

University of California, Riverside
Assistant and Associate University Librarian (AUL)
CALL

**ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIAN REVIEW PROCEDURES**

“THE CALL”

2021-2022

Contents

Calendar: Academic Personnel Review Procedures for the AUL Series, 2021-2022	3
2021-2022 CALL for Assistant and Associate University Librarians (AUL).....	5
1. <i>Schedule</i>	5
2. <i>Titles</i> :.....	5
3. <i>Initiation of a Review</i>	5
4. <i>Documentation Required and General Procedures</i>	5
5. <i>Criteria for Advancement</i>	7
6. <i>Access to Academic Personnel Records</i>	8
7. <i>Appeals</i>	9
<i>APPENDICES</i>	10
APPENDIX I – ACADEMIC REVIEW ACTION SUMMARY	11
APPENDIX II – DOCUMENTATION CHECKLIST FOR REVIEW OF ASSISTANT/ASSOCIATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIANS	12
APPENDIX III – ASSISTANT/ASSOCIATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN – STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT (SOPA)	13
APPENDIX IV – ASSISTANT/ASSOCIATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN STATEMENT OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES (SOPR)	14
APPENDIX V – CANDIDATE’S CONFIDENTIAL LETTERS OF EVALUATION REQUEST FORM	16
APPENDIX VI – REVIEW INITIATOR’S REQUEST FOR LETTERS OF EVALUATION	18
APPENDIX VII –STATEMENT OF PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS	19

Calendar: Academic Personnel Review Procedures for the AUL Series, 2021-2022

The formal review period for the Librarian Series is from January 1 through the end of December each year. The following dates have been established for the 2021-2022 review: (Used as a guideline for dates)

Date(s)	Activities
December 6, 2021	Library Human Resources (LHR) will distribute to Assistant and Associate University Librarians (AUL) and the University Librarian (UL), a notification of impending review.
December 6, 2021 through December 22, 2021	Initial review Consultation between the UL and AUL. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review the Statement of Primary Responsibilities 2. Discuss Potential Review Actions 3. Outline the process and discuss the schedule and documentation.
December 22, 2021	An AUL requesting a deferral notifies the UL in writing by this date.
January 18, 2022	UL notifies AUL-of the deferral request result.
January 21, 2022	Final date for AUL to submit to UL: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) An updated statement describing the candidate’s current primary responsibilities signed by the candidate and the UL. 2) Candidate’s letter of Evaluation Request Form (when requested).
January 24, 2022 through February 25, 2022	UL requests letters of evaluation, when requested or required. Responses due by: February 25, 2022 . A redacted copy of each request made by the UL will be included in the Candidate’s file. Unredacted copies of the UL’s request shall be provided to LHR. Unredacted copies of letters received shall be provided to LHR for logging and placed in Candidate file, with a redacted copy to the Candidate.
March 25, 2022	Final date for AUL to submit to UL: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Statement of Professional Achievements. 2) A description of the candidate’s plans and goals following the review period. (and beyond, as appropriate). 3) Additional supplemental documents, including any other statement or material the candidate deems relevant.
May 6, 2022	Final date for UL to meet with Candidate and submit recommendation for a merit increase, promotion, or denial of advancement to LHR, along with the complete file of each candidate undergoing review.
June 13, 2022	The UL informs the Candidates of the decision and LHR completes distributing copies of any remaining redacted confidential material.
June 17, 2022	The Vice Provost for Academic Personnel's (VPAP) decisions on any files alleging a procedural violation are sent to the UL via LHR.
July 1, 2022	Salary increase begins for the successful Candidate, based on the new salary point.
August 1, 2022	The Candidate receives the first paycheck which reflects the new salary.

2021-2022 CALL for Assistant and Associate University Librarians (AUL)

1. Schedule:

- a) It is the responsibility of all involved to ensure that assignments are performed with the greatest possible care and promptness. Adherence to the calendar is in the best interest of all participants. When exceptions to the calendar are necessary in particular files, the agreed upon timeline shall be communicated to all parties involved in the review process.

