should consider whether

the candidate has had the opportunity to demonstrate both successful performance in their Criterion 1 job responsibilities, as well as evidence of contributions in Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4, so that the strongest possible packet may be submitted in support of that recommendation. There is no expectation that a candidate must pursue career status as soon as they are eligible. In cases where career status is not pursued at the first eligible opportunity, the RI should provide, within their recommendation, guidance to the candidate to support the candidate's progression towards achieving career status in a future review.

It is imperative for the RI to maintain open and regular communication with the candidate throughout the review period, discussing progress toward goals and any need for goal modification. This open and regular communication ensures that there are no surprises for the candidate or the RI during the review process. Performance concerns need to be discussed in a timely manner as they arise to ensure open and ongoing communication regarding expectations and performance goals. The Peer Review process is not the opportunity to address performance concerns for the first time, but rather it is an opportunity to reflect on a candidate's performance over the course of the period under review and evaluate improvement and growth.

In cases where the candidate is pursuing an action not supported by the RI, the candidate will work with the ADAHR to document and process the action.

The RI must forward the peer review documentation to the next level of review by the specified deadline. The *Review Initiator's Certification Statement* ([Form #3-C](#)), a required document, allows the RI to note the dates on which they received the Data Summary, the Statement of Professional Achievements and other peer review documents from the candidate. If the RI foresees any problem in submitting the documentation by the deadline, the RI or the candidate should request an extension of the deadline from the University Librarian (hereinafter UL).

Beyond this, it is also the responsibility of the RI, to the extent possible given departmental workloads, to encourage librarians under their supervision to serve on CAPA and on ad hoc committees in order to ensure continued staffing of the peer review process across the campus.

C. Candidate for Appointment

In general, a national recruitment shall be conducted in order to appoint the most qualified individuals to Librarian Series positions unless the University determines that recruitment is not required or shall be limited to UCLA employees in a particular case.

When a position is subject to outside recruitment, candidates for appointment shall submit a letter of application, résumé or curriculum vitae, and list of references, and make themselves available for an interview.

When a waiver of recruitment is sought for a specific individual, it is the role of the individual being considered for a potential career appointment to submit a letter of interest, résumé or curriculum vitae, and list of references.

D. Recommending Officer

The Recommending Officer is the person who is authorized to recommend positions for recruitment and candidates for appointment. The University Librarian holds ultimate approval authority. A Recommending Officer is the supervisory AUL in cases where the librarian position is within the Library. In affiliated units, the Recommending Officer may be a dean, department chair or director depending on the organizational structure and practices of the department.

E. Unit or Department Head

The unit or department head assumes the role of the RI in conducting the review of a candidate who reports directly to them. It is also the role of the unit or department head:

- To coordinate appointment and peer review actions within their unit;
- To ensure that RIs within their unit adhere to peer review principles and procedures;
- To ensure that the rights of candidates under review within their unit are respected;
- To ensure that actions coming from their unit are properly justified and documented.

It is imperative that the unit or department head maintain open and regular communication with the RI throughout the review period, discussing the candidate's progress toward goals and any need for goal modification. This open and regular communication ensures that there are no surprises for anyone involved in the review process.

Beyond this, it is also the responsibility of the department or unit head to ensure that a sufficient number of librarians within their unit are available to provide a fair share of service on CAPA and on ad hoc committees in order to ensure continued staffing of the peer review process across the campus.

F. Referee

A referee is someone who, in response to a formal, written request, provides confidential statements evaluating and assessing a candidate's work and contributions.

G. Supervisory Assistant/Associate University Librarian (AUL)

The role of the supervisory AUL is to assume the role of the RI in conducting the review of a candidate who reports directly to them. It is also the responsibility of the supervisory AUL:

- To coordinate appointments and peer review actions within their areas;
- To ensure that RIs and unit/department heads within their areas adhere to peer review principles and procedures;
- To ensure that the rights of candidates for appointment or review within their unit(s) are respected;
- To ensure that actions coming from their unit(s) are properly justified and documented.

It is imperative that the supervisory AUL maintain open and regular communication with the RIs and unit/department heads within their areas throughout the review period, discussing the candidate's progress toward goals and any need for goal modification. This open and regular communication ensures that there are no surprises for anyone involved in the review process.

Beyond this, it is also the responsibility of the supervisory AUL to ensure that a sufficient number of librarians within their unit(s) are available to provide a fair share of service on CAPA and on ad hoc committees in order to ensure continued staffing of the peer review process across the campus.

H. Committee on Appointments, Promotions & Advancements (CAPA)

CAPA is a standing committee of LAUC-LA. Its members are elected and appointed in accordance with the [LAUC-LA Bylaws](#). CAPA has been created by LAUC-LA to advise the UL on appointments, promotions, merit increases and career status actions in the Librarian Series before final administrative recommendations are made, thus assuring that professional as well as organizational considerations are fairly and consistently taken into account ([LAUC-LA Bylaws, Article VI.6.i](#)).

To ensure the full effectiveness of the review process, it is essential that librarians are willing to serve on CAPA when called upon, that all involved in the review process scrupulously respect the confidentiality of the records they examine, and that they carry through their assignments with the greatest possible fairness, care, and dispatch.

1. Composition of CAPA

- a. The Committee shall consist of seven members: Chair, Chair-Elect, and five other members. All members shall be from the Librarian Series with either career status or potential career status. Terms of service for CAPA members are defined in the [LAUC-LA Bylaws, Article VI.6](#).
- b. The Chair-Elect of the Committee must have career status and shall be elected by the membership. The Chair-Elect will perform the duties of the Chair in cases where the Chair is unavailable or excluded.

- c. The five non-elected Committee members shall be appointed by the LAUC-LA Executive Board.
 - d. The CAPA Chair shall serve as a member of the LAUC-LA Executive Board for a period of one year, commencing September 1.
 - e. In the event of a vacancy in the Chair of the Committee, the Chair-Elect shall become Chair and serve for the remainder of the term.
 - f. In the event of a vacancy in the Chair-Elect of the Committee, a special election shall be held as specified in the [LAUC-LA Bylaws](#) (Article IX.2.a).
 - g. In the event of the resignation of any of the five appointed Committee members, the LAUC-LA Executive Board shall appoint a replacement to serve the remainder of the term.
 - h. No person shall serve consecutive full terms on the Committee.
 - i. The terms of CAPA members, excluding the Chair and Chair-Elect, are for two years. If the composition of CAPA is such that four (4) members will end their term at the same time, CAPA has the discretion to appoint a member or members for a one year term.
2. Annual Report of CAPA
- a. CAPA and the ADAHR shall meet at the end of the review cycle for the year to evaluate procedures and make recommendations for changes to procedures or to the language of the *CALL*. Recommended changes shall be forwarded to the LAUC-LA Committee to Review the *CALL* and also included in CAPA's annual report presented at the Fall General Membership Meeting of LAUC-LA.
 - b. The following statistics will be supplied by the ADAHR to be included in the annual report of CAPA:
 - 1) Number of librarians eligible for peer review actions;
 - 2) Number of actions reviewed and the number approved;
 - 3) Number of appointments and the number approved;
 - 4) Breakdown and number of actions in each case in which there was a disagreement between any one or more of the parties involved in reviewing the action (RI, CAPA, and/or ad hoc committee), including the final administrative recommendation.

I. Ad Hoc Committees

When specified, ad hoc committees shall be constituted by CAPA for the purpose of reviewing a recommended personnel action or a group of personnel actions. Each ad hoc committee shall review the documentation and shall be responsible for assessing an individual's performance during a given review period to determine whether the recommended action is warranted. The identities of ad hoc committee members are known only to the Chair and/or Chair-Elect of CAPA, and, for the purposes of configuring access to review cases in Opus, the ADAHR and the Academic Human Resources Analyst.

It shall be a professional responsibility for each librarian at UCLA to serve on ad hoc committees. As necessary or appropriate, librarians outside UCLA may be asked to serve on ad hoc committees.

J. Assistant Director of Academic Human Resources (ADAHR)

Working with LAUC-LA, CAPA, and the UL, the ADAHR has responsibility for providing support to facilitate the peer review process, including assistance with logistics.

It is the responsibility of the ADAHR to:

1. Maintain a centralized file of all librarian personnel peer review files, control access to confidential material, and serve as the official office of record for librarian appointees on the UCLA campus;
2. Work with the UL and CAPA to coordinate the annual peer review process for the UCLA campus;
3. Serve as a neutral consultant and be available to all participants in the peer review process to interpret and advise on application of these policies and procedures;
4. Provide notice to librarians and RIs of an individual's eligibility for review and distribute documentation as detailed further in Sections of the *CALL*;
5. Ensure the most up-to-date documents and forms are available to implement these procedures;
6. Serve as the liaison with the UCLA Academic Personnel Office to ensure that these procedures and their implementation meet University requirements;
7. Work with the candidate to document and process the action in cases where the candidate is pursuing an action not supported by the RI, the unit or department head, or the supervisory AUL;
8. Work with the librarian's department to provide appropriate review of Criteria 2, 3, and/or 4 contributions in cases where a librarian reports to someone without the professional training appropriate to review a librarian's activities and contributions;

9. Revise the *CALL* and make it available to all involved in the peer review process when changes to the *CALL* are drafted by the Committee to Review the *CALL* and agreed to by the UL;

10. Provide administrative support to the UL for peer review activities.

K. University Librarian (UL)

The UCLA Chancellor has delegated to the UL the responsibility to provide for review of the qualifications of candidates in the Librarian Series for appointment, merit increase, promotion, career status, and termination.

The UCLA Chancellor has delegated to the UL the authority to approve Librarian Series appointments, promotions, career status actions, and merit increases consistent with the published salary scales after appropriate review.

In determining appointments, promotions, career status, and merit increases, the UL assumes ultimate responsibility for defining performance standards for library academic personnel, communicating expectations, stimulating discussion, and promoting common understanding and consensus. The UL is also responsible for ensuring that these procedures, as approved by University Administration, are implemented and adhered to.

[BACK TO TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

VI. CRITERIA FOR MERIT INCREASE, PROMOTION, AND CAREER STATUS

A. General Criteria Applicable for Advancement

Librarians are to be evaluated based on their activities in the **first** of the following criteria and, to the extent they are relevant, on **one or more** of Criteria 2-4. ([MOU Article 4.2](#); [APM 360-10](#))

Growth as a professional librarian requires ongoing study. Librarians are expected to seek opportunities to learn and to contribute to the improvement of the library/affiliated unit's services. Leadership is demonstrated when the librarian identifies improvements or new ideas, generates a plan of action, and brings the idea to fruition. Originality of ideas or concepts may be demonstrated in one's primary responsibilities through the recognition of problems and their workable resolution, or through dissemination of the results of one's work, which may include research and writing. Librarians' careers may include unsuccessful efforts at innovation and experimentation; professional growth may be demonstrated through insights gained and lessons learned.

The level of competence and scope of contribution required for continued advancement through the Series becomes greater as the librarian progresses.

Advancement through all ranks in the Librarian Series is open to all members of the Series regardless of any specialization and regardless of whether or not an individual has administrative responsibilities.

Contributions in Criteria 1-4, outlined below, are defined in the [MOU Article 4.C.2.a](#) and [APM 210-4.e.3.](#)

1. Professional Competence and Quality of Service within the Library (Criterion 1)

Although contributions in each of the following areas will vary considerably from person to person depending on each person's primary functions as a librarian, performance and potential shall be reviewed and evaluated in any or all of the major areas of librarianship:

For non-represented, managerial librarians: obtaining, organizing, and providing access to information resources; curating and preserving collections of scholarly, scientific, cultural, or institutional significance; engaging with users to provide them with guidance and instruction on the discovery, evaluation, and use of information resources and collections; carrying out research and creative activity in support of the foregoing and for the continual improvement of the profession; and, library administration and management.

For represented librarians: Selection and development of resources; bibliographic control of collections and their organization for use; reference and advisory service; development and application of specialized information systems; library non-managerial administrative duties as defined by HEERA; and research where necessary or desirable in relation to the foregoing.

Additionally, librarians should be evaluated on consistency of performance, grasp of library methods, command of their subjects, continued growth in their fields, judgment, leadership, originality, ability to work effectively with others, and ability to relate their functions to the more general goals of the library/affiliated unit and the University. Consistently excellent performance in Criterion 1 is the primary and essential consideration in any review for merit increase or promotion.

Evidence of effective service may include, but is not limited to:

- The opinions of professional colleagues, particularly those who work closely or continuously with the appointee;
- The opinions of faculty members, students, or other members of the University community as to the quality of a collection developed, for example, or the technical or public service provided by the candidate;
- The opinions of librarians outside the University who function in the same specialty as the candidate;
- The effectiveness of the techniques applied or procedures developed by the candidate;

- Relevant additional educational achievement, including programs demonstrating improvement of language or subject knowledge.

