ACADEMIC REVIEW PROCEDURES, LIBRARIAN SERIES, UC San Diego
Revised 11/2016, 2/5/2019, 10/30/2020, 4/8/2021

I.   INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND/HISTORY

1. Although Librarians' status in the University of California changed from that of staff employees to non-Senate academic employees in the 1960's, until 1970/1971 their initial appointments and subsequent performance reviews continued to be carried out through a hierarchical, administrative process.

    That year a process which incorporated a peer review component into the evaluation of proposed appointments and performance reviews was introduced for the Librarian Series. This process was described in chapters introduced for the first time into the University's *Academic Personnel Manual* (*APM*). The Librarians' Association of the University of California (LAUC) played an instrumental role in drafting those Universitywide policies, as well as the related procedural documents on each campus, and has remained actively involved in the revisions and updates of those documents.

2. A key principle inherent in the peer review component of this process is the concept 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. The Librarian Series is the only non-Senate academic series in the University that uses a peer review component in the evaluation of proposed appointments and professional performance.

B. PURPOSE

1. These guidelines are designed to provide procedural details for conducting appointment and performance reviews of UC San Diego Librarians.

2. Objective and thorough reviews of the qualifications of Candidates for appointment, merit increase, promotion, and career status are conducted at specific intervals. The review process, in addition to its value as a means of commending demonstrated individual growth and sustained excellence, serves to ensure the high quality of library service provided to the UC San Diego community by Librarians in the Librarian Series.

C. AUTHORITY/CRITERIA

1. The review procedures for Librarians are governed by two documents: the *University of California and University Council-American Federation of Teachers Memorandum of Understanding (UC-AFT MOU)* for represented librarians and the University of California *Academic Personnel Manual* for non-represented librarians. Specifically, these procedures are consistent with the provisions of UC-AFT MOU Articles 4, 5 and 13, and *APM* Sections 360 and 210-4.

2. In accordance with an option provided for in *APM* Sections 360-6 and 360-24, the Executive Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs at UC San Diego has delegated to the University Librarian responsibility for appointing review committees and authority for approving final personnel actions for incumbents in the Librarian Series. As stated in

APM 360-6, it is the function of the review committees to advise the officer who makes the final decisions. At UC San Diego, review committees are advisory to the University Librarian. (There is variation among the UC campuses in the Chancellors' practices of delegating authority for approving actions affecting the Librarian Series.)

3. This *Academic Review and Procedures Manual* (ARPM) describes and clarifies the UC San Diego local review procedures in everyday language, and establishes useful forms and checklists to assist everyone through the process. The ARPM intends its local procedures to be consistent with the language of both the APM and MOU (per APM Sections 360-6-b and 360-80-b, and MOU Article 5.R), so it is edited periodically in order to maintain this alignment.

D. <u>STAGES OF THE REVIEW</u>

Each appointment or performance review is conducted in three stages:

1. Program level review, including the Program Director's review and recommendation for personnel action. In cases of performance review, the Candidate's self-review precedes this.

2. Peer review by the LAUC-SD Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Advancement (CAPA) and, in specified cases, an Ad Hoc Committee;

3. Administrative review, including the University Librarian's final decision for action.

II. BASIC PRINCIPLES

A. OBJECTIVITY

The review shall be based on an objective appraisal of the documentation in relation to the criteria stated in the *Academic Personnel Manual*. The documentation shall be in sufficient detail to make an objective appraisal possible. All decisions and recommendations shall be based solely upon materials within the review file. The 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 information).

B. CONFIDENTIALITY

It is the responsibility of all involved in the peer review process to scrupulously respect the confidentiality of their deliberations and the records and documents they examine. All personnel records, reports, and documents relating to a Candidate's case shall be kept in Library Employee Services when not in use by an authorized reviewer. All documents in transit shall be in sealed envelopes marked "Confidential."

C. TIMELINESS

It is the responsibility of all involved to ensure that assignments are performed with the greatest possible care and promptness. Adherence to calendar deadlines is in the best interest of all participants.

D. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

It is a professional responsibility for each Librarian at UC San Diego to serve on Ad Hoc Committees. Some Librarians may serve on several such committees each year. A person may disqualify himself/herself, but only if s/he questions his/her ability to make an objective judgment in a particular case.

E. NONDISCRIMINATION
(*MOU* Article 2, as appropriate)

The review process shall be applied equally to all Librarians at UC San Diego 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).

III. DEFINITIONS

A. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PARTICIPANTS

1. CANDIDATE FOR APPOINTMENT
   a. Defined as: An applicant for a position who has been recommended for appointment.

   b. Roles:
      1) Submits letter of application, resume and list of references.

      2) Makes himself/herself available for an interview.

2. CANDIDATE FOR REVIEW
   a. Defined as: A currently employed Librarian for whom a personnel action (career status, promotion, merit increase, no action, termination) is being considered.

   b. Roles:
      1) Examines and reports on the significance of his/her accomplishments and contributions during the review period, evaluating progress toward achieving established goals and identifying performance strengths and weaknesses.