2. Titles: See Section [365](#) of the Academic Personnel Manual (hereafter [APM](#) for rules and procedures applicable to those serving as Associate University Librarian or Assistant University Librarian.

3. Initiation of a Review.

- a) It is the responsibility of the University Librarian to consider for review each Assistant University Librarian and Associate University Librarian under the jurisdiction of that particular University Librarian. [APM 365-18-c](#) establishes that there is no normal period of service at either title, but as a general practice, appointees shall be considered for merit increases at two-year intervals. However, when candidates are already at the top of the salary range for their title, and no promotion is under consideration, the University Librarian and the candidate may agree to extend the review period to up to four years.
- b) The University Librarian will submit a recommendation for a merit increase, promotion, or denial of advancement.
- c) Those candidates who are judged to be deserving of advancement before a normal review cycle may be recommended for an accelerated merit increase or promotion.
- d) Those candidates who request (or agree) that a normal merit review be deferred should provide a memo to that effect to be included in the file. However, a review will be conducted if, in the University Librarian's judgment, it is advisable.

4. Documentation Required and General Procedures.

- a) It is the candidate's responsibility to submit a review file, to include:
 - i. An updated current Statement of Primary Responsibilities signed by the candidate and the University Librarian
 - ii. A Statement of Professional Achievements.
 - iii. A description of the candidate's plans and goals following the review period (and beyond, as appropriate)

- iv. Additionally, the candidate may supplement the file by including any other statement or material the candidate deems relevant. The candidate may also request, in writing, that the University Librarian request letters from specific individuals for additional information to be included in the file. The candidate may also provide names of persons who, in the view of the candidate, and for the reasons set forth, might not objectively evaluate in a letter or on a committee.
- b) Following an initial review discussion with the candidate and receipt of all relevant evaluation information, it is the responsibility of the University Librarian to review the file which has been received, to supplement it as necessary and appropriate with additional letters and documents, including any requested by the candidate, and to prepare a letter of recommendation. The opening paragraph of the recommending letter should include:
 - i Name, date, rank and salary of the candidate's initial UCR AUL appointment.
 - ii Existing rank and salary of the candidate.
 - iii Number of years at the existing salary.
 - iv Recommended action.
- c) The University Librarian's letter of recommendation should also include the following:
 - i A comprehensive assessment of the candidate's performance and accomplishments together with specific evidence to support the evaluation. This evaluation should follow the same criteria and areas of Librarianship as outlined in APM Sections [210-4e\(3\)](#) and [APM 365-10](#), but with primary emphasis on administrative performance within their defined responsibilities.
 - ii An evaluation of the candidates' statement of plans and goals for their division/departments, professional and/or personal goals, and a comparison of the previous review file's statement with actual accomplishments since that date.
 - iii In the case of a recommendation for promotion, an assessment of the candidate's professional growth or increased responsibilities, and sustained successful performance at the rank of Assistant University Librarian.
- d) Campus policy does not require letters of evaluation as part of the review process for positions in the AUL Series, and in the large majority of cases no such letters will be solicited.

However, the candidate or the University Librarian may wish to have letters of evaluation or other forms of evaluation solicited in specific cases, such as when promotion is under consideration. In the case of letters of evaluation, the University Librarian has the responsibility of soliciting the letters from qualified persons, including persons nominated by the candidate. The University Librarian has the option to solicit other evaluation information from other constituents internal and/or external to the Libraries for use in the review process. In both cases, requests for letters or other evaluation information should include appropriate language regarding the University's policies governing confidentiality. The candidate may provide in writing to the review initiator or other appropriate person, names of persons who in the view of the candidate, for reasons provided by the candidate, might not objectively evaluate in a letter or on a committee, the candidate's qualifications or performance. Any such statement provided by the candidate shall be included in the academic review file. The University Librarian's decision regarding the requested disqualification shall not be subject to grievance and arbitration.