2. Professional Activity Outside the Library (Criterion 2)

A candidate's professional commitment and contribution to the library profession should be evaluated by taking account of such activities as the following:

- Membership and activity in professional and scholarly organizations;
- Participation in library and other professional meetings and conferences;
- Consulting or similar service;
- Outstanding achievement or promise as evidenced by awards, fellowships, grants;
- Teaching and lecturing.

3. University and Public Service (Criterion 3)

Evaluation of a candidate's university and public service should take into account University-oriented activities, including but not limited to the following:

- Membership or chairmanship of administrative committees appointed by the Chancellor, UL, or other university administrative officers;
- Membership or chairmanship of other university committees, including those of student organizations and of departments and schools other than the library such as service on thesis or dissertation portfolio committees;
- Service on UC-wide committees not required by Criterion 1 responsibilities;
- Professional librarian services to the community, state, and nation.

4. Research or Other Creative Activity (Criterion 4)

Research by practicing librarians has a growing importance as library, bibliographic, and information management activities become more demanding and complex. Librarian engagement in academic research enhances their ability to relate their functions to the more general goals of the University. It is therefore appropriate to take research into account in measuring a librarian's professional development. The evaluation of such research or other creative activity should be qualitative and not merely quantitative and should be made in comparison with the activity and quality appropriate to the candidate's areas of expertise. Note should be taken of continued and effective endeavors. This may include authoring, editing, reviewing, or compiling books, articles, reports, handbooks, manuals, and/or similar products which are submitted or published during the period under review.

B. Weighing the Contributions in Criteria 1-4

1. There is no single recommended pattern of development and performance for advancement within the Librarian Series. It is the responsibility of the individual librarian to determine the relevance of Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4 to their development and the degree of participation in each of these criteria. Communication between

candidate and RI is a critical component to monitoring performance and professional effectiveness in an ongoing manner.

2. Occasionally, organizational or professional pressures may make the optimum balance between Criterion 1 and Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4 difficult or impossible to achieve. In this situation, the RI and the candidate should work together to restore an appropriate balance, remembering in all cases the primacy of Criterion 1. A temporary imbalance should not adversely affect the merit action when the RI and the candidate have agreed that the candidate will be concentrating in one area for a sustained period. Such a temporary imbalance should not exceed one peer review cycle and should not be an ongoing situation or circumstance. While the factors contributing to this imbalance need to be clearly explained in the recommended action by the RI, when the Criterion 1 performance is outstanding and the unit has benefited significantly from the candidate's concentration on Criterion 1, a merit increase would be the appropriate action. Examples of appropriate circumstances might include severe staffing shortages within the unit or the undertaking of a special project for the unit that took all of the candidate's efforts.

If a candidate is being considered for promotion under these unusual circumstances, the candidate's Criterion 2, 3 and/or 4 contributions would need to be considered in light of the candidate's total career.

3. There may be more limited circumstances in which a candidate may wish to make a Criterion 2, 3 and/or 4 commitment that will limit their Criterion 1 contributions (for example, holding an office in a professional organization that will take a majority of the candidate's time). Again, if the candidate has worked with their RI to address Criterion 1 expectations and unit-wide workload concerns, this temporary imbalance should not adversely affect a merit action. If, however, a candidate has chosen to devote themselves to Criterion 2, 3 and/or 4 activities without working with their RI to address Criterion 1 expectations or unit-wide work-load concerns, other types of actions may be more appropriate.
4. Although there is no single recommended pattern of development and performance for advancement within the Librarian Series, there is an expectation of increasing and significant contributions that extend beyond the performance of immediate job responsibilities as librarians move through the Librarian Series. This means that in order to advance through the Librarian Series, librarians will need to gradually move away from almost exclusive concentration on the primary responsibilities in Criterion 1 toward increasing involvement with, and achievement in, one or more of the activities in Criterion 2, 3 and/or 4. In addition, the level of competence and the scope of contributions required for advancement become greater as the librarian moves through the series. Achievement in every criterion in a given review period is not a requirement for advancement. ([MOU Article 4](#); [APM 210-4.e](#) and [360-10.b](#))

5. Candidates undergoing their first review at UCLA may be eligible for review prior to completing a full review cycle. All participants in the review process should adjust expectations accordingly in recognition of shorter than normal review periods.

C. Quality of Criteria 2-4 Contributions

It is the quality and not the quantity of Criteria 2-4 activities that is important; therefore, fulfillment of contributions to Criterion 2, 3 and/or 4 is not achieved by merely showing some activity in the review period. Mediocre or low-level performance in all three Criteria would be unsatisfactory for advancement. The activities chosen by the candidate must be of value and relevance to the librarian's career. There is an expectation of a degree of excellence, of high quality involvement, and of responsibility that should be demonstrated by every librarian in the Series. The librarian advancing through the Series should become an increasingly valuable asset to the library and to the profession. Thus, the level of competence and the scope of contribution required for a merit increase become greater as a librarian advances in rank.

In evaluating professional activities in Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4, the quality of the involvement must be considered. For instance, passive membership on a committee that can point to no accomplishments is not valued as highly as active membership and/or leadership that results in commendation by the chair and/or results in a useful product or report. Attendance at a workshop is more highly valued when it results in an improvement in performance or in information that can be shared to the benefit of coworkers. Publication of a well-considered and carefully researched article in a professional journal is more highly valued than a brief article in the library newsletter.

D. Goals and Planning

In planning priorities for Criterion 1, the librarian should work with their RI to ensure that their job goals and objectives are compatible with and contribute to institutional goals and objectives. It is the responsibility of the individual librarian to determine goals in Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4 that are relevant to their career development. Goals should not be rigid; the librarian should be prepared to adjust them as their abilities grow and interests develop, as the strategic plans of the library/affiliated unit and the University evolve, and as the profession itself changes over time. If the goals change significantly during the review period (i.e. due to the COVID-19 pandemic), the candidate should briefly address why in their SOPA.

The review process as detailed in the *CALL*, the *MOU*, and the *APM*, mandates ongoing, regular consultation and communication between the librarian and RI. Such consultation can help each librarian to balance their activities in Criterion 1 with those in Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4, in order to progress through the Librarian Series, to advance the library/affiliated unit's strategic priorities and the University's academic plan, and to contribute to the profession.

E. Specific Types of Actions

1. Merit Increase

A merit increase is advancement following a positive review. Review for a merit increase is limited to evaluation of performance since appointment, or the last peer review action. The evaluation for merit increases primarily emphasizes performance in Criterion 1 (professional competence and quality of service within the library). As a candidate advances through the Librarian Series, there is the expectation that one's performance will demonstrate an increasing level of expertise with regards to job responsibilities and increasing achievement in Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4.

Failure to perform well in primary job assignments, even with strong contributions in Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4, may result in denial of merit increases and advancement.

There are two types of Merit actions:

a. Merit Increase

A normal, or standard, Merit Increase will usually result in an increase of two salary points on the applicable scale for Assistant and Associate Librarian ranks, and three salary points on the applicable scale for the Librarian rank. (*MOU Article 13.D.1*)

b. Merit with Exceptional Performance

A Merit with Exceptional Performance may result in an increase of more than two or three salary points (as outlined above), based on the nature of the outstanding performance as evidenced in the peer review file. (*MOU Article 13.D.1*)

The final decision for peer review actions rests with the UL as the UCLA Chancellor's designated University Official.

2. Promotion

A promotion is advancement to the next highest rank within this series. Promotion shall be justified by demonstrated superior professional skills and achievement and, in addition, demonstrated professional growth and accomplishment and/or the assumption of increased responsibility. The assumption of administrative responsibility is not a necessary condition for promotion. ([MOU Article 4.E.1.c](#); [APM 360-10.c](#))

Review for promotion consists of evaluation of the totality of the candidate's career, as a UCLA librarian in a potential career status position or career status position. A résumé or curriculum vitae covering the candidate's career prior to their appointment in a potential career or career status librarian position at UCLA is also needed for promotion.

“If, on the basis of a review, the individual does not meet the criteria for continuation or advancement, there is no obligation on the part of the University to continue, advance, or to promote.” ([MOU Article 4.C](#) and [APM 210-4.e.2](#))

There are two types of Promotion actions:

a. Promotion

A normal, or standard, Promotion will result in advancement to the next rank and a salary increase equivalent to two salary points for Assistants advancing to the Associate rank, or three salary points for Associates advancing to the Librarian rank. Candidates with potential career status will automatically achieve career status in conjunction with a promotion.

b. Promotion with Exceptional Performance

A Promotion with Exceptional Performance will result in advancement to the next rank and a salary increase greater than two salary points for Assistants moving to the Associate Rank, or greater than three salary points for Associates moving to the Librarian Rank, based on the nature of the outstanding performance as evidenced in the peer review file. Candidates with potential career status will automatically achieve career status in conjunction with a promotion. While the review for promotion considers the totality of the candidate’s career in a career status or potential career status position at UCLA, the review for exceptional performance must show that the candidate’s work exceeded expectations in the current review period. Thus, a candidate for promotion with exceptional performance must demonstrate superior professional skills and achievement as well as demonstrated professional growth and accomplishment and/or the assumption of increased responsibility throughout their career at UCLA in addition to exceeding expectations of performance in their current review period.

The final decision for peer review actions rests with the UL as the UCLA Chancellor’s designated University Official.

3. Exceptional Performance

A Merit with Exceptional Performance or a Promotion with Exceptional Performance is warranted when accomplishments by the candidate under review during the review period are **clearly beyond expectations**.

The peer review documentation for a recommendation of Exceptional Performance should provide **specific illustrations** of how the candidate’s performance exceeded expectations and **impacted** the library/affiliated unit, the campus, or the profession in a significant way.

Such accomplishments are expected to be **in addition** to excellent performance in fulfilling primary job responsibilities. Exceptional Performance recommendations may occur at any rank. As a candidate advances through the Librarian Series, there is the expectation that one's performance will demonstrate an increasing level of expertise with regards to job responsibilities and increasing achievement in Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4. Likewise, as a candidate advances through the Librarian Series, the expectations for Exceptional Performance also increase.

4. Career Status

A librarian in a potential career appointment may be awarded career status following careful and periodic review of performance, professional competence, achievement, and promise. Career status is achieved upon successful completion of a suitable trial period in potential career status. Possession of career status guarantees that a review will be conducted before a librarian is terminated for unsatisfactory performance. It is also a factor, after other considerations, in determining the order of layoff for librarians covered by the *MOU*. Both the criteria and procedures for a separate career status review are identical to those of a normal merit review.

The peer review documentation for a recommendation of career status should include a discussion of the librarian's professional competence as demonstrated by successful performance of primary job responsibilities, as well as evidence of and promise of continuing contributions in Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4. The period of eligibility for career status begins with the start date of a potential career appointment.

Associate Librarians and Librarians in potential career appointments may technically achieve career status at the earliest upon their two year work anniversary. For practical purposes this is usually done during the peer review cycle so career status may be awarded as of July 1 following their second anniversary, or on the second anniversary of their date of hire. However, a candidate may not be considered for career status until they have worked at least eighteen months during the review period.

- a. Career status is granted at the earliest upon the two year work anniversary in cases where a potential career Assistant Librarian is promoted to the rank of Associate Librarian and in cases where a potential career Associate Librarian is promoted to the rank of Librarian.
- b. A potential career librarian appointed at the Assistant Librarian rank must be considered for career status during their trial period of not more than six years and not less than two years unless promoted sooner to the rank of Associate Librarian. A potential career librarian appointed at the Associate Librarian rank must be considered for career status during their trial period of not more than four years and not less than two, unless promoted sooner to the rank of Librarian. A potential career librarian appointed at the Librarian rank must be considered for

recommendation to career status during their trial period of not more than three years and not less than two. Failure to attain career status during this period normally results in termination.

- 1) If recommended, career status may be included as part of a review action for merit increase. **The recommendation for career status must be explicitly indicated on the Academic Personnel Recommendation, the evaluation/recommendation statement, and other appropriate parts of the documentation.**
- 2) Career status may be recommended as a separate action not tied to a normal review action.
- 3) When considering the timing of the recommendation for career status, both the candidate and the RI should consider whether the candidate has had the opportunity to demonstrate both successful performance in their Criterion 1 job responsibilities, as well as evidence of contributions in Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4, so that the strongest possible packet may be submitted in support of that recommendation. There is no expectation that a candidate must pursue career status as soon as they are eligible. In cases where career status is not pursued at the first eligible opportunity, the RI should provide, within their recommendation, guidance to the candidate to support the candidate's progression towards achieving career status in a future review.