      2) Furnishes required documents for the review file.

      3) Develops performance goals for the next review period. [See ARPM Appendix X for goals guidelines.]

      4) Maintains open and regular communication with Program Director during the review period, adjusting and revising goals in response to changing opportunities.

3. PROGRAM DIRECTOR
   (*MOU* Article 5.E)
   a. Defined as: The individual who has primary responsibility for the home program to which the position is assigned.

   The Program Director is, by default, assigned the role of Review Initiator for any Candidate assigned to his/her program as the home program. When appropriate, the Program Director may choose to delegate certain tasks during the review process (noted below) to an individual within the home program who has direct knowledge of the Candidate's work. In such a case, this delegate shall work closely with the Program Director throughout the course of the review process.

   If the Candidate reports directly to an AUL, then the AUL is the Review Initiator.

   b. Roles:
      1) Participates in the recruitment and screening of applicants and recommends the appointment of Candidates to positions within the program.

      2) Initiates the consultation at the beginning of the review process, clarifying expectations and responsibilities.

3) Works with the Candidate to establish a calendar to assure prompt completion of the review file. [This action may be delegated.]

4) Submits list of requested letters of reference to LHR, if applicable.

5) Procures evaluations from Secondary Evaluators within the Library, if applicable.

6) Gathers required documents for assembly into the Candidate's review file. [This action may be delegated.]

7) Writes an evaluation, assessing the value of the Candidate's accomplishments and contributions, identifying strengths and weaknesses, and recommending measures to be taken to improve performance. [This action may be delegated. See ARPM Section IV.C.4.h for guidelines.]

8) Ensures that the applicable procedures are being followed and completed, and that the Candidate is able to review and sign all applicable portions of the review file. [This action may be delegated.]

9) Recommends a personnel action based on the documentation in the file relative to the criteria for Librarians' performance stated in the *Academic Personnel Manual*.

10) Assists the Candidate, including new appointees, to formulate goals for the next review period, clarifying expectations. [See ARPM Appendix X for goals guidelines.]

11) Maintains open and regular communication with the Candidate during the review period, discussing progress toward goals and any need for goal modification, as well as addressing potential areas of weakness and ideas for improvement. Program directors seeking information on mechanisms for remediation can consult the APM 360-17-b.7 in conjunction with Library Employee Services.

12) Finalizes and signs Checklist A (ARPM Appendix II), and signs all applicable documents [See ARPM Appendix I] in the review file.

4. SECONDARY EVALUATOR
   a. Defined as: An individual outside the Candidate's direct reporting line who has knowledge of one or more of the Candidate's functional assignments.

   May be, but is not limited to, one of the following:
   1) A Program Director or Work Leader within a program which is not the Candidate's home program, but for which the Candidate has an official assignment.
   2) A Program Director or Work Leader within a program for which the Candidate does not have an official assignment, but performs some job function.
   3) A member of the Candidate's home program who oversees a function of the Candidate's job and does not otherwise have input into the review file.

      b. Role: Within the functional area for which s/he has knowledge, evaluates the Candidate's performance for the review file.

5. REFEREE
   a. Defined as: Any individual who is knowledgeable about the Candidate's performance and responds to the Library's formal request for comment.

   b. Role: In response to a formal request, provides confidential statements for the file evaluating the Candidate's work.

6. CAPA (Committee on Appointment, Promotion, Advancement)
   a. Defined as: A review group elected by the membership of LAUC-SD.

   b. Roles:

      1) Oversees and coordinates the peer review component of the review process.

      2) Acts as a standing committee to review all personnel actions.

      3) Acts as the sole review committee for cases that are not referred to an Ad Hoc Committee.

      4) Nominates eligible persons to serve on Ad Hoc Review Committees.

      5) Reviews and comments on the draft of the University Librarian's final letter to the Candidate.

      6) Evaluates the review procedure document and recommends changes to LAUC-SD and to the University Librarian.

      7) Advises LAUC-SD and/or the Library Administrative Team on academic personnel matters.

      8) Plans and presents the annual academic review writing and Best Practices for Review Initiators workshops near the beginning of the review cycle.

7. AD HOC COMMITTEE
   a. Defined as: A review group formed expressly to review the file of an individual Candidate.

   b. Role: Reviews the documentation in a personnel action file and reports its findings and recommendations to CAPA.

8. ASSISTANT OR ASSOCIATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN (AUL)
   a. Defined as: A Library administrative officer who reports to the University Librarian.

   b. Roles:
      1) Serves as the Review Initiator in conducting the review of a Candidate who reports directly to him/her.

2) Advises the University Librarian in the administrative portion of the review process.

9. LIBRARY EMPLOYEE SERVICES (LES)
   a. Defined as: A unit within the Business and Employee Services Program. The Library Officer(s) within LES provide administrative oversight for academic human resource matters.

   b. Roles:
      1) Maintains a centralized file of all personnel files, controlling access to confidential material.

      2) Coordinates the application of the review procedures.

      3) Is available to all participants to interpret and advise on application of these procedures.

      4) Ensures the supply and distribution of all documents and forms required to implement these procedures.