- e) The University Librarian will hold a second review discussion with the candidate after the candidate has had the opportunity to read the contents of the entire file (including the University Librarian's letter of recommendation, and any redacted confidential letters provided to the candidate). The candidate also will be given the opportunity to add any written comments to the file. The University Librarian will be given the opportunity to review any additional written comments from the candidate.
 - f) The final decision will be made by the University Librarian, who will also inform the candidate.
5. *Criteria for Advancement.* As specified in APM Sections [APM 365-10](#) and [210-4e\(2\) and \(3\)](#) candidates for merit increases and promotions shall be judged on the basis of the first of the following criteria, and, to the extent they are relevant, on one or more of the others:
- a) administrative performance in carrying out key job responsibilities;
 - b) professional competence and quality of service within the library;
 - c) professional activity outside the library;
 - d) University and public service; and
 - e) research and other creative activity.

In the case of Assistant and Associate University Librarians, successful performance under the first two of the above criteria are paramount.

Merit increases are not automatic and must be justified by the quality of professional and administrative service rendered by the appointee (APM Section [APM 365-18](#)).

Promotion from Assistant University Librarian to Associate University Librarian must be justified not only by excellence of service and administrative attainment, but also by demonstrated professional growth and accomplishment and/or the assumption of greater responsibility (APM Section [APM 365-10a](#)).

6. *Access to Academic Personnel Records*. The specific procedures are divided into two categories: (A) procedures in relation to an ongoing personnel review and (B) procedures for access to all other records
 - A. Access to Personnel Files in an Ongoing Personnel Action ([APM 360-80-g](#)) Access in relation to an ongoing personnel review (defined as the period between the initiation of the recommendation by the University Librarian through the final administrative decision), is normally governed by two applicable procedures: i) after the University Librarian's initial review discussion with the candidate but before the University Librarian's second review discussion with the candidate and ii) after the final decision.
 - i. After the University Librarian's initial review with the candidate but before the University Librarian's second review discussion with the candidate, the candidate may inspect all non-confidential documents to be included in the review file and shall receive upon written request to the University Librarian a redacted copy of the confidential documents which will be included in the file, whether included in the file as full or as summary documents. The University Librarian has responsibility for the redaction of such documents. Such documents shall not disclose the identities of persons who were the sources of confidential documents. The candidate shall also be shown a copy of the University Librarian's recommendation letter and shall sign and date it to acknowledge receipt.
 - ii. After the final decision from the University Librarian has been communicated to the candidate by the University Librarian, the candidate shall have the right, upon written request to receive from the University Librarian a written statement of the reasons for that decision, and/or redacted copies of any confidential documents in the personnel review file not provided by the Review Initiator before the Review Initiator's letter is written. Such documents shall not disclose the identities of persons who were the sources of confidential documents. Requests for these documents shall be submitted on the form labeled "Request for Material in Academic Personnel File" (see Appendix D Librarian Series).
 - B. Procedures for Access to All Other Academic Personnel Records ([APM 160-20-c](#)).
 - i. An individual may inspect, at reasonable times, all other non-confidential documents in any of the academic personnel records of the individual.

- ii. Requests for access to confidential information in an individual's personnel file must be addressed to the University Librarian and sent via Library Human Resources (LHR). Requests for these documents shall be submitted on the form labeled "Request for Material in Academic Personnel File" (see Appendix D Librarian Series). The redacted documents are prepared only after the University Librarian completes the formal review of the Personnel File. Materials will be sent directly to the individual by LHR.

7. Appeals. In those cases, in which a candidate wishes to allege procedural violations as outlined below, the candidate will first review the issues with the University Librarian in an attempt to achieve a resolution. If the candidate still wishes to submit an allegation, a formal written allegation statement shall be sent to the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel. Disagreements or questions regarding academic judgment are not procedural violations and may not be appealed.