5. No Action

The normal expectation is that librarians will advance throughout the Librarian Series according to the normal review cycle at their rank. Associate Librarians with career status may remain at the top salary point of the rank as long as they are fulfilling their Criterion 1 responsibilities in an excellent fashion even if they lack sufficient Criteria 2-4 contributions to warrant advancement. This is called a No Action, and is a neutral, non-prejudicial action. To ensure that the appraisal process is regularly carried out for all librarians at UCLA, however, individuals remaining at the top salary points in both the Associate and Librarian ranks are reviewed according to the established review cycles for their rank.

A No Action (without prejudice) decision is the normal decision for a candidate choosing to continue for an indefinite duration at the top salary point of the Associate Librarian rank. It is also the normal decision for a candidate at the top salary point of the Librarian rank. However, candidates at the Librarian rank must be excellent in Criterion 1 and continue to perform in Criterion 2, 3 and/or 4.

A No Action (with prejudice) is a recommendation intended to address performance issues in Criterion 1, and includes the actions required to improve that performance for those at any rank. If performance issues persist, the Review Initiator will consult with the ADAHR. An off-cycle review may be conducted in the following peer review cycle. A No Action (with prejudice) decision and continued unsatisfactory performance may lead to termination (see [VI.E.6](#)).

In exceptional circumstances, a librarian who receives a No Action and who are not at the top of the salary scale, may be awarded a one point salary advancement at the Assistant and Associate Librarian ranks and a one or two point advancement at the Librarian rank. (*MOU Article 13.D.2*)

6. Termination

If a librarian's performance is unsatisfactory, the subsequent peer review may lead to a recommendation and final action of termination. A final action of termination ends the employment of a librarian after due notice. Review Initiators are required to consult with the ADAHR and provide the librarian with a written remediation plan, and sufficient time for the librarian to demonstrate improvement, prior to recommending an action of termination. ([MOU Article 4.D.5.g](#); [APM 360-17.b.7](#))

7. Off-Cycle Review

A candidate not normally eligible for review during a particular review cycle may request from their RI an off-cycle review during that cycle. An RI may also initiate an off-cycle review for the candidate. The decision to proceed with an off-cycle review is at the sole discretion of management, which can be either the candidate's RI or the Unit Head.

[FOR THE LIFE OF THE CURRENT *MOU* (APRIL 1, 2019 – MARCH 31, 2024), THE DECISION TO GRANT AN OFF-CYCLE REVIEW FOR REPRESENTED LIBRARIANS IS AT THE SOLE DISCRETION OF MANAGEMENT.]

An off-cycle review is a review that occurs in a different year than that in which a candidate is normally eligible at their particular rank and salary point. An off-cycle review is appropriate when:

- a. A potential career appointee in the Librarian Series becomes eligible for consideration for career status before the end of the peer review cycle and this action is sought without a corresponding merit increase or promotion according to the peer review calendar.
- b. An appointee in the Librarian Series is exceeding standard expectations of consistently excellent performance. In such exceptional cases the candidate may be recommended for a merit increase or a promotion in accordance with the peer review calendar but in an earlier year than the normal review cycle.
- c. If an appointee in the Librarian Series is not performing satisfactorily, a review may be conducted before the next regularly scheduled review cycle and in accordance with the peer review calendar. The results of such a review would normally be a No Action or Termination, but it could result in a merit increase.

8. Self-Initiated Actions

In cases when the candidate is normally eligible for review but the RI and the candidate do not agree on the proposed action, the candidate has the option of pursuing a self-initiated action. The ADAHR shall work with the candidate in preparing the documentation, solicit any supporting letters on the candidate's behalf, prepare redacted versions of these letters, and provide counseling to the candidate as necessary.

The review file may include statements by the RI, unit or department head, and/or supervisory AUL either in support of or in disagreement with the candidate's position.

Additionally, if the RI initiates an off-cycle review, a candidate may propose a self-initiated action through the rejoinder process. See section [VII.I](#) for information on rejoinders.

See section [VII.J](#) for additional information on self-initiated actions.

9. Extension

An extension is the approval by the UL of additional time within the current peer review cycle by extending the peer review calendar deadlines in particular actions. Only the UL can grant an extension; requests must be submitted by a candidate or RI in writing. An extension is not a deferral, which delays the review by one year.

10. Deferred Review ([MOU Article 4.e.2](#); [APM 360-80.a.2](#))

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 by the candidate or by the RI.

A review may be deferred if prolonged absences 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 approval to the UL. The UL's decisions concerning review deferrals shall not be subject to grievance or arbitration.

Deferral of review should be permitted for all career and potential career appointees in the Librarian Series of the University of California.

When a deferral takes place, the review is deferred for one year whether the person's review cycle is two years or three years. Hence deferral for an additional, consecutive year should be regarded as a new request and thus subject to the same approval process. After the completion of a review which has been deferred, the review cycle will resume anew at the two or three year interval. Work conducted

during the extended review period shall be reviewed as though it were completed in the normal period.

F. Candidates in Temporary Appointments

Temporary appointments fall under the following categories:

1. Appointments using library funds, which have a duration of two years or less;
2. Appointments using external funds (funds outside of the library budget) which are for a duration of two years or less. They may be continued for one additional year, upon approval by the UL;
3. Appointments using extramural funds (external funds from outside UCLA), which may be continued for the duration of the funding, upon approval by the UL.

A librarian in a temporary appointment will go through peer review if the length of the temporary appointment is at least as long as the normal review cycle for their rank within the Librarian Series.

A librarian in a temporary appointment who goes through peer review will follow all of the same procedures and steps in preparing their documentation as do librarians in potential career and career appointments. The sections of the *CALL* that discuss career status are not relevant to librarians in temporary appointments. Only librarians in potential career appointments are eligible to be considered for career status.

G. Criteria in Relation to Advancement through the Librarian Series

1. Assistant Librarian – Movement through the Rank and Promotion
 - a. Movement through the rank of Assistant Librarian is the first step in a progression that includes promotion to Associate Librarian, the attainment of career status by potential career appointees, and movement through the rank of Associate Librarian to, potentially, the rank of Librarian.
 - b. For Assistant Librarians, primary emphasis in evaluation for merit increases will be on Criterion 1. In their earliest years in the profession, librarians are most absorbed in continuing to learn from colleagues, locally and in wider contexts. As a candidate moves through the rank, there is the expectation that their performance will reflect an increasing breadth and depth of understanding of both job responsibilities and the larger library and professional context in which they occur.
 - c. Consideration of Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4 will not play a major role in advancement through the early stages of the Assistant Librarian rank.

However, since promotion to Associate Librarian is based on potential for further growth, the Assistant Librarian at the middle of the salary range should begin to demonstrate activity in some areas of Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4. Within Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4, a wide range of opportunities for involvement exists, such as membership on LAUC campus or system-wide committees and task forces; local, regional, state, national, or international service; and research, publication, or other creative activity. The spectrum of possibilities is typically informed by the candidate's interests and subject specialization. Typically, incumbents in the Assistant Librarian rank are expected to have more minimal involvement in such activities but would become increasingly active as their careers progressed towards promotion to the rank of Associate Librarian. For example, in regard to Criterion 2, an Assistant Librarian might begin to identify opportunities for professional growth and involvement, such as attending meetings, conferences, and workshops of professional associations and similar groups.

- d. If denial of a merit increase occurs, and performance does not improve significantly during the following year, termination may occur after a thorough review and due notice. ([MOU Article 4.D.5.a](#); [APM 360-17.b.1](#))
- e. For Assistant Librarians in potential career appointments, the conferral of career status does not occur except in conjunction with promotion to Associate Librarian. If promotion to Associate Librarian with career status does not occur within a reasonable time (normally not more than six years) the individual is subject to termination. ([MOU Article 4.D.5.b](#); [APM 360-17.b.1](#))
- f. Assistant Librarians who have demonstrated superior professional skills and achievement and, in addition, demonstrated professional growth and accomplishment and/or the assumption of increased responsibility should, after a sufficient number of years, be recommended for a promotion to Associate Librarian. The assumption of administrative responsibility is not a necessary condition of promotion. ([APM 360-17.b.1](#))

When an Assistant Librarian with potential career status has achieved a salary in a rank that overlaps with the next rank, they may request a promotional review. A positive review would result in promotion to the next rank. If it is determined that the Assistant Librarian is not meeting expectations for a librarian at their rank, and they do not earn promotion in accordance with the normal progression (normally six years), termination (after a thorough review and due notice) is the normal result.

Individuals with six years of service at the Assistant Librarian rank are eligible for a promotional review even if they have not achieved a salary that overlaps with the Associate Librarian rank.

- g. Review for promotion to Associate Librarian covers the candidate's entire period at UCLA in a potential career status or career status position. Promotion is granted

on the basis of evidence of maturing ability to handle the range of responsibilities assigned to the position and evidence of interest in, and commitment to, activities described in Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4.

2. Associate Librarian – Movement through the Rank and Promotion

- a. Movement through the rank of Associate Librarian is the next step in the progression and may include promotion to Librarian.
- b. Although primary emphasis in evaluation for merit increase remains on Criterion 1, there is the expectation of increased involvement in Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4 as a candidate moves through the rank. An Associate Librarian contemplating advancement to the rank of Librarian would begin to be actively involved in one or more of a broad range of activities, such as chairing committees or convening meetings, contributing as a speaker, panelist or presenter of scholarly papers, authoring published articles or books, or providing leadership in the development of innovative instructional techniques or technological applications of value to the library or to the profession.
- c. Movement through the rank of Associate Librarian requires a balance between Criterion 1 as well as Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4. Achievement in every criterion in a given review period is not a requirement for advancement. Failure to perform well in primary job assignments, even with strong contributions in Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4, will result in denial of merit advancement. Conversely, denial of merit advancement might also result if continuing active involvement in Criteria 2, 3, or 4 is not shown. Continued performance at an unsatisfactory level may be cause for a recommendation of termination.
- d. For Associate Librarians in potential career appointments in this rank, conferral of career status can occur in conjunction with a merit increase or promotion, or as a separate action.
- e. An individual may choose to remain at the top of the salary point scale for Associate Librarian indefinitely and without prejudice ([APM 360-80.a.2.1](#)). In addition, both the *MOU* and *APM* state: “There is no obligation on the part of the University to promote an Associate Librarian to the rank of Librarian solely on the basis of years of service.” ([MOU Article 4.D.5.c](#); [APM 360-17.b.3](#))

Promotion to the Librarian rank is not required to continue in career status. Denial of promotion to Librarian does not, in itself, constitute a judgment of unsatisfactory performance, nor does it preclude being considered again for promotion at a later time.

- f. Associate Librarians who have achieved a salary in a rank that overlaps with the next rank may be considered for promotion to Librarian. Associate Librarians are promoted to the rank of Librarian on the basis of demonstrated superior

professional skills and achievement as well as demonstrated professional growth and accomplishment and/or the assumption of increased responsibility. The assumption of administrative responsibility is not a necessary condition of promotion. ([MOU Article 4.C.1](#); [APM 360-10.c](#))

- g. Review for promotion to Librarian covers the candidate's entire career at UCLA in a potential career status or career status position. This review is necessarily more exacting in requirements than reviews for previous advancements; promotion to Librarian requires an increasing higher order of performance, and contribution to the library/affiliated unit, the University, and the profession than is expected at lower ranks.
3. Librarian – Movement through the Rank
- a. Movement through the rank of Librarian is the last step in the progression.
 - b. For Librarians, primary emphasis in evaluation for merit increase remains on Criterion 1. Advancement through the rank is dependent on substantial and significant achievement of the highest level on a continuing basis in Criterion 1, and Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4. A Librarian moving through the rank of Librarian would continue to demonstrate active involvement and significant achievement in one or more of a broad range of activities, such as chairing committees or convening meetings, contributing as a speaker, panelist or presenter of scholarly papers, writing articles or books which are published, or providing leadership in the development of innovative instructional techniques or technological applications of value to the library or to the profession. Those moving through the rank of Librarian must show evidence of a significantly expanding depth of professional achievement. Depth means recognized significant and useful professional contributions to appropriate associations on the state, national or international level, to the University or the community, or professional or scholarly publication or comparable creative activity. The opportunities and career paths are as varied as the appointees in the Series, but over the length of a career, the librarian is expected to take or create opportunities to make substantial contributions. Achievement in every criterion in a given review period is not a requirement for advancement.
 - c. Thus, movement through the rank of Librarian requires the candidate to maintain the same high level of achievement demonstrated for promotion or appointment to the rank. Failure to perform at this level may result in a No Action. Continued performance at an unsatisfactory level may be cause for termination.
 - d. For Librarians in potential career appointments in this rank, conferral of career status can occur in conjunction with a merit increase or as a separate action.

BACK TO TABLE OF CONTENTS

VII. THE PROCESS FOR MERIT INCREASE, PROMOTION, AND CAREER STATUS

The appraisal of candidates serves as the basis for the recommending action, and provides an opportunity for continuing dialogue between supervisors and appointees about quality of performance, accomplishments and achievements. The review process should be seen not only as an assessment of achievement accompanied by recommendations for appropriate recognition but also as a way to build professional competence and organizational strength.