      5) Maintains liaison with the campus Academic Personnel Services to ensure that these procedures and their implementation meet University requirements.

10. UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN
    a. Defined as: The Library's chief executive officer.

    b. Roles:
       1) Assumes ultimate responsibility for defining performance standards for Library academic personnel, communicating expectations, stimulating discussion, promoting common understanding and consensus.

       2) Assumes ultimate responsibility within the Library for ensuring that these procedures, as approved by University Administration, are implemented and adhered to.

       3) Appoints members of each Ad Hoc Committee from lists of nominees supplied by CAPA.

       4) Reviews the documentation in personnel action files and makes final decisions regarding recommendations.

       5) Reports the final decision in a letter to the Candidate, or extends an offer to a Candidate for appointment.

B. TYPES OF REVIEWS

1. STANDARD REVIEW
   (*MOU* Article 4.E.2.a)
   A standard review is one that takes place every two (2) years at the Assistant and Associate ranks and three (3) years at the Librarian rank.

2. OFF-CYCLE REVIEW
   (*APM* 360-80-a(2)(b) and *MOU* Articles 4.E.2.b and 5.C)
   An off-cycle review is one that takes place earlier than the standard review.   A Candidate who is not typically eligible for a review during a particular review cycle may request an off-cycle review during that cycle. The decision to grant an off-cycle review is at the sole discretion of management.

3. DEFERRED REVIEW
   (*APM* 360-80-a(2)(c) and *MOU* Article 4.E.2.c)
   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.

   a. A deferral of a review for an one-year period may be requested by the Candidate or the Program Director, but may be initiated only with the written agreement of the Candidate, and may be approved only when there is insufficient evidence to evaluate performance due to prolonged absence or other unusual circumstances since the last personnel review.

   b. Reasons for the review deferral must be submitted in writing and must be submitted for written recommendations in the following sequence: Program Director, CAPA and then to the University Librarian for decision.

C. TYPES OF ACTIONS

   1. POTENTIAL CAREER STATUS
      (*APM* 360-17 and *MOU* Article 4.D.5)
      Potential Career Status refers to a trial period for new appointees. An appointee whose appointment is not explicitly temporary, and who is at the rank of Assistant Librarian or a new appointee at any rank is in Potential Career Status for a trial period. If, after careful and thorough review, the appointee is not placed in Career Status within the time limit specified for that rank, the appointment is terminated after due notice.

   2. CAREER STATUS
      (*APM* 360-8-f and *MOU* Article 4.E.1.a)
      Career Status is a continuing appointment, typically achieved only after successful completion of a suitable trial period in Potential Career Status. The University Librarian may grant career status upon hire in exceptional circumstances, for example, when appointing individuals who have already achieved career status or the equivalent.

      An appointee with Career Status making an intercampus transfer retains Career Status.

   3. MERIT INCREASE
      (*APM* Sections 360-8-d, 360-18-c and -e, and *MOU* Articles 4.E.1.b and 13.D)
      A merit increase is an advancement following a positive review. A positive review shall result in an increase of at least two (2) salary points on the applicable scale for an Assistant and Associate ranks, and at least three (3) salary points on the applicable scale at the Librarian rank.

      An increase of less than the minimum may be awarded in cases where fewer points remain on the scale of the Candidate's respective rank.

The University is not precluded from granting merit increases of a greater number of points for any reason. A Program Director may recommend a greater number of salary points if s/he feels that the Candidate's review file reflects evidence of unusual achievement and exceptional promise of continued growth (See ARPM Appendix VII for a more detailed description and guidelines).

4. PROMOTION
(*APM* 360-8-c; *MOU* Articles 4.E1.c, 13.E, 13.G. and Sideletter Academic Reviews)
A promotion is advancement to the next highest rank within the Librarian Series. A Candidate may request a promotional review once s/he has achieved a salary in a rank that overlaps with the next rank. Candidates 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.

If a promotional review is requested, a positive review will result in promotion to the next rank. Upon promotion, the Candidate will receive an increase of at least two (2) salary points above their previous salary amount if being promoted to the Associate Librarian rank, and at least three (3) salary points above their previous salary amount if being promoted to the Librarian rank.

5. NO ACTION
(*APM* 360-8-e and 360-18-d and *MOU* Articles 4.E.1.d and 13.D.2)
A no action is one of the following:
a. A neutral, non-prejudicial action for those at the top salary point of the Associate or Librarian rank.

b. An action intended to address performance issues and the actions required to improve that performance for those at any salary point.

If the Candidate receives a No Action for performance-related reasons, the Candidate will be provided with a written remediation plan to address the perceived deficiency, if s/he does not already have one. APM 360-17-b(7) and MOU Article 4.D.5.g address the appropriate actions and timing guidelines to be taken once a remediation plan has been implemented.

In exceptional circumstances, a librarian who receives a no-action may be awarded a one (1) point salary advancement at the Assistant and Associate Librarian ranks and a one (1) or a two (2) point advancement at the Librarian rank.