A procedural violation is deemed to have occurred when:

- (1) the procedures were not in consonance with the applicable University rules, regulations or Academic Personnel policies, and/or
- (2) the challenged decision was reached on the basis of impermissible criteria including (but not limited to) race, sex, or political conviction.

The Vice Provost for Academic Personnel will appoint an ad hoc appeal committee for each case in which the candidate alleges a procedural violation. The Vice Provost for Academic Personnel will inform candidates of their right to a hearing before the ad hoc committee, and will forward to the committee the University Librarian's response to the allegations. The committee will make a recommendation to the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel but is not empowered to re-evaluate the academic qualifications or professional competence of the complaint. The Vice Provost for Academic Personnel shall inform the University Librarian of final action in the case.

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX I—Academic Review Action Summary
- APPENDIX II—Documentation Checklist
- APPENDIX III—AUL Statement of Professional Achievement and Administrative Accomplishments
- APPENDIX IV—AUL Statement of Primary Responsibilities
- APPENDIX V—Candidates Confidential Letters of Evaluation Request Form
- APPENDIX VI—Review Initiator’s Request for Letters of Evaluation
- APPENDIX VII—Statement of Procedural Safeguards

APPENDIX I – ACADEMIC REVIEW ACTION SUMMARY

ACTION PROPOSED BY CANDIDATE		ACTION PROPOSED by REVIEW INITIATOR	
CANDIDATE DATA:			
Name of Candidate		<input type="checkbox"/>	Merit
Present Status		<input type="checkbox"/>	Promotion to:
Present Rank:		<input type="checkbox"/>	No Action (remain at present rank)
Present Salary		<input type="checkbox"/>	Deferral
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Termination
Requested Action	<input type="checkbox"/> Merit		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Promotion		Proposed Salary:
	<input type="checkbox"/> Deferral		Effective Date
			Review Initiator's Signature
			Date

LIBRARY HUMAN RESOURCES ONLY

CONCURRENCE OF REVIEW LEVELS WITH REVIEW INITIATOR'S PROPOSED ACTION

Review Level	Agree	Disagree	Note Recommended Action	Date
Ad Hoc				

Decision	Recommended Rank	Salary	Increase %
University Librarian	___ Assistant Univ. Librarian ___ Associate Univ. Librarian ___ Deputy Univ. Librarian		

APPENDIX II – DOCUMENTATION CHECKLIST FOR REVIEW OF ASSISTANT/ASSOCIATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIANS

NAME OF CANDIDATE: _____ DEPARTMENT: _____

Candidate initials and dates the below-listed items to certify that these obligations have been fulfilled in this current academic review.

Before the academic review file was assembled:

- ___1. The Candidate was notified of the impending action.
- ___2. The Candidate was informed about the entire review process and was made aware of APM 365, the AUL CALL or, as applicable, the MOU.
- ___3. The Candidate was given an opportunity to ask questions.
- ___4. The Candidate was asked to provide the following information:
 - ___a. Academic Review Action Summary Form (required)
 - ___b. Candidate’s Letters of Evaluation Request Form (required)
 - ___c. Candidate’s Statement of Professional Achievement (required)
 - ___d. Current Statement of Primary Responsibilities (required)
 - ___e. Previous Statement of Primary Responsibilities (as applicable) ___ number
 - ___h. Other information that the Candidate wishes to have included in the review file (optional)

Before the file was submitted to LHR:

- ___5 The Candidate was provided the opportunity to discuss, inspect, and submit a written response to all documents to be included in the file, other than confidential documents.
 - ___a. Review Initiator Evaluation (required)
 - ___b. Secondary Evaluation(s) (required if applicable)
 - ___c. Appendix XII: Candidate’s written statement(s), if any, included in file.
- ___6 The Candidate was given a redacted copy of each solicited letter included in the file.