A. Notice of Eligibility for Review

A review period is either two calendar years or three calendar years, in accordance with the review cycles defined in the *MOU* and *APM* ([MOU Article 4.E.2.a](#); [APM 360-80.2.a](#)). Librarians holding part-time appointments are to be evaluated on the same review schedule and by the same criteria as those with full-time appointments.

1. Determination of Eligibility for Review and Notification

- a. Each year prior to the beginning of the review process, LHR determines which librarians are eligible for review. Eligibility is determined according to the intervals for academic reviews stated in the *MOU and APM* as appropriate:

- 1) Assistant Librarians: Every two years;
- 2) Associate Librarian: Every two years;
- 3) Librarian: Every three years.

- b. Notification of Eligibility for Review

All librarians receive written notification of their eligibility for review and the peer review calendar from LHR by early October. Candidates under review and their RIs will also receive written notice of the candidates' eligible personnel actions. Both parties shall be asked to review the summary of options for accuracy.

2. Distribution of the *CALL*

The revised *CALL* is distributed online to all librarians and RIs no later than 30 calendar days prior to the first required action following the issuance of the *CALL*. The *CALL* is available on the LHR and LAUC-LA websites.

3. Role of the Review Initiator (RI)

The peer review process is more than a performance evaluation. The RI and the candidate share responsibility for ensuring that the peer review file presents a thorough picture of the entire period under review. **The RI serves as a guide for the candidate and for the peer review process.** As such, the RI is required to attend a peer review documentation workshop each year they have a candidate undergoing

peer review. This ensures that the RI has the most current information about the peer review process as changes are made to the CALL annually.

The RI should work together with the candidate to develop and set goals for each of the years encompassed by the review period, and should meet regularly with the candidate to evaluate progress.

Periodic discussions of performance expectations enable the RI to:

- Discuss changes within the department or organization;
- Provide a clear and up-to-date description of job responsibilities and performance expectations;
- Establish and review goals and clarify or agree upon timetables for meeting the goals.

The RI of a relatively new librarian may elect to prepare preliminary assessments and/or to provide formal written feedback on the librarian's performance at various times throughout the review period.

The RI works with the candidate to develop an accurate Statement of Responsibilities (hereinafter SOR).

There shall be one designated RI for a candidate, who shall make a recommendation for a personnel action which will be included in the review file.

The RI should acknowledge and document the librarian's contributions and performance during the review period in the formal evaluation.

When appropriate or necessary to document a librarian's contributions and performance during the review period, the RI should request comments providing a brief non-confidential assessment from former RIs or supplemental supervisors according to the requirements outlined in Section VII.E in the following situations:

- If a librarian has a split appointment and reports to a supplemental supervisor for a maximum of 49% of their time
- If a librarian has reported to a functional team lead in a matrixed structure
- If a librarian has served in an interim role at any time during the review period and reported to a different RI
- If a librarian reported to a former RI during the review period

The RI and candidate should confer on the impending review early and as often as necessary. The RI should make certain the candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process, including the criteria specified in the *MOU* and *APM*. The candidate shall be given the opportunity to ask questions and to supply pertinent information and evidence to be used in the review. In cases of promotion from the rank of Associate Librarian to Librarian, a discussion of the candidate's entire relevant professional history in a potential career status or career status position at UCLA is required.

B. The Candidate's Documentation

It is appropriate for candidates to work on their peer review documentation during work time. Since librarians are exempt employees (i.e. do not track time in terms of hours worked), it is reasonable to expect that librarians will use their best judgement to determine how to fit this work in without compromising essential work priorities, which in some cases may mean working a little longer than they normally would to complete their documentation.

All involved in the process should be aware that it is the candidate who determines the length of their documentation within the page limits established in the *CALL* for specific components. However, **it is strongly recommended that the candidate prepare concise documentation in support of the action.** It is also strongly recommended that the candidate focus on accomplishments that highlight the candidate's impact and communicate the value of their work. Comprehensive documentation is unnecessary; CAPA and the UL can request additional documentation if anything in the packet is unclear.

A candidate in a potential career appointment who was previously in a temporary librarian appointment at UCLA should bear in mind that the review period begins with the potential career appointment start date. The inclusive dates of the period of review must be consistent across all documentation included in the peer review file. Accomplishments achieved in the temporary appointment should be reflected in the résumé or curriculum vitae included in the required documentation.

1. List of Names for Letters of Assessment on Performance

- a. If letters of reference are required or desired for the review file, the candidate shall provide the RI with a list of persons indicating which areas of the candidate's performance each referee should be asked to address ([See Form 17](#)).

For example, letters may be solicited from faculty members, librarians and/or colleagues at UCLA, or colleagues at other organizations and institutions.

If possible, candidates should provide more names than actual letters that will be solicited by the RI in order to help ensure fairness and that the RI has sufficient options of persons from whom to request assessments. Typically, three or four letters are sufficient. However, it is understandable if librarians in the earlier stages of their career may not have as broad professional networks to submit more than three to four names.

The number of letters to be solicited will depend upon how many are needed to reflect adequate assessment of performance and contributions. The RI is not required to solicit letters from all individuals suggested by the candidate, nor is the RI restricted to that list of persons. RIs should solicit from others when they deem them to be important sources for evaluation for aspects of the candidate's work

with which the RI is unfamiliar, unless the persons are identified by the candidate as not being able to objectively evaluate their qualifications or performance.

If the RI has questions or concerns about the lists provided by the candidate, they should seek guidance from the ADAHR before soliciting letters.

- b. The candidate may also provide a list of persons the candidate believes might not objectively evaluate their qualifications or performance.
 - c. These lists shall be included in the review file.
2. Statement of Responsibilities (SOR) – *see also [Appendix C and Form # 15](#)*
- a. The SOR is a **concise** descriptive statement highlighting responsibilities, not specific tasks. It may include management and supervisory responsibilities as relevant to the position. It may also include an indication of the relative percentage of time spent in each major area of responsibility.
 - b. Development of the candidate's SOR is the joint responsibility of the candidate and the RI; both parties should sign and date it for inclusion in the file. If there is disagreement, the candidate and/or RI should consult with LHR to mediate a resolution. If no agreement is possible, it is incumbent on the RI to finalize the SOR. Once the SOR is finalized, both parties should sign and date it for inclusion in the file. The SOR should be periodically reviewed and updated as needed.
 - c. Candidates should revise or prepare a separate SOR whenever they change position, responsibilities, and/or reporting structure. The SOR documents a common understanding of responsibilities between a librarian and RI. Therefore, a new SOR should be executed any time a librarian reports to a new RI. Each SOR or revision should include **beginning and ending** (if applicable) **dates**. Include all SORs that cover the entire review period. Both librarians and RIs are encouraged to review the SOR annually to determine if revisions are needed.
3. Data Summary – *see also [Appendix D and Form # 4](#)*

- a. Purpose

The Data Summary provides a history of the academic and professional career of the candidate during the period under review. Authorized library administrators, CAPA and ad hoc committees consult the Data Summary when considering personnel actions. Other parties involved in the evaluation process also consult the data summary in the development of evaluation/recommendation statements. Candidates may choose to limit Data Summary entries to selected accomplishments and activities that demonstrate their impact and communicates the value of their work. Candidates should not add the same entry in more than one criterion.

- 1) For merit reviews: Submit a Data Summary for the period under review. If this is the candidate's first review, the librarian must also submit a résumé or curriculum vitae of their career prior to appointment as a librarian at UCLA; this should be the same copy of the résumé or curriculum vitae that the candidate used to apply to the UCLA librarian position. A candidate in a potential career appointment who was previously in a temporary librarian appointment at UCLA should bear in mind that the review period begins with the potential career appointment start date. The inclusive dates of the Data Summary must be consistent with the period under review. Accomplishments achieved in the temporary appointment should be reflected in the résumé or curriculum vitae.
- 2) For career status and promotion reviews: Submit an accumulated Data Summary for the entire career as a potential career librarian at UCLA. A résumé or curriculum vitae which represents the candidate's career prior to appointment as a potential career librarian is also required; this should be the same copy of the résumé or curriculum vitae that the candidate used to apply to the UCLA librarian position.

b. Content

1) Professional Competence and Quality of Service Within the Library

This may include and is not limited to:

- Substantive documents, such as reports and manuals, prepared for internal use or related to the candidate's responsibilities as reflected in the SOR
- Criterion 1 library instruction, including teaching and preparation of instructional materials **if it** is part of the candidate's primary job responsibilities
- Participation in UC-wide committees on which membership is required as part of the candidate's primary responsibilities

2) Professional Activity Outside the Library

This may include and is not limited to:

- Service and contributions to professional and scholarly associations, e.g., committee work, program participation as panelist or discussion leader, offices held, consulting work, or editorial activity outside of primary responsibilities.
- Teaching courses for credit through another academic department

3) University and Public Service

This may include and is not limited to:

- University-oriented activities outside the scope of the primary job responsibilities, such as membership or chairmanship of administrative

committees appointed by the Chancellor, UL, or other University administrative officers

- Membership or chairmanship of other University committees, including those of student organizations and of the departments and schools other than the library/affiliated unit such as service on thesis or dissertation portfolio committees.
- Service and contributions to LAUC, both locally and statewide
- Service and contributions to UCLA-wide or UC-wide committees, working groups, etc. (including special contributions, such as chairing or undertaking special projects, that exceed the required participation in such groups mandated by the candidate's primary responsibilities).
- Professional librarian services to the community, state, and nation, including as a consultant, speaker, or expert to groups, officials or associations.

4) Research or Other Creative Activity

This may include and is not limited to:

- Research completed or portions thereof completed during the review period, research in progress and/or continuing projects
- Grants and/or fellowships awarded to support such activities should be reported and the resulting publications cited
- Authoring, editing, reviewing or compiling books, articles, reports, handbooks, manuals and/or similar products which are submitted for publication or published during the period under review, and other creative activity such as preparation of exhibits that are not a part of Criterion 1 responsibilities. (Documents, projects, exhibits, etc., prepared for internal use or related to the candidate's responsibilities as reflected in the SOR should be included under Section I in the Data Summary.)

4. Statement of Professional Achievements (SOPA) – see also [Appendix E and Form # 14](#)

Note: Limit the entire SOPA to five pages -- up to seven pages for Promotion, Career Status, or Exceptional Performance. Brevity and conciseness are expected.

Excessively lengthy documentation obscures the value and impact of significant accomplishments. Any exceptions to the required page limitations must be approved by the ADAHR prior to uploading documentation to Opus.

The candidate under review must prepare a SOPA, which is a review of pertinent information and evidence of the candidate's professional contributions and impact in Criterion 1 and in their choice of Criteria 2, 3, and/or 4. The candidate does not have to provide in-depth detail on each of their goals. Rather, they should focus on their highest priority goals and most significant accomplishments that clearly demonstrate impact and communicate the value of their work. The candidate's discussion of progress on goals and accomplishments should be clearly organized in the SOPA to reflect the appropriate criteria. They may also include what inspires their work or unsuccessful

efforts at innovation and experimentation that demonstrate professional growth through insights gained and lessons learned.

- a. For merit actions, exceptional performance, and No Action reviews, the SOPA should cover the time period of the review cycle.
- b. For promotion actions and/or career status, the SOPA should cover the candidate's entire relevant professional history in a potential career status or career status position at UCLA, and emphasize the current review cycle.

5. Librarian Goals Template – see also [Form # 5](#)

The Librarian Goals Template provides a list of the candidate's goals for the upcoming review period. It is designed to be used by the librarian and the RI to articulate goals and to document and list additional/new goals developed during the review period. The candidate and the RI should review this document regularly throughout the review period.

Goals should be specific enough to promote a common understanding between the candidate and the RI and to facilitate accountability. The number and nature of goals will vary widely across the library/affiliated units depending on position responsibilities, professional interests, and the stage of the individual's career. Librarians and RIs are encouraged to think expansively about how to evaluate progress towards goals as not all goals have easily quantifiable outcomes.

6. Supplemental Documents

Supplemental documentation is not required. It should be included judiciously and only when adding value to the file. Supplemental documentation need not be included when the material is available online and a link to the documentation can be provided.

C. Meetings between the RI and the Candidate

When the candidate has completed their documentation, the documents shall be assembled and submitted to the RI. A key component of the peer review process is the series of meetings between the RI and the candidate and the exchange of pertinent information. It is the responsibility of both the candidate and the RI to work together to present a thorough picture of the entire review period. There is no maximum number of meetings to discuss documentation.