6. TERMINATION
(*APM* 360-17-b and *MOU* Article 4.E.1.e)
Ends the employment of a librarian.

D. CRITERIA FOR REVIEW
(*APM* Sections 360-10 and 210-4-e and *MOU* Articles 4.C)

A Candidate shall be evaluated on the basis of the criteria listed below. In considering a Candidate, reasonable flexibility is to be exercised in weighing the comparative relevance of the criteria.

1. REVIEW OF PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

   a. Professional Competence and Service within the Library
   Encompasses achievement and service in areas of primary responsibilities as well as other contributions to the library such as committee work and special assignments. Include here mention of substantive documents, such as reports and manuals, prepared for internal use. Library instruction goes here, including teaching and preparation of instructional materials. Also include here participation in UC-wide committees on which membership is required as part of the Candidate's responsibilities, such as collection development groups. Include management and supervisory responsibilities as relevant to the position.

   b. Professional Activity outside the Library
   Includes service and contributions to professional and scholarly associations, e.g., committee work, program participation as panelist or discussion leader, offices held, consulting work, and editorial activity outside of primary responsibilities. [Note: Attendance at professional meetings, workshops, institutes, etc. should appear in Section 2 (see Professional Growth, below); formal papers delivered at meetings that result from research activities should appear in Section 1.d. (Research and Other Creative Work)]

   c. University and Library-Related Public Service
   Includes teaching courses for credit through another academic department; service and contributions to LAUC, both locally and statewide; service and contributions outside the scope of the primary job responsibilities to UC San Diego-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 [see 1.a]). Also includes professional service as a consultant, speaker, or expert witness to public service oriented groups, officials or associations.

   d. Research and Other Creative Work
   Includes 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. Includes scholarly and professional publications, addresses, formal papers and presentations, reports of research, and other creative activity including preparation of exhibits. Documents prepared for internal use or for library instruction should be included under Section 1.a (Professional Competence and Service, above).

2. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION
Includes attendance at conferences, workshops, institutes, and formal courses.

3. OTHER FACTORS RELATED TO PERFORMANCE
Includes additional factors that may help Reviewers form an objective appraisal of the Candidate's performance, or a summary of factors important in weighing the evidence in the file.

E. THE REVIEW PERIOD

1. RESTRICTIONS AND REQUIREMENTS
   The review file shall consider activities and documentation that relate to the period under review only (see ARPM Section III.B, Types of Reviews, above). Reference to earlier events or projects, or to previous reviews, should not be made in the Candidate's self-review or the Program Director's review unless clearly essential to the current review. Activities, events and/or projects from the employee's entire work history may be included in the Academic Biography Form (see ARPM Section IV.C.4, Review File Documents, below).

   In cases of promotion, discussion of the Candidate's entire relevant professional career history is required. It is the responsibility of both the Candidate and the Program Director to work together to present a thorough picture of the entire career history in the review file.

   When an internal Candidate is appointed to a new position in the Librarian series through an open recruitment, the review period will be reset to begin at the date of the new appointment only when there is a change in salary (either within the same or new rank), and the Candidate's next review file should only cover activities occurring since the date of the salary change. If the new appointment does not result in a change in salary, the existing review period will remain in effect. (see APM 200 Sections 17 and 30 and MOU Article 4.D.6).

   In the case of new appointees external to the UC San Diego Library who are undergoing their first review, the documentation relevant to Criteria 1.b-d should cover the same time period as that of other Librarians at their level. Candidates should also include evidence from Criteria, Sections 2 and 3, above.

2. RESPONSIBILITY
   a. When a Program Director has responsibility for a program for only a portion of a review period, the Program Director will be asked to write a letter for those Candidates that have been under his/her supervision for at least six months of the review cycle. The letter will discuss performance since the last review in all of the areas noted above. The former Program Director will discuss the letter with each Candidate supervised; each Candidate will also have the opportunity to respond in writing to the letter. The resulting documentation will be signed by both the Program Director and the Candidate and then submitted to Library Employee Services for inclusion in the documentation for the next review.

   b. In all cases, the Program Director supervising the Candidate on the date at which the review file is due to Library Employee Services shall write the recommendation for personnel action. In cases in which the Candidate has changed programs during the review period, and the recommending Program Director has not been the supervisor during the majority of the review period, the recommending Program Director will prepare the recommendation in consultation with the prior Program Director(s). If there is any disagreement among these Program Directors regarding the recommendation, that disagreement will be noted in the current Program Director's review.

IV. REVIEW PROCEDURES: MERIT INCREASE, PROMOTION, AND CAREER STATUS

A. ADVANCE PREPARATION FOR ACADEMIC REVIEWS
   (*APM* Sections 360-17-c, 360-17-d, 360-80-a, 360-80-d, and *MOU* Articles 5.B and 5.C as appropriate)

   1. DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR REVIEW
      a. Each year prior to the beginning of the review process, each Librarian shall be notified in writing of his/her eligibility for review.

      b. Eligibility is determined according to the intervals for academic reviews stated in *APM* 360-80-a and *MOU* Article 5.B, as appropriate; the policy for calculating periods of service is found in *APM* 360-17-d.