CERTIFIED BY:

_____ Signature of Candidate	_____ Date	_____ Signature of Review Initiator	_____ Date
_____	_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX III – ASSISTANT/ASSOCIATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN – STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT (SOPA)

Date Submitted:
Period Covered:

Name:
Academic Title:
Functional Title (s)
Supervisor:

APPENDIX IV – ASSISTANT/ASSOCIATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN STATEMENT OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES (SOPR)

Date Submitted:
Period Covered:

Name:
Academic Title:
Functional Title (s)
Supervisor:

I. General Statement of Responsibilities within the Library in the Five Major Areas of Librarianship

Library Administration and Management

Selection and Development of Resources

Bibliographic Control

Reference & Advisory Services

Specialized Information Systems

II. Standing Committees and Task Forces Undertaken as Part of Job Assignments

III. Long-Term Special Projects, On-Going Responsibilities, and Other Assignments Not Mentioned Above

Candidate Signature

Date

Review Initiator Signature

Date

APPENDIX V – CANDIDATE’S CONFIDENTIAL LETTERS OF EVALUATION REQUEST FORM

CONFIDENTIAL:

TO: _____
Review Initiator

FROM: _____
Candidate

RE: Letter of Evaluation for Review File

Action Requested: _____
(Merit, Promotion, Accelerated Promotion, Deferral)

Note: Campus policy does not require letters of evaluation as part of the review process for positions in the AUL Series, and in the large majority of cases no such letters will be solicited. However, the candidate or the University Librarian may wish to have letters of evaluation or other forms of evaluation solicited in specific cases, such as when promotion is under consideration.

Candidate:

I request letters of evaluation for my review file from persons selected from the following list (names listed in priority order and addresses attached for off-campus persons.)

Name/Address	Activities to be Addressed
1. _____	
2. _____	
3 _____	
4 _____	

NONE WANTED

Candidate’s Signature Date

CANDIDATE'S CONFIDENTIAL LETTERS OF EVALUATION REQUEST FORM – PAGE 2

In my view, for reasons set forth here, the following person(s) might not objectively evaluate my qualifications of performance:

Name	Reason(s)
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

NONE LISTED

Candidate's Signature Date

APPENDIX VI – REVIEW INITIATOR’S REQUEST FOR LETTERS OF EVALUATION

CONFIDENTIAL:

TO: LIBRARY HUMAN RESOURCES

FROM: _____
Review Initiator

RE: Letter of Evaluation for _____
(Candidate)

Action Requested: _____
(Merit, Promotion, Accelerated Promotion, Deferral)

Note: Campus policy does not require letters of evaluation as part of the review process for positions in the AUL Series, and in the large majority of cases no such letters will be solicited. However, the candidate or the University Librarian may wish to have letters of evaluation or other forms of evaluation solicited in specific cases, such as when promotion is under consideration.

Please initial and Date

(Letters requested must include a reasonable number of names requested by the candidate)

Letters Requested From:

Name: _____
Activity: _____
Address: _____

NONE WANTED

Review Initiator’s Signature Date

APPENDIX VII –STATEMENT OF PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS

I CERTIFY THAT:

A. Under APM 360-80d, e, f or UC/UC-AFT MOU, whichever is applicable

- 1) I was notified of the impending review,
- 2) I was informed about the entire review process and was made aware of the APM, Sections 210-4 and 360
- 3) I was provided the opportunity to ask questions,
- 4) I was given the opportunity to provide a list of names of persons familiar with my performance from whom the Review Initiator may request letters of reference,
- 5) I was given the opportunity to supply the names of person who, for reasons set forth by me, might not provide objective evaluations.

B. Under APM .360-80 g or UC/UC-AFT MOU, whichever is applicable

- 1) I had the opportunity to inspect all documents to be included in the file other than those which are confidential,
- 2) I had the opportunity to request and receive redacted confidential documents in this file (if requested in writing),
- 3) The evaluations of the Review Initiator were made available to me,
- 4) I had the opportunity, if I wished, to provide a written statement for inclusion in this file in response to or commenting upon the material in the file.

C. I was given the opportunity to examine the Documentation Checklist and to ask questions pertaining to it.

Candidate's Signature

Date