After the candidate has submitted the SOR(s), Data Summary, and the SOPA to the RI, the RI must meet with the candidate to discuss performance and mutual expectations for the personnel action and to discuss the candidate's documentation in detail. An understanding of the appropriate steps that will take place should be established, along with a timeline of due dates and planned additional meetings. This will ensure that an overall plan is in place to meet all calendar deadlines and allows both RI and candidate to schedule all planned meetings in advance.

The RI must provide the candidate an opportunity to raise questions, to supply appropriate information, and to submit evidence throughout the process. This may include an outline focused on Criterion 1 aspects of the job performance that may serve as a reference point for the RI, as well as the names of persons from whom letters would or would not be appropriate, if applicable.

The RI must supply the candidate with a copy of the draft evaluation and redactions of confidential letters that have been added to the file. The candidate must be allowed a reasonable period of time (at least seven consecutive calendar days) to review the evaluation and recommendation. If the candidate feels that a rejoinder is called for, the RI must allow a reasonable period of time (at least seven consecutive calendar days) for the rejoinder, or for a statement of intent to gather further information as necessary. The rejoinder and/or statement must be included in the review file.

D. Request for Confidential Letters – *see also* [Appendix F](#)

Confidential letters are required when the candidate is being considered for Merit with Exceptional Performance, Promotion, or Promotion with Exceptional Performance, and may be solicited in other cases as well. Letters may describe contributions to any of the four criteria.

Confidential letters of assessment are the only acceptable mechanism by which outside input is invited into the peer review process.

The candidate shall provide the RI with a list of persons from whom confidential letters are appropriate. The candidate may also provide in writing to the RI a list of persons who in the view of the candidate, for reasons set forth, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications or performance. Any such list(s) provided by the candidate shall be included in the review file (see [Form 17](#)).

The number of letters to be solicited will depend upon how many are needed to reflect adequate assessment of performance and contributions. The RI is not required to solicit letters from all individuals suggested by the candidate, nor is the RI restricted to that list of persons. It is recommended that candidates provide more names than actual letters that will be solicited by the RI in order to help ensure fairness and that the RI has sufficient options of persons from whom to request assessments. However, it is understandable if librarians in the earlier stages of their career may not have as broad professional networks to submit more than three to four names.

RIs should solicit from others when they deem them to be important sources for evaluation. The RI is encouraged to limit letters of assessment to referees who can clearly demonstrate the impact of the work and contributions discussed in the letter of assessment. Typically, three or four letters are sufficient.

If the RI has questions or concerns about the lists provided by the candidate, they should seek guidance from the ADAHR before soliciting letters.

The [Request for Letter of Assessment on Performance](#) is included in the Appendices and must be used to request letters of assessment. Note that it includes the University of California policy regarding confidentiality for Letters of Recommendation for Academic Appointment or Promotion, which must be included in every such request for a letter assessing performance.

If confidential letters are requested by the RI or an authorized representative of the UL, they must be included in the peer review file, along with the Sample Letter from the Review Initiator to Referees to Request Confidential Letters of Assessment on Performance. To ensure timeliness of the process, RIs should forward confidential letters immediately to LHR upon receipt for redaction; LHR will provide RI with redacted copies and RI will provide to the candidate for their review and comment (if warranted), and for inclusion in the file. LHR will add the original, un-redacted letter to the file after candidate submits. All confidential letters, in both full and redacted form, must be included in the file, regardless of whether letters are required for the specific recommended action.

- E. Request for Non-Confidential Assessment from Supplemental Supervisor or Former RI – see also [Form # 6-A](#)

Note: Limit comments to two pages.

A candidate's current RI should solicit a non-confidential assessment from supplemental supervisor(s) or previous RI(s) if the candidate had a supplemental supervisor or former RI who supervised the candidate for more than six months of the review period. If a supplemental supervisor or former RI supervised the candidate for less than six months of the review period, an assessment is not required but may be requested and included.

The current RI should request the assessment from each former RI or supplemental supervisor in writing. The former RI(s) or supplemental supervisor(s) should complete [Form #6-A](#) to provide the non-confidential assessment in writing, and the non-confidential assessment should be included in the file. If the current RI is unable to obtain a written assessment from the former RI, the current RI should attempt to conduct a phone interview to seek the former RI's input and incorporate the information into the evaluation or as a separate transcript attached to the RI's evaluation and recommendation.

If former RI(s) or supplemental supervisor(s) do not provide a non-confidential assessment, this should not be prejudicial against the candidate, but the current RI should note the omission of the non-confidential assessment in the RI's evaluation if applicable.

- F. RI's Evaluation & Recommendation – see also [Form # 6](#)

Note: Limit the evaluation to three pages -- up to five pages for Promotion, Career Status, or an action with Exceptional Performance.

The primary goals of the evaluation are to describe how well the candidate met performance expectations in their primary area(s) of responsibility and to assess and report on the value of the accomplishments and contributions of a candidate under review. As a reminder, in addition to Criterion 1, candidates are expected to participate in activities in Criterion 2, 3, and/or 4. Therefore, the evaluation should discuss the candidate's efforts in the other criteria. In addition, the RI should discuss how the candidate has contributed to the profession through Criterion 1 and any other criteria in which the candidate has participated. In the case of exceptional performance or exceptional accomplishments during the period under review, the RI may recommend a merit or promotion with exceptional performance.

The evaluation should cover the entire period specified for the recommended action, and should not be limited simply to recent months. It is helpful to have drafts of the candidate's Data Summary and SOPA before writing the evaluation. The inclusive dates of the period of review must be consistent across all documentation in the peer review file.

The essential elements to place in the evaluation are:

- Action(s) proposed;
- Discussion of Criteria 1-4 performance based on personal observation and experience;
- Comments on the candidate's progress towards achievement of goals for the current review period;
- Discussion of if and how goals were accomplished, the resulting outcomes and/or impact on the unit, the library/affiliated unit, and the organization;
- Discussion of future goals;
- In cases where career status is not pursued at the first eligible opportunity, the RI should provide, within their recommendation, guidance to the candidate to support the candidate's progression towards achieving career status in a future review.

The evaluation should include specific examples of activities accomplished first in Criterion 1 and then in other criteria. The evaluation should focus on significant and impactful accomplishments rather than being a comprehensive list. The RI should include descriptions of extenuating circumstances or unusual events that may have influenced the candidate's ability to meet expectations. A discussion of how the candidate's professional development activities in all criteria contribute to furthering the goals of the library/affiliated unit and the profession should be a part of the evaluation.

There should be no surprises for the candidate in the RI's review. Discuss the candidate's strengths and any areas for potential growth or development. When appropriate, constructive criticism may be included assuming the RI has discussed with the candidate any problematic issues throughout the review period and there are

ongoing performance concerns. If needed, the RI should include concrete suggestions for how to improve performance, which can be incorporated into future goals if appropriate. If the RI's recommendation is "termination," the evaluation should be explicit about how the librarian has failed to meet the goals of a remediation plan so severely that "no action with prejudice" is insufficient.

The RI must present the candidate with a copy of the evaluation/recommendation, copies of any comments from supplementary supervisors or former RIs, and copies of any redacted confidential letters that will be added to the review file. The candidate must be allowed a reasonable period of time (at least seven consecutive calendar days) to review the evaluation/recommendation. If the candidate feels that a rejoinder is called for, the RI must allow a reasonable period of time (at least seven consecutive calendar days) for the rejoinder, or for a statement of intent to gather further information as necessary. The rejoinder and/or statement must be included in the review file.

G. Meetings between the RI, Department Head, and the Supervisory AUL

The RI will assess the documentation and will discuss with the unit or department head the nature of the action to be recommended. The RI will then meet with the candidate to discuss the proposed action. The RI then prepares a draft statement of the evaluation and recommendation.

If problems are anticipated, the draft should be shown to the unit or department head first and then to the appropriate supervisory AUL (or in the case of librarians in affiliated units, the appropriate administrator). Then the draft statement should be shown to the candidate. If the candidate has a minor disagreement with the statement, it may be negotiated and resolved at this point. If the candidate has a major, continuing disagreement with the evaluation/recommendation which cannot be resolved, they may prepare a rejoinder outlining the areas of disagreement to submit to the RI and for the file. Both documents will be transmitted together by the unit or department head to the appropriate supervisory AUL (or appropriate administrator for librarians in affiliated units).

The unit or department head will discuss the draft evaluation, supporting documentation, and recommended action with the appropriate supervisory AUL. If the unit or department head and/or RI and the candidate have disagreed as to the recommendation or the content of the evaluation, the supervisory AUL may hold a meeting with the candidate, the unit or department head and the RI before the final evaluation is prepared. If appropriate, a written report of the outcome of the meeting may be included in the final evaluation.

H. Additional Documentation – Merit with Exceptional Performance, Promotion, or Promotion with Exceptional Performance

Merit with Exceptional Performance, Promotion, and Promotion with Exceptional Performance recommendations require letters of assessment on performance. Sources

of letters may include the candidate's colleagues, especially if their remarks will be important to support the recommended action. Because Merit with Exceptional Performance, Promotion, or Promotion with Exceptional Performance may require letters from outside the unit and/or outside the library/affiliated unit, and these letters will need to be redacted before being added to the peer review file, both the RI and the candidate must take into account the time to coordinate and plan.

The RI will provide the candidate redacted copies of all confidential letters of recommendation received. Redacted information shall include: Name, title, institutional affiliation, and relationship to the candidate. Both the original and the redacted letters are included in the candidate's review file, although the candidate only receives copies of the redacted versions.

- a. Promotion documentation must include a Data Summary and SOPA for the entire period of employment as a UCLA librarian, as well as a résumé or curriculum vitae covering the candidate's career prior to employment within UCLA in a potential career librarian appointment; this should be the same copy of the résumé or curriculum vitae that the candidate used to apply to the UCLA librarian position. In the case of exceptional performance and/or accomplishments during the period under review, the RI may recommend a Promotion with Exceptional Performance. The review for exceptional performance must show that the candidate's work exceeded expectations in the current review period.

I. Rejoinder – *see also* [Form # 16](#)

A rejoinder is a statement prepared and submitted to the RI by a candidate who wishes to comment on their evaluation, recommendation, or any other document added to the peer review file by other parties involved in the review process. For example, a rejoinder may correct statements considered to be unwarranted or incorrect, amplify statements considered to be inadequate, add significant achievements to the record, or respond to statements in confidential letters. The candidate may also simply wish to present a different perspective on their performance.

Where a rejoinder includes a self-initiated action, the proposed action must be explicitly stated in the rejoinder.

J. Self-Initiated Action

In cases when the candidate is normally eligible for review, but the RI and the candidate do not agree on the proposed action, the candidate has the option of pursuing a self-initiated action. In such cases, the candidate shall contact the ADAHR. The self-initiated action shall include a rejoinder to clarify the candidate's case for the action and the areas of disagreement with the RI's assessment. The proposed action must be explicitly stated in the rejoinder.

A candidate not normally eligible for review also may prepare off-cycle documentation for a Merit/Merit with Exceptional Performance, Career Status, or Promotion/Promotion with Exceptional Performance when they believe such action to be warranted and the RI disagrees.

(For the life of the current *MOU* (April 1, 2019-March 31, 2024), the decision to grant an off-cycle review for represented librarians is at the sole discretion of management. For questions, please contact the ADAHR.)

If the RI initiates an off-cycle review, the candidate may propose a self-initiated action through the rejoinder process. See section [VII.I](#) for additional information on rejoinders.

In self-initiated actions, the ADAHR will work with the candidate in preparing the documentation and will solicit any supporting letters on the candidate's behalf, prepare redacted versions of these letters, and provide counseling to the candidate as necessary.

The review file may include statements by the RI, unit head, or department head, and/or supervisory AUL either in support of or in disagreement with the candidate's position.

K. Unit or Department Head's Comments – see also [Form # 7](#)

Note: Limit comments to two pages.

The inclusive dates of the period of review must be consistent across all documentation in the peer review file.

At the time of the review, if the unit or department head is also functioning as the candidate's RI, there will be no separate unit or department head comments for that review. Instead, the unit or department head will use Form #6 and follow the procedures for RI evaluation and recommendation.

If the RI is not the unit or department head (or the equivalent for librarians in affiliated units), the RI shall keep the unit or department head appropriately informed of the review process. The RI shall share the entire review file with the unit or department head before submitting it for any supervisory AUL review.

The unit or department head will add comments to the documentation before the RI submits it to the next review level. The comments consist of a statement indicating agreement or disagreement with the RI's recommendation, and may include a brief narrative. This narrative does not need to reiterate the RI's evaluation but should succinctly discuss impactful accomplishments within the context of the unit or department.

There should be no surprises for the candidate in the Unit/Department Head's comments. When appropriate, constructive criticism may be included assuming the unit/department head and/or the RI have discussed with the candidate any problematic

issues throughout the review period and there are ongoing performance concerns. If needed, the unit or department head should include concrete suggestions for how to improve performance, which can be incorporated into future goals if appropriate.