   2. NOTIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR REVIEW
      Approximately one month before the review process begins, all Candidates for review and Program Directors of all programs to which the Candidates are assigned shall be provided with a written list of the personnel actions for which the Candidate is eligible in the upcoming review. The Candidate and home Program Director shall be asked to review the summary of options for accuracy.

B. THE CALL
   (*APM* 360-80-c and *MOU* Article 5.D, as appropriate)

   1. DISTRIBUTION OF PACKETS, INSTRUCTIONS AND CALENDAR
      All Candidates for review and their home Program Director will receive from Library Employee Services a complete review packet, including a call for recommendations for academic merit increases, promotions, and career status actions and the calendar of due dates for the appraisal and review process no later than 30 calendar days prior to the first required action following the issuance of the call. [See ARPM Appendix I for lists of the forms and documentation included in the review file.]

   2. CALENDAR
      All parties shall adhere to the calendar, and the Candidate shall be notified of the decision within six months of the first required action. If necessary, in individual cases, provisions for reasonable extensions shall be developed in consultation with the campus Academic Personnel Services.

C. PROGRAM LEVEL REVIEW PROCEDURES

   1. INITIAL CONSULTATION
      Early in the course of a personnel review, the Program Director shall notify the Candidate (along with a delegated evaluator, if applicable) of the impending review. In conference(s) with the Candidate, the Program Director will make certain the Candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process, including the criteria specified in APM 210-4, APM 360-10 and MOU Article 4.C. The Candidate shall be given the opportunity to ask questions and to supply pertinent information and evidence to be used in the review.

   2. CHECKLIST A

Checklist A (ARPM Appendix II) shall be initialed and dated by the Candidate and the Program Director as a way to certify that the necessary steps of the review process have been fulfilled. This may be done as the steps are completed, or all at once at the end of the review process.

3. RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROGRAM LEVEL REVIEW
   a. The Program Director in the Candidate's home program shall initiate the review.

   b. The home Program Director may choose to delegate certain tasks during the review process to an individual to whom the Candidate reports within the program (See ARPM Section III.A.3 regarding Program Director roles for more detail). In such a case, this delegate shall work closely with the Program Director throughout the course of the review period. Ultimately, however, it is the responsibility of the home Program Director to ensure that the review is carried out and to make the recommended personnel action.

4. REVIEW FILE DOCUMENTS

   a. LETTERS OF REFERENCE LIST
      1) The Candidate shall submit to the Program Director a list of names of persons from whom letters of reference and/or secondary evaluations might be solicited. The Candidate may also list names of persons who, for reasons set forth in writing, might not objectively evaluate, in a letter or on a committee, the Candidate's qualifications or performance.

      2) See ARPM Section IV.C.4.f (Letters of Reference) below for a further instructions and guidance regarding letters of reference.

      3) The list should be provided early in the review calendar so that there is sufficient time for the letters to be completed and received by the required date.

   b. ACADEMIC BIOGRAPHY FORM
      1) The Candidate will update the Academic Biography Form.

      2) The Candidate and the Program Director should initial and date the Academic Biography Form.

   c. CANDIDATE'S POSITION DESCRIPTION
      (*MOU* Articles 7.B.2 and 7.D.2. Note: the MOU use of the term "Statement of responsibility" is equivalent to UC San Diego use of "Position Description." Both represented and non-represented librarians shall follow the procedures outlined below.)
      1) A position description shall be prepared and signed by the Candidate and supervisor within 30 days of the date of hire. Signed position description should be sent to LES for inclusion in the Candidate's file. The Candidate and supervisor should also retain a copy for their records.

      2) A position description shall be reviewed by the Candidate and the supervisor within 30 days of their hire and at the commencement of each review period.

3) A position description should consist of a concise descriptive statement (normally one page) outlining present responsibilities. The approximate percentage of time spent in each major area of responsibility should be included. Such descriptive detail would not typically be repeated in the Candidate's self-evaluation, which is an evaluative appraisal rather than a descriptive statement.

4) If the position description requires updating, the Candidate and the supervisor shall agree upon the necessary changes and update the position description accordingly. When the position description has been agreed upon, the Candidate and the supervisor should sign and date it and send to LES. Candidate and supervisor should also retain a copy for their records If the update occurs at the beginning of an academic review, the Candidate merely includes it with the review packet (no need to send an extra copy to LES).

5) In the case of reassignment, a revised position description should be prepared no less than ten (10) working days prior to the commencement of the new assignment. When a reassignment occurs due to unexpected or unplanned circumstances (including but not limited to, sudden resignations or prolonged absences), a revised position description shall be prepared no later than ten (10) working days after the commencement of the new assignment. Timelines can be extended by mutual agreement.

d. CANDIDATE'S SELF-REVIEW
1) A brief, concise self-review of "pertinent information and evidence" shall be prepared, consisting of a page or so of vita-style enumeration of accomplishments keyed to the criteria outlined in ARPM Section III.D above, followed by a narrative discussion of no more than three of the most significant items within 1.a and no more than three of the most significant items within criteria 1.b-d. The suggested length for an entire self-review should be no more than five pages. Exceptions to these self-review guidelines are actions involving promotion, career status or additional salary points upon merit increase. In such cases, the review file may be longer, if necessary.

2) When the Candidate has completed his/her self-review, the Academic Biography Form, Position Description and Self-Review shall be assembled and submitted to the Program Director, and Checklist A will be updated and initialed.

e. ORGANIZATION CHART
The Program Director shall share with the Candidate an organization chart that shows the Candidate's position in the library. This is a required form and shall include an indication of the Candidate's current rank. The organization chart will be added to the review file.

f. LETTERS OF REFERENCE
(*APM* 160-20 and 380-80 and *MOU* Article 5.G, as appropriate)

1) Letters of reference are recommended only for reviews recommending promotion, career status, merit increase with additional salary points, or in

those cases in which the home Program Director and/or the delegated evaluation writer does not have firsthand knowledge of the individual's performance in a certain area.

2) The Program Director shall submit to Library Employee Services the names of persons from whom Library Employee Services shall request letters of reference. These names may be supplied by the Candidate or the Program Director. For each letter of reference to be solicited, the Referee shall be asked to address specific aspects of the Candidate's performance with which s/he is familiar.

3) If letters of reference are requested, a reasonable number of letters should be from the list of names supplied by the Candidate. Although there is no set limit, usually not more than four letters shall be requested. Both the Candidate's list and the final list shall become part of the review file.

4) The Program Director should decide whether or not to solicit letters from those persons whom the Candidate has named as persons who, for reasons set forth by the Candidate, might not objectively evaluate the Candidate's qualifications and performance. If such named reviewer is used, the Program Director should explain the reasons for consulting the named individual so that the file will show not only the Candidate's reasons for the exclusion, but also the reason for the Program Director's decision to seek input from the named person.

5) Letters of Reference may be requested from colleagues, faculty, library or other University staff, or library users who are familiar with the Candidate's performance. If the Referee is internal to the UCSD Library, this is considered a Secondary Evaluation and is addressed in Section g below.

6) When the letters of reference have been received by Library Employee Services, they shall be sent to the Program Director for inclusion in the review file.

7) The Program Director shall be informed by Library Employee Services of the names of persons from whom letters of reference have not been received within a reasonable period of time and a name may be substituted, if necessary, to complete the file.

8) The Program Director shall ensure that the Candidate will not know the name of any person from whom a letter has been requested. The Candidate may request in writing from Library Employee Services a redacted copy of each letter of reference in the file. See ARPM Appendix VI for a greater explanation of this policy.

g. SECONDARY EVALUATIONS
   1) If appropriate, the Program Director shall request from a Secondary Evaluator an evaluation of the Candidate's performance of the function(s) for which the Secondary Evaluator is responsible during the review period.

   2) When a Candidate has an official assignment split among two or more programs, a secondary evaluation is required from each Program Director.

3) Secondary evaluations are optional in all cases in which a Candidate has a single official reporting line. Optional secondary evaluations are suggested only in instances in which the Candidate's Program Director does not have sufficient knowledge of the Candidate's performance in a specific area of his/her responsibilities, or if some aspect of his/her job performance will not be evaluated sufficiently elsewhere in the review file. An optional secondary evaluation may be initiated by the Candidate, the Secondary Evaluator, or the Program Director.

4) If an evaluation is requested of a Secondary Evaluator, s/he is obligated to fulfill the request.

5) The procurement of a secondary evaluation will be the responsibility of the Program Director. Secondary evaluations will be brief letters which will be included in the review file.

6) The secondary evaluation(s) shall be shown to and discussed with the Candidate and initialed and dated by the Candidate, the authoring Secondary Evaluator and Program Director, and included in the review file.

h. PROGRAM DIRECTOR'S EVALUATION
1) It is the responsibility of the Program Director to thoroughly evaluate the work of the Candidate in relation to the criteria set forth in *APM Sections* 360-10 and 210-4-e(3), and detailed in ARPM Section III.D above and to make an appropriate recommendation for career status, merit increase, promotion, no action, or termination. Off-cycle and deferred reviews should be clearly identified as such.

2) The Program Director may request that an individual to whom the Candidate reports within the program prepare the program level review. In this case, the Program Director need address only those points that have not been adequately covered, or points of disagreement. If the delegate's evaluation does not require elaboration, the Program Director may note, "I concur", sign and date it. The Program Director may not delegate the responsibility for making the personnel action recommendation.