If the unit or department head does not support the recommendation of the RI, the unit or department head shall submit a written statement outlining their reasons and shall provide a copy to the candidate and to the RI before the review record is sent to the supervisory AUL.

The candidate may submit a rejoinder in response to the comments of the unit or department head. The candidate must be given a reasonable amount of time (at least seven consecutive calendar days) to respond to the unit or department head's comments. The RI may also include in their evaluation a response to the unit or department head's comments, in which case the candidate will have another opportunity to respond.

- L. Supervisory AUL's Comments (or equivalent administrator in affiliated units) —*See also [Form # 8](#)*

Note: Limit comments to two pages.

This document is optional for librarians in affiliated units.

The inclusive dates of the period of review must be consistent across all documentation in the peer review file.

At the time of the review, if the person who is the supervisory AUL for the candidate is also functioning as the candidate's RI, there shall be no separate AUL comments for that review. Instead, the supervisory AUL will use [Form #6](#) and follow the procedures for RI evaluation and recommendation.

In other cases, the supervisory AUL shall review the entire file and indicate whether they concur or do not concur with the RI's recommendation. Comments are optional when the AUL concurs with the RI's recommended action. Comments are required if the AUL does not concur. The AUL's narrative does not need to reiterate the RI's evaluation but should succinctly discuss impactful accomplishments from the perspective of the AUL's entire portfolio.

There should be no surprises for the candidate in the AUL's comments. When appropriate, constructive criticism may be included assuming the AUL, the unit or department head, and/or the RI have discussed with the candidate any problematic issues throughout the review period and there are ongoing performance concerns. If needed, the AUL should include concrete suggestions for how to improve performance, which can be incorporated into future goals if appropriate.

If the AUL does not support the recommended action, the AUL shall submit a written statement outlining their reasons and shall provide a copy to the candidate and to the RI and/or unit or department head.

The candidate may submit a rejoinder in response to the comments of the AUL. The candidate must be given a reasonable amount of time (at least seven consecutive calendar days) to respond to the AUL's comments. The RI may also include in their evaluation a response to the AUL's comments, in which case the candidate will have another opportunity to respond.

M. Final Certification of the Process – see also [Form # 3 and Form # 3-C](#)

The *Review Initiator's Certification Statement* ([Form # 3-C](#)) and the *Candidate's Certification Statement* ([Form # 3](#)) should be the last items completed before the file is submitted to LHR.

Before the review file is forwarded to the appropriate unit or department head and the supervisory AUL (or the equivalent administrator for librarians in affiliated units), the candidate must be provided the opportunity to review the file as it is to be submitted to LHR, with the exclusion of non-redacted confidential letters.

Once the file is reviewed by the unit or department head and supervisory AUL and their comments have been made, the candidate must also complete a *Candidate's Certification Statement*, which becomes part of the review file. The certification statement serves as further assurance that the candidate was given every possible opportunity to contribute to the process, to respond to statements made about their performance, and to make amendments to the file.

The *Candidate's Certification Statement* also documents whether the candidate has submitted instructions regarding the exclusion of any CAPA members or, in cases where an ad hoc committee may be formed to review the file, documents the librarian(s) whom the candidate wishes to exclude, if any, from serving on an ad hoc committee. CAPA is informed of all exclusions.

The *Review Initiator's Certification Statement* documents that the RI oversaw the peer review process as specified in the *CALL* and that the peer review documentation was submitted according to dates specified in the *Peer Review Calendar*.

The inclusive dates of the period of review must be consistent across all documentation in the peer review file. Care must be taken that documents submitted in the review file are certified by the appropriate persons. If any material is added to the file after the candidate has completed the *Certification Statement* and the file has been submitted to LHR, a *Checklist Addendum & Candidate's Certification Statement* (see [Form # 3B](#)) must be certified by the candidate and submitted along with the additional documentation.

VIII. PEER REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR MERIT INCREASE, PROMOTION, AND CAREER STATUS

A. Assistant Director of Academic Human Resources (ADAHR)

The ADAHR is responsible for coordinating the preparation of peer review files for CAPA review. The ADAHR also expedites the flow of completed files to and from the UL.

B. Committee on Appointments, Promotion & Advancements (CAPA)

1. Functions of CAPA

- a. **CAPA shall guard the confidentiality of individual review cases.**
- b. CAPA oversees and coordinates the peer review component of the review process by reviewing all review files, including the statements of departmental reviewers and the reports of ad hoc committees, and makes final recommendations to the UL.
- c. CAPA reviews all personnel recommendations including recommendations for cases requiring ad hoc committees.

1) Exclusion

Candidates may exclude members of CAPA from participating in the review of their action. CAPA is informed of all exclusions.

2) Disqualification

A member of CAPA shall not participate in reviewing a file when:

- a) Their own file is being reviewed.
- b) They have been responsible for performing or approving the departmental review or have submitted a letter of assessment for the review.
- c) They question their ability to make an objective judgment in a particular case or feel there is a possible conflict of interest.

3) Quorum

CAPA members shall make every effort to participate in all cases. A minimum of five CAPA members must be available to review and determine the action

on any file. When a quorum is lacking, previous CAPA members shall be called upon to constitute a quorum beginning with those who served most recently.

- d. CAPA appoints eligible persons to serve on ad hoc committees whenever they are required or requested. Ad hoc committees review the following actions:
 - Off-cycle review (action may also include career status)
 - Promotion (action may also include career status)
 - Self-Initiated Action
 - Any review for which a candidate has requested an ad hoc committee
 - Any review for which CAPA has requested an ad hoc committee
 - e. CAPA shall keep confidential records of the composition of all ad hoc committees appointed during the peer review cycle. Membership of ad hoc committees is known only to the CAPA Chair and/or Chair-Elect.
 - f. CAPA Chair or Chair-Elect will request additional documentation as needed for the ad hoc committees, and assists these committees where needed. Additional documentation may include copies of previous peer review files.
 - g. As necessary, the UL and CAPA may correspond or consult about specific appointment and review cases or issues.
 - h. In order to ensure the confidentiality of CAPA deliberations, there should be no direct communication between any participant in the review concerning the peer review process and any member of CAPA. Participants include candidates, RIs, section or department heads, and supervisory AULs.
 - i. CAPA makes annual reports to the LAUC-LA membership, reporting on the peer review process and highlighting any issues or recommendations for reform of the process or the supporting documentation.
 - j. CAPA evaluates review procedures and documentation and recommends changes to LAUC-LA and to the UL.
 - k. CAPA advises LAUC-LA and/or the UL on academic personnel matters.
2. Instructions to CAPA for Performing Reviews
- a. CAPA acts as the sole review committee for files that are not referred to an ad hoc committee.
 - b. For files that are referred to an ad hoc committee, the CAPA Chair or Chair-Elect shall notify CAPA when the file is ready for review.
 - c. CAPA's review shall be based on an objective appraisal of the recommendation and documentation in relation to the criteria in the *MOU* and *APM*. CAPA shall determine whether, in its judgment, the overall performance of the candidate

warrants the proposed action and whether the documentation supports the recommendation of the RI.

- d. The documentation required to be submitted differs depending on the type of action presented to the committee and whether the candidate is from an affiliated unit.
 - e. Documentation incorrectly prepared or lacking sufficient detail to make a sound determination on the merits shall be returned for amplification or additional documentation, through LHR.
 - 1) If CAPA feels that a Merit with Exceptional Performance, Promotion, Promotion with Exceptional Performance, or Career Status may be warranted in the case before it, CAPA may recommend a different action, and request additional supporting documentation if necessary, even if the review file does not indicate that any of these actions are being recommended or considered.
 - 2) In order to amplify the performance record in specific areas and to ensure that all contributions of the candidate in their assigned responsibilities are fairly considered, CAPA may name an individual from whom the RI shall request additional documentation, or CAPA may request the RI select an individual from whom the RI shall request assessment of a specific area of performance.
 - 3) Such documentation shall be added to the review file after the candidate has been given copies of any non-confidential material and redacted copies of any confidential material added to the review file. The candidate and RI shall be provided an opportunity to submit a written statement in response to the additions to the review file.
 - 4) The *Checklist Addendum & Candidate's Certification* ([Form # 3-B](#)) must be completed and submitted with any documentation added to the file in order to verify that these steps have been completed.
 - f. Each CAPA member is responsible for ensuring that all notes and preliminary drafts containing confidential information are destroyed.
3. The *CAPA Report & Recommendation to the University Librarian* ([Form #11-A](#)) shall include the following:
- a. Name of the person reviewed;
 - b. Action recommended by the RI, an indication of the current and proposed rank, and current salary;

- c. A statement indicating whether CAPA agrees or disagrees with the RI's recommendation. If the committee does not concur with the RI's recommendation, it should specify what action it recommends;
 - d. A brief narrative supporting CAPA's recommendation to the UL, including the rationale for their recommendation. The report shall address each area of the criteria outlined in the *MOU* or the *APM* (bulleted lists are acceptable);
 - e. If CAPA cannot come to a unanimous decision, the nature of the disagreement and reasons therefore shall be communicated either in the body of the report or in separate statements by individual members;
 - 1) In cases involving a minority opinion, the minority member(s) of CAPA may also submit a written report;
 - 2) If there is no majority opinion, but there is a quorum, CAPA shall submit multiple reports.
 - f. The names of CAPA members who participated in reviewing the action shall appear as the last, separate page of the report.
4. The Chair shall add CAPA's recommendation to the candidate's review file and transmit it to LHR.
- C. Ad Hoc Committees

1. Purpose & Duties of Ad Hoc Committees

Each ad hoc committee shall be separately constituted for the purpose of reviewing a recommended peer review action.

Ad hoc committees review the following actions:

- Promotion (may also include Career Status)
- Promotion with Exceptional Performance (may also include Career Status)
- Off-Cycle review (may also include Career Status)
- Self-Initiated Action
- Any review for which a candidate has requested an ad hoc committee
- Any review for which CAPA has requested an ad hoc committee

Each ad hoc committee shall review the documentation and shall be responsible for assessing the individual's performance during a given review period to determine whether the recommended action is warranted.

2. Appointment to Ad Hoc Committees

It shall be a professional responsibility of each librarian at UCLA to serve on ad hoc committees.

- a. The CAPA Chair or Chair-Elect appoints ad hoc committees for all actions listed above. The membership of ad hoc committees is known only to the CAPA Chair or Chair-Elect. Additionally, the ADAHR or the Senior Academic Personnel Analyst coordinate the assignment of permissions to ad hoc committee members in Opus and therefore have access to information regarding the composition of ad hoc committees.
 - 1) For actions not requiring an ad hoc committee, CAPA may appoint one whenever it deems it appropriate.
 - 2) A candidate may request that CAPA convene an ad hoc committee, via the submission of the *Candidate's Certification Statement – Exclusions* ([Form #3-A](#)) for any type of action. This form should be submitted directly to the ADAHR.
 - b. All librarians in the Librarian Series are eligible to serve on ad hoc committees. The [LAUC-LA website includes a directory](#) of all UCLA librarians as well as certain employees whose classifications are outside the Librarian series, including but not limited to the UL, supervisory AULs, Assistant or Associate Law Librarians, and the Law Librarian. For questions about who is eligible to serve, please contact the ADAHR.
 - c. Ad hoc committee members can be appointed from any rank in the Librarian Series.
 - d. Ad hoc committee members can be in career, potential career, or temporary appointments.
3. Composition of Ad Hoc Committees
- a. Members of CAPA may not serve on an ad hoc committee.
 - b. Former members of CAPA are not required to serve on ad hoc committees the immediate year following the conclusion of their CAPA term; however, they are not excluded from serving if they expressly wish to do so.
 - c. Librarians who have contributed confidential documentation to a review file may not serve on the ad hoc committee for that review.
 - d. Each ad hoc committee shall consist of three members as follows:
 - 1) In the case of Promotion or Promotion with Exceptional Performance, at least two members of the ad hoc committee shall have rank equal to, or above, that for which the candidate is being considered. If necessary (particularly to gain the appropriate mix of membership), librarians of the appropriate rank from other UC campuses from similar library programs may be asked to serve. One or more members may be included from outside the UC as needed.

- 2) Whenever possible, an ad hoc committee for performance review shall include a member with knowledge of the candidate's duties and responsibilities or whose functional areas of expertise is related to that of the person whose performance is being reviewed. If necessary to gain subject or area expertise, librarians of the appropriate rank from other UC campuses with similar library programs may be asked to serve. One or more members may be included from outside the UC as needed.
- 3) A person asked to serve on an ad hoc committee shall recuse themselves when they question their ability to make a fair and objective decision in a particular case or feels there is a possible conflict of interest.
- 4) In cases when librarians from outside UCLA are to be considered for membership on an ad hoc committee, LHR shall present the candidate with a list of potential members from outside of UCLA and the candidate will be able to indicate when they feel that a potential candidate may not be able to make a fair and unbiased assessment of the candidate's performance.