3) The Program Director shall thoroughly evaluate the Candidate's professional service to the Library, concentrating on performance in each major area of responsibility and on the Candidate's progress toward achieving goals established for the review period. S/he shall evaluate the quality and quantity of the Candidate's work, and acknowledge the Candidate's activities as reviewed by a Secondary Evaluator. Comments on the value of the Candidate's work to the program and the Library should be included. Specific aspects of the Candidate's work that are carried out exceptionally well or that need improvement should be commented upon. Mention should be made of activities that have contributed to the Candidate's professional growth. In the case of new appointees undergoing their first review, the documentation relevant to criteria 1.b-d should cover the same time period as that of other Librarians at their level. In evaluating the Candidate's performance, the Program Director shall consider the Candidate's consistency of performance,

grasp of library methods, command of subject area, continued growth in field, judgment, leadership, originality, ability to work effectively with others, including contributing to and working effectively in shared decision-making processes, and ability to relate functions to the general goals of the Library and the University. If the Candidate supervises the work of other library staff, the Program Director should comment on the quality and effectiveness of the supervision provided.

4) Evidence of effective service may include the opinions expressed in the letters of reference, the effectiveness of the techniques applied or procedures developed by the Candidate, and relevant additional educational achievement.

5) Reviews should be brief and concise. In preparing the documentation for the evaluation, the Program Director should follow the numbering and headings given in ARPM Section III.D above. Section 1.a must be discussed. Sections 1.b-d, 2 and 3 shall be discussed to the extent applicable.

5. RECOMMENDATION OF PERSONNEL ACTION
   a. The Program Director shall prepare a recommendation for personnel action for the Candidate, indicating the recommended review action and the proposed rank, salary point increase, and status in the Librarian Series.

   b. In the case of a Candidate with responsibilities in multiple programs, the recommendation for personnel action will be made having taken into consideration the evaluations of all Secondary Evaluators.

6. PROGRAM DIRECTOR'S CONFERENCE WITH THE CANDIDATE
   The Program Director shall review the following documents with the Candidate and each shall be signed and dated by the Program Director and the Candidate:
   a. The Candidate's self-review.

   b. The evaluation by the home Program Director, Secondary Evaluators (if applicable), and delegated evaluator (if applicable).

   c. Any redacted copies of the letters of reference requested in writing by the Candidate.

   d. The Program Director's recommendation for personnel action.

7. CANDIDATE'S RESPONSE TO MATERIAL IN THE FILE
   (*APM* 360-80-g and MOU Articles 5.E and 5.H)
   The Candidate shall be allowed a reasonable period of time, no less than seven consecutive calendar days, to review and respond to the file. This period of time may be extended by mutual agreement of the parties The Candidate may submit for inclusion in the file a written statement in response to or commenting upon material in the review file to which the Candidate has access.

8. ASSEMBLING PROGRAM LEVEL REVIEW FILE
   The Program Director will assemble all of the documents listed above [See ARPM Appendix I for reference.] into the final review file for transmittal to Library Employee

Services. The Program Director shall review all documents, including "Checklist A" (Appendix II), for completeness and for appropriate signatures and dates.

9. REDACTED COPIES OF CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS
    Library Employee Services will provide redacted copies of the confidential documents included in the record. See ARPM Appendix VI for a greater explanation of this policy.

10. NON-CONFIDENTIAL MATERIALS AVAILABLE TO CANDIDATE
    The final non-confidential contents of the review file shall be given to the Candidate for examination before the file is forwarded for peer review. The Candidate shall have the opportunity to make copies of any non-confidential parts of his/her review file.

D. PEER REVIEW PROCEDURES

On completion of the program level review procedures, the Program Director shall submit the Candidate's review file to Library Employee Services who shall transmit the file to CAPA. CAPA shall act as a peer review committee for all files. Depending on the nature of the review, an Ad Hoc Committee may also be formed to review the file.

1. COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND ADVANCEMENT (CAPA)
    a. CAPA ELECTION
        Members shall be elected at the annual LAUC-SD election for two years with terms staggered so that two members are elected each year. Of these four members, the Chairperson of CAPA shall be appointed by the Executive Board of LAUC-SD. If a vacancy occurs in CAPA, the method of filling it shall be determined at a general meeting of LAUCSD. No Librarian shall serve consecutive terms as a member of CAPA.

    b. CAPA COMPOSITION
        (*MOU* Article 5.A, as appropriate)
        Membership of CAPA shall consist of four members from the Librarian Series with Career Status.

    c. CAPA QUORUM
        Three members of CAPA shall constitute a quorum when reviewing a 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 DISQUALIFICATION
        A member of CAPA shall recuse himself/herself from reviewing a file when
        1) his/her own file is being reviewed.

        2) s/he has been responsible for contributing a significant portion of the review file.

        3) s/he questions his/her ability to make an objective judgment in a particular case.

2. AD HOC COMMITTEES
    a. PURPOSE AND DUTIES OF AD HOC COMMITTEES

1) Each Ad Hoc Committee shall be separately constituted for the purpose of reviewing the personnel action and salary points recommended by the PD.

2) 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 if a merit, promotion, or career status action should be recommended. The Ad Hoc Committee may also advise on the recommended salary points.

b. SERVICE ON AD HOC COMMITTEES
1) It shall be a professional responsibility for each Librarian at UC San Diego to serve on Ad Hoc Committees. It is anticipated that some Librarians shall serve on several such committees each year.

2) A person may disqualify himself/herself, but only if s/he questions his/her ability to make an objective judgment in a particular case, and CAPA shall recommend an alternate.

c. FORMATION OF AD HOC COMMITTEES
Ad Hoc committees shall be formed under the following circumstances:
1) In all cases of promotion, career status, or termination, or when CAPA disagrees with the Program Director's recommended action.

2) In cases where a request for formation of an Ad Hoc Committee has been made by the Candidate, Program Director, AUL, University Librarian, or CAPA.

3) Ad Hoc Review Committees shall convene as soon as possible after appointment by the University Librarian. Library Employee Services shall ask one member of the Committee to convene the first meeting, at which time the committee will elect its chair.

d. APPOINTMENT OF AD HOC COMMITTEES
(*APM* 360-6-c and MOU Article 5.M)
1) CAPA shall obtain from Library Employee Services a current roster of academic staff in the Librarian Series that shall serve as the list of staff eligible to serve on Ad Hoc Committees.

2) CAPA shall submit its recommendation for the makeup of an Ad Hoc Committee to the University Librarian for his/her approval. Should the University Librarian decide that the membership of a committee is potentially inappropriate for a particular case, s/he shall request that CAPA recommend alternates for his/her consideration.

2) Assignments to these committees shall be distributed equitably among Librarians at UC San Diego.

3) The membership of Ad Hoc Review Committees is strictly confidential and shall be made known only to Library Employee Services (Coordinator or Director), CAPA members, the AULs, CAO and the University Librarian.

5) If CAPA determines that membership of an Ad Hoc Committee has become known to any unauthorized person, CAPA may recommend to the University Librarian that the appointed committee be disbanded and shall recommend a new Ad Hoc Committee. Additional documentation requested by the original Ad Hoc Committee will remain in the file with the members' names removed.

e. COMPOSITION OF AD HOC COMMITTEES
1) Members of CAPA may not serve on an Ad Hoc Committee.

2) Former members of CAPA may not serve on an Ad Hoc Committee the year following their final year on CAPA.

3) Librarians who have contributed confidential documentation to a review file may not serve on the Ad Hoc Committee to review that Candidate's file for two years.

4) It is desirable that an Ad Hoc Committee for performance review include a Librarian whose functional area of expertise is related to that of the person whose performance is being reviewed.

5) Each Ad Hoc Committee shall consist of three members as follows:
   a. For each recommended personnel action for Candidates holding the rank of Librarian, and for each Candidate whose list of personnel action options includes promotion from the rank of Associate Librarian to Librarian, each Ad Hoc Committee shall be composed of three Librarians, at least two of whom hold the rank of Librarian with Career Status, and the third the rank of Librarian or Associate Librarian with Career Status.

   b. For each recommended personnel action, except promotion, for Candidates holding the rank of Associate Librarian, and for each Candidate whose list of personnel action options includes promotion from Assistant Librarian to Associate Librarian, the Ad Hoc Committee shall be composed of three Librarians holding the rank of Librarian with Career Status, or Associate Librarian with Career Status.

   c. For each recommended personnel action, except for those Candidates whose list of personnel action options includes promotion, for Librarians holding the rank of Assistant Librarian, the Ad Hoc Committee shall be composed of three Librarians, at least one of whom holds the rank of Librarian with Career Status, or Associate Librarian with Career Status.

3. INSTRUCTIONS TO AD HOC COMMITTEES AND CAPA FOR PERFORMING REVIEWS
(*APM* 210-4 and *MOU* Article 5.M)
a. An Ad Hoc committee, when applicable, will review a file before CAPA. When the Ad Hoc committee report is received, Library Employee Services shall notify CAPA that the file is ready for CAPA review.

b. CAPA shall serve as the only peer review committee for those files that are not referred to an Ad Hoc Committee.

c. The review shall be based on an objective appraisal of the recommendation and documentation in relation to the criteria in APM 210-4-e. The committee shall determine whether, in its judgment, the documentation supports the recommendation of the Program Director.

d. 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 point.

e. Documents lacking in detail shall be returned for amplification, or requests for additional documentation, shall be requested through CAPA, who can work with Library Employee Services about this request. The committee may name an individual from whom to request additional documentation, or may request the Program Director name an individual to address a specific area of performance. Such documentation shall be added to the review file after the Librarian under review has been given copies of any non-confidential material and, upon written request, redacted copies of any confidential material added to the review file. The Candidate and his/her Program Director shall be provided an opportunity to submit a written statement in response to the additions to the review record. The certification statement called "Checklist B" (ARPM Appendix III) will be annotated to verify that these steps have been completed.

f. Recommendations for promotion, career status, or termination shall be substantiated with documentation consisting of the Candidate's prior review files. Additionally, if a Candidate's list of personnel action options for the current review includes one of these actions, the retrospective review files shall be provided to the committee at its request regardless of whether the Program Director or a review committee has indicated that any of these actions is being recommended or considered.

4. REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORTS
   The reports of an Ad Hoc committee (ARPM Appendix VIII) and CAPA (Appendix IX) shall include the following items:
   a. Name of the person reviewed.

   b. Type of action recommended by the Program Director and an indication of