4. Instructions to Ad Hoc Committees for Performing Reviews

- a. The CAPA Chair or Chair-Elect shall convene the ad hoc committee as soon as possible after appointing its members.
- b. The ad hoc committee's review shall be based on an objective appraisal of the recommendation and documentation in relation to the criteria in the *MOU* and *APM*. The ad hoc committee shall determine whether, in its judgment, the overall performance of the candidate warrants the proposed action and whether the documentation supports the recommendation of the RI.
- c. The documentation required to be submitted differs depending on the type of action presented to the committee and whether the candidate is from an affiliated unit.
- d. Documentation incorrectly prepared or lacking sufficient detail to make a sound determination on the merits shall be returned for amplification or additional documentation, through LHR, via the CAPA Chair or Chair-Elect.

Such documentation shall be added to the review file after the candidate has been given copies of any non-confidential material and redacted copies of any confidential material added to the review file. The candidate and RI shall be provided an opportunity to submit a written statement in response to the additions to the review file.

The *Checklist Addendum & Candidate's Certification Statement* ([Form #3-B](#)) will be completed to verify that these steps have been completed.

- e. Each ad hoc committee member is responsible for ensuring that all notes and preliminary drafts containing confidential information are destroyed.
5. The Ad Hoc Committee Report & Recommendation to CAPA ([Form #10](#)) shall include the following:
 - a. Name of the person reviewed;
 - b. Action recommended by the RI, an indication of the current and proposed rank, and current salary;
 - c. A statement indicating whether the ad hoc committee concurs or does not concur with the RI's recommendation. If the committee does not concur with the RI's recommendation, it should specify what action it recommends;
 - d. A brief narrative supporting the ad hoc committee's recommendation to the UL. The report shall address each area of the criteria outlined in the *MOU* or the *APM* (bulleted lists are acceptable);
 - e. In cases involving a minority opinion, the minority opinion can be included in the body of the ad hoc committee report. Alternatively, the minority member of the ad hoc committee may also submit a separate written report;
 - f. The ad hoc committee's report without the final signature page is submitted to the CAPA Chair or Chair-Elect to be included in the review file;
 - g. A copy of the report with a separate page including names of ad hoc committee members will be shared with the ADAHR digitally. This additional copy is kept confidential by LHR, and does not become a part of the review file.
 6. The CAPA Chair or Chair-Elect will notify LHR that the ad hoc committee's report is complete; LHR will add the unsigned copy to the candidate's file and keep the signed copy confidential.

[BACK TO TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

IX. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW FOR MERIT INCREASE, PROMOTION, AND CAREER STATUS

A. University Librarian's (UL) Review and Decision

The final decision for actions in the Librarian Series rests with the UL, as the UCLA Chancellor's designated University official.

1. When the reports of the ad hoc committee, if applicable, and CAPA have been submitted, the file is ready for review by the UL who, in accordance with campus

procedures, has authority for making the final decision for personnel actions in the Librarian Series.

2. Academic judgment is not subject to grievance or arbitral review.
 3. Using the criteria provided in the *MOU* and the *APM*, the UL shall review the documentation in each file.
 4. The documentation shall be in sufficient detail to make an objective appraisal possible. Documentation shall include a statement of the candidate's present rank and salary.
 5. The documentation required to be submitted differs depending on the type of action presented to the UL and whether the candidate is from an affiliated unit. Documents lacking sufficient detail to make a sound determination on the merits shall be returned for amplification, or additional documentation shall be requested through LHR from the appropriate party. Such documentation shall be added to the review file after the candidate has been given copies of any non-confidential material, and redacted copies of any confidential material added to the review file. The candidate and their RI shall be provided an opportunity to submit a written statement in response to the additions to the review file. The *Checklist Addendum & Candidate's Certification Statement (Form #3-B)* must be completed and submitted with any documentation added to the file in order to verify that these steps have been completed.
 6. If the UL's decision is contrary to the recommendations of CAPA in cases of promotion, career status, or termination, the UL will notify the CAPA cohort that reviewed the file with respect to the UL's differing assessment. CAPA will be given the opportunity to further comment before the final decision is made. The RI, unit or department head, and supervisory AUL will be notified of the final decision indicating reasons. Ad hoc committees are not informed when the decision of the UL is contrary to the recommendation of the ad hoc committee. If the candidate feels aggrieved by a decision, they may petition for reconsideration/alternative dispute resolution according to Section [IX.B](#).
 7. The UL reports the final decision in a letter to the candidate.
- B. Request for Reconsideration/Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)
1. A librarian who feels aggrieved by a decision concerning a merit, promotion, or career status may petition for reconsideration/ADR.
 2. Librarians involved in a request for reconsideration/ADR are reminded that in order to ensure the confidentiality of CAPA deliberations, there should be no direct communication between any participant in the review concerning the peer review process and any member of CAPA. Participants include candidates, RIs, unit or department heads, and supervisory AULs.

3. The petitioner may first request an informal meeting with the ADAHR or the UL to discuss questions involving the review. The informal meeting must be requested within thirty consecutive calendar days from the date on which the librarian knew or could be expected to know of the decision concerning a merit, promotion, or career status.
4. Following the informal meeting with the ADAHR or DLHR (if requested) or with the UL, if the petitioner continues to believe that either the documentation was not factual, the review was not objective, or procedural rules were not followed, they shall, within forty-five consecutive calendar days from the date on which the librarian knew or could be expected to know of the UL's decision, submit to the UL a written statement that contains the reasons supporting the merits for reconsideration/ADR.
5. If the UL agrees that a reconsideration/ADR is appropriate, they shall notify the RI, the unit or department head, supervisory AUL, and CAPA within forty-five consecutive calendar days from the date on which the UL knew or could be expected to know of the petitioner's written request for reconsideration/ADR.
6. The reconsideration/ADR of the petitioner's file shall occur in the following peer review cycle. The CAPA Chair shall appoint an ad hoc committee to review the case. LHR shall provide to CAPA and the ad hoc committee the following:
 - The petitioner's statement that contains the reasons supporting the merits for reconsideration/ADH
 - Documents, if any, to support the petitioner's claim that documentation associated with their original case was not factual, the review was not objective, or procedural rules were not followed
 - The petitioner's original peer review file

No additional documentation is allowed to be submitted.

7. In making their determination, CAPA and the ad hoc committee appointed in a reconsideration/ADR of an action may consult reports of any prior ad hoc committees, CAPA, or the UL. If additional documentation is requested by anyone in the review process, the documentation shall remain in the file.
 8. Following the ad hoc committee review, CAPA shall review the file and submit a report to the UL.
 9. The membership and deliberations of all ad hoc committees are strictly confidential and may not be revealed to the petitioner under any circumstances.
- C. Administrative Review of the Final Decision (Grievances)
1. If, after using the reconsideration procedure stated above, the candidate still wishes to appeal the decision of the UL regarding merit, promotion or career status, such

appeal shall be in writing to the appropriate campus office as outlined in the *MOU* or the *APM*.

Only procedural errors may be grieved:

- a. An allegation that the University has violated a contractual procedure regarding merit award, promotion, or the award of career status shall be subject to the contractual grievance procedure only to the degree that it identifies a violation that had a material, negative impact on the University's decision regarding merit, promotion, or career status ([MOU Article 24.A.2](#)).
 - b. A grievance is defined as a claim "of a violation of a provision of applicable University Rules, regulations, or Academic Personnel policies which adversely affects the appointees existing terms or conditions of employment" ([APM 140-4.a](#)).
2. If the case is referred to arbitration, the arbitrator shall have the authority to determine whether the university has violated a procedure set forth in [Articles 24, 25, and 26 of the MOU](#), and [APM 140](#). However, in any grievance alleging a violation of [Article 5 of the MOU](#), the arbitrator shall not have the authority to review any decision to:
- Initiate an academic review;
 - Award or deny a merit increase;
 - Award or deny a promotion;
 - Award or withhold career status;
 - 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. ([MOU Article 25.E.10](#))

[BACK TO TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

X. CRITERIA AND PROCESS FOR RECRUITMENT AND APPOINTMENT

A. Definition of Librarian Series

The MOU ([Article 4.A](#)) states,

The Librarian Series is used for academic appointees who provide professional services in the University libraries, archives, and other academic units, in support of the University's educational, research, and public service functions. These services include:

1. Selection and development of resources;
2. Bibliographic control of collections and their organization for use;

3. Reference and advisory services²;
4. Development and application of specialized information systems; or
5. Library non-managerial administrative duties as defined by HEERA³;
6. Research where necessary or desirable in relation to the foregoing.

The APM ([360-4](#)) states,

The librarian series is used for academic appointees who--in support of the University's educational, research, and public service missions--provide professional library services that facilitate the creation and transmission of knowledge. These services may include:

- a. obtaining, organizing, and providing access to information resources;
- b. curating and preserving collections of scholarly, scientific, cultural, or institutional significance;
- c. engaging with users to provide them with guidance and instruction on the discovery, evaluation, and use of information resources and collections;
- d. carrying out research and creative activity in support of the foregoing and for the continual improvement of the profession; and,
- e. library administration and management.

B. Appointment to the Series

1. A candidate for appointment shall have a professional background of competence, knowledge, and experience to ensure suitability for appointment to this series. Such background 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.
2. Selection of an individual to be appointed to the rank of Assistant Librarian is based upon the requirements of the position with due attention to the candidate's demonstrated competence, knowledge and experience. A person appointed as Assistant Librarian without previous professional library experience should normally be appointed at the first salary point. A person who has had previous experience relevant to the position may be appointed to one of the higher salary levels in this

² Teaching and instructional activities are normally considered under this category.

³ Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act

rank, depending on the candidate's aptitude, the extent of prior experience, and/or the requirements of the position.

3. A candidate with extensive previous relevant experience and superior qualifications may be appointed to one of the two higher ranks in the series.
4. At the time of original appointment to a title in this series, each appointee shall be informed that continuation or advancement is justified only by demonstrated superior professional skills and achievement. Promotion may also depend upon increased responsibility as well as growing competence and/or contribution in the candidate's position. This is assessed through objective and thorough review. If, on the basis of a review, the individual does not meet the criteria for continuation or advancement, there is no obligation on the part of the University to continue, advance or promote. Promotion may also be tied to position change. The assumption of administrative responsibilities is not a necessary condition for promotion. ([MOU Article 4.C.1](#); [APM 210-4.e.2](#))

C. Recruitment

The goal of recruitment is to appoint the most qualified individuals to Librarian Series positions. Local procedures will guide the recruitment process.

Most potential career appointments are made following a national recruitment. Members of the Librarian Series currently employed by the university who apply for positions shall be considered with all other applicants in accordance with local procedures.

All positions shall be open for outside recruitment unless the university determines that recruitment shall be waived. Campus procedures do allow units, under exceptional circumstances, to request a waiver of recruitment or waiver of a national search for academic positions. Such requests for waivers of recruitment and supporting documentation are reviewed by the Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel. In the event a potential career appointment is being made without a national recruitment, the approved waiver of recruitment will be submitted in lieu of the report and/or recommendation of the search committee as a part of the appointment file.

D. Recommendation for Appointments

The Recommending Officer shall write the appointment recommendation. In cases of temporary appointment, a brief explanation of the rationale for a temporary, rather than potential career, appointment should be included. The appointment recommendation shall include: Name of candidate and justification for appointment to the Librarian Series, including an assessment of the candidate's prior experience and potential for future contributions in the criteria necessary for advancement.

The Recommending Officer will forward the appointment recommendation to the ADAHR who will prepare the appointment file for submission to CAPA.

E. Documentation for Appointments

1. Temporary Appointments

The documentation for temporary appointments shall include:

- a. Cover memo from the ADAHR, stating the recommended rank and temporary status for the appointment (required)
- b. Recommending Officer letter (required), including a justification for why a particular candidate was chosen, if the Recommending Officer is making the final recommendation or disagrees with the Search Committee's recommendation
- c. *Search Committee Report and Hiring Recommendation* ([Form # 13](#), if applicable)

Under exceptional circumstances, temporary appointments may be made without a national recruitment. As a result, these appointments may not have a search committee report.

- d. Letter of Interest from the Candidate for Temporary Appointment (required)
- e. Résumé or curriculum vitae of the Candidate for Temporary Appointment (required)
- f. Transcripts or summaries of telephone reference checks on the candidate for temporary appointment, or letters of reference if they are not contained or quoted in the recommendation of the Recommending Officer (required)
- g. Position Posting or Statement of Responsibilities (required)

2. Potential Career Appointments

The documentation for potential career appointments shall include:

- a. Cover memo from the ADAHR, stating the recommended rank and career status option for the appointment (required)
- b. Recommending Officer letter (required), including a justification for why a particular candidate was chosen if the Recommending Officer is making the final recommendation or disagrees with the Search Committee's recommendation
- c. *Search Committee Report and Hiring Recommendation* ([Form #13](#), required unless a waiver of recruitment and approval is included)

Potential career appointments are normally made following a national recruitment and a search committee has screened applications and selected candidates for interviews. In most cases, the search committee report is included.

Some recommending officers do not require search committees to make a recommendation. Instead, the search committee may be asked for an assessment of each candidate interviewed.

- d. Waiver of Recruitment Approval (when applicable)
 - e. Application (Letter of Interest and résumé or curriculum vitae) of Candidate for Potential Career Appointment (required)
 - f. Transcripts or summaries of telephone reference checks on the candidate for appointment, or letters of reference if they are not contained or quoted in the recommendation of the Recommending Officer (required)
 - g. Position Posting or Statement of Responsibilities (required)
3. Career Appointments

The documentation for career appointments shall include:

- a. Cover memo from the ADAHR, stating the recommended rank and career status option for the appointment (required)
- b. Recommending Officer letter (required), including a justification as to why a particular candidate was chosen if the Recommending Officer is making the final recommendation or disagrees with the Search Committee's recommendation
- c. In most cases, the search committee report is included

Some recommending officers do not require search committees to make a recommendation. Instead, the search committee may be asked for an assessment of each candidate interviewed.

Most librarian appointments are potential career status unless explicitly a temporary position. However, a career status appointment may occur under exceptional circumstances, including but not limited to: when a librarian transfers to UCLA from another UC campus with no break in service and the librarian was awarded career status on the former campus, when a UCLA librarian with career status is appointed to a different librarian position, or at the discretion of the UL based on the candidate's exceptional professional background and accomplishments

- d. Waiver of Recruitment Approval (when applicable)
- e. Letter of Interest from Candidate for Career Appointment (required)
- f. Transcripts or summaries of telephone reference checks on the candidate for appointment, or letters of reference if they are not contained or quoted in the recommendation of the Recommending Officer (required)

g. Position Posting or Statement of Responsibilities (required)

F. Formal Offer

The formal offer includes rank, compensation, start date, moving expenses, and information on other applicable employment issues. Upon completion of CAPA's review and approval by the UL, informal offers are generally made verbally, and a formal written offer letter is sent upon the candidate's acceptance of the informal offer terms.

After CAPA review and UL approval for the appointment, the ADAHR will extend the offer for positions within the UCLA Library. **Within the UCLA Library, only the University Librarian or the ADAHR, with approval of the UL, are authorized to extend offers of employment.** Within the UCLA Library, the ADAHR will inform the RI, unit/department head, and supervisory AUL of the candidate's acceptance or rejection of a formal offer.

In the case of affiliated units, the ADAHR will inform the Recommending Officer of the UL's approval of the appointment. In affiliated units, the authorized Recommending Officer extends an offer to the candidate.

The candidate's formal written acceptance is added to the candidate's personnel file.

[BACK TO TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

XI. PEER REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT

Appointment to the Librarian Series is subject to peer review. Following peer review, final approval for all appointments to the Librarian Series rests with the UL.

A. Appointment

An appointment in the Librarian Series occurs when a person is employed in one of the three ranks of the Series – Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, or Librarian – and whose previous status was:

1. Not in the employ of the University of California; or
2. In the employ of the University of California, but not within a title in this series;
3. Appointed in the Librarian Series at another campus (an intercampus transfer is treated as a new appointment by the new campus).

Appointments occur throughout the fiscal year and are reviewed by CAPA as they occur.

B. Types & Conditions of Appointments in the Librarian Series

1. An initial appointment to a title at any rank in this series may be a temporary appointment or a potential career appointment.

a. Temporary

A temporary appointment has a specified date of termination and is for two years or less, unless supported by external or extramural funds. Externally funded appointments may be continued for one additional year. Positions funded by extramural funds may be continued for the duration of the funding. ([MOU Article 18.A.3](#))

When the length of the appointment permits or if the hiring unit secures additional funding, the librarian will be reviewed following the same procedures and review cycles set forth for review of potential career or career appointees.

b. Potential Career

A potential career appointment is distinguished from an explicitly temporary appointment by the fact that no definite date of termination of the appointment is specified and by the fact that the appointee is regarded as one who may qualify, after a suitable trial period and careful review, for a continuing career appointment. ([MOU Article 4.D.2](#))

Potential career appointments are subject to regular reviews.

2. Intercampus Transfer

An intercampus transfer is treated as an appointment by the new campus, and it may involve a merit increase or promotion. The following provisions apply to the status of potential career and career appointees:

- a. The normal period of potential career status shall not be lengthened as a result of an intercampus transfer.
- b. Career status acquired on one campus shall be continued upon transfer to another campus. A librarian making an intercampus transfer retains career status, any accrued sick leave, vacation, and retirement credits, as well as seniority for the purpose of merit, promotion, and layoff. ([APM 360-8.f](#))
- c. Promotion in rank at the time of an intercampus transfer shall confer career status.

3. Career Appointments

- a. A career appointment does not have a specified date of termination.
- b. Career appointments are subject to regular reviews.

C. CAPA's Review of Appointments

CAPA will only receive documentation for the final candidate selected. In reviewing appointments, CAPA's role is to determine: 1) whether or not the documentation is complete, 2) on the basis of the documentation, whether or not the candidate meets the requirements for appointment to, and promise of continuance in, the Librarian Series, and 3) if the rank being recommended is appropriate to the candidate's education and experience.

1. Functions of CAPA

- a. **CAPA shall guard the confidentiality of individual appointment files.**
- b. CAPA reviews all appointment files and makes final recommendations to the UL. CAPA submits its recommendation within two business days of receiving the appointment packet. The CAPA Chair or Chair Elect will notify the ADAHR if CAPA requires more than two business days to complete its recommendation.

1) Disqualification

A CAPA member shall not participate in reviewing an appointment file when:

- a) They served as a member of the search committee for the position;
- b) They have been responsible for approving the appointment, preparing documentation for the appointment file, or have submitted a letter of assessment, or a telephone reference for the recruitment;
- c) They question their ability to make an objective judgment in a particular case or feel there is a possible conflict of interest.

2) Quorum

CAPA members shall make every effort to participate in the review of all appointment files. A minimum of five CAPA members must be available to review and determine the action on any file. When a quorum is lacking, previous CAPA members shall be called upon to constitute a quorum beginning with those who served most recently.

2. Instructions to CAPA for Performing Appointments

- a. In reviewing appointment files, CAPA should review the documentation and make a recommendation on two primary factors:
 - 1) Whether or not the candidate meets the requirements for appointment to the Librarian Series based on the criteria for appointment;
 - 2) If the rank being recommended is appropriate to the candidate's education and experience.

- b. CAPA should consider the following criteria for appointments:

A candidate for appointment shall have a professional background of competence, knowledge, and experience to ensure suitability for appointment to this series. Such background 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.

Selection of an individual to be appointed to the rank of Assistant Librarian is based upon the requirements of the position with due attention to the candidate's demonstrated competence, knowledge, and experience. A person appointed as Assistant Librarian without previous professional library experience should normally be appointed at the first salary point. A person who has had previous experience relevant to the position may be appointed to one of the higher salary levels in this rank, depending on the candidate's aptitude, the extent of prior experience, and/or the requirements of the position.

A candidate with extensive previous relevant experience and superior qualifications may be appointed to one of the two higher ranks in the series.

3. The *CAPA Report & Recommendation to the University Librarians* ([Form #11-A](#)) shall include the following:
- a. Name of the person recommended for appointment;
 - b. Type of appointment submitted by the recommending officer (temporary, potential career, or career), and an indication of the proposed rank;
 - c. A statement indicating whether CAPA agrees or disagrees with the recommendation of a candidate proposed by the Search Committee or the Recommending Officer;
 - d. A statement indicating whether the proposed rank is appropriate to the candidate's education and experience;
 - e. If CAPA disagrees with the proposed rank, the report shall include a brief narrative supporting CAPA's recommendation to the UL. The report shall address specific qualifications relevant to the appointment (bulleted lists are acceptable);
 - f. If CAPA cannot come to a unanimous decision, the nature of the disagreement and reasons therefore shall be communicated either in the body of the report or in separate statements by individual members:
 - 1) In cases involving a minority opinion, the minority member(s) of CAPA may also submit a written report.

- 2) If there is no majority opinion, but there is a quorum, CAPA shall submit multiple reports.
- g. The names of CAPA members who participated in reviewing the appointment shall appear as the last, separate page of the report.
4. The Chair shall add CAPA's recommendation to the candidate's review file and transmit it to LHR.

[BACK TO TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

XII. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW FOR APPOINTMENT

The final decision on librarian appointments including the rank and salary at which an individual is appointed rests with the UL.

- A. When the report of CAPA has been submitted, the file is ready for review by the UL who, in accordance with campus procedures, has authority for making the final decision on appointments to the Librarian Series.
- B. Using the criteria provided in the MOU and the APM, the UL shall review the documentation in each file.
- C. The documentation shall be in sufficient detail to make an objective appraisal possible.
- D. Documents lacking in sufficient detail to make a sound determination on the merits shall be returned for amplification, or additional documentation shall be requested through LHR from the appropriate party. Such documentation shall be added to the review file after the recommending officer submits them.
- E. If the UL disagrees with the appointment recommendation of a candidate, the UL shall notify all levels in the review cycle (CAPA, supervisory AUL, unit or department head, and recommending officer), indicating the reasons and asking for any further information which might support a different decision.
- F. In making appointments, the UL should particularly be mindful of the institutional differences that may exist between libraries, particularly for those units that do not report to the UL. The UL should take care to consider the differing professional structures, professional development opportunities and compensation levels in various settings and to display requisite flexibility in evaluating professional achievements of librarians in other branches of the profession.

Accordingly, in the event that any tentative decision of the UL concerning the appointment of a candidate is contrary to the recommendation of the unit or department head, the UL will consult with the unit or department head in question and

there shall be an opportunity for all parties to provide additional information that might suggest a different decision.

- G. For Units reporting to the UL, the ADAHR reports the final decision of the UL on the appointment to the Recommending Officer. The ADAHR prepares a formal written offer from the UL to the candidate.
- H. For Units not reporting to the UL, the ADAHR reports the final decision of the UL on the appointment to the Recommending Officer, who prepares the formal written offer letter.

XIII. APPENDICES TABLE OF CONTENTS

UCLA LIBRARIANS' CALL:

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL PROCEDURES FOR THE LIBRARIAN SERIES

APPENDICES

Appendix A:	Glossary
Appendix B:	Documentation Chart for Peer Review Actions
Appendix C:	Sample Statement of Responsibilities (SOR) Instructions and Sample
Appendix D:	Data Summary Instructions and Sample
Appendix E:	Guidelines for Statement of Professional Achievements (SOPA)
Appendix F:	Request for Letter of Assessment on Performance
Appendix H:	Guidelines for Exclusions from a Review
Appendix I:	Peer Review Websites

Note: [Appendices](#) appear in a separate document

XIV. FORMS TABLE OF CONTENTS

UCLA LIBRARIANS' CALL:

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL PROCEDURES FOR THE LIBRARIAN SERIES

FORMS

- Form # 2-A: Academic Personnel Recommendation
- Form # 2-B: Academic Personnel - Appointment Recommendation
- Form # 3: Candidate's Certification Statement
- Form # 3-A: Candidate's Certification Statement – Exclusions
- Form # 3-B: Checklist Addendum & Candidate's Certification Statement
- Form # 3-C: Review Initiator's Certification Statement
- Form # 4: Data Summary
- Form # 5: Librarian Goals Template
- Form # 6: Review Initiator's Evaluation & Recommendation
- Form # 6-A: Non-Confidential Assessment
- Form # 7: Unit/Department Head's Comments
- Form # 8: Supervisory Assistant/Associate University Librarian's Comments
- Form # 9: Request for Additional Documentation or Clarification
- Form # 10: Ad Hoc Committee Report & Recommendation to CAPA
- Form # 11-A: CAPA Report & Recommendation to the University Librarian
- Form # 11-B: CAPA Report & Appointment Recommendation to the University Librarian
- Form # 12: Comments
- Form # 13: Search Committee Report and Hiring Recommendation
- Form # 14: Candidate's Statement of Professional Achievements (SOPA)
- Form # 15: Candidate's Statement of Responsibilities (SOR)
- Form # 16: Rejoinder
- Form # 17: Names of Individuals Candidate Suggests to Submit/Exclude from Submitting Letters of Assessment on Performance

Note: [Forms](#) appear in a separate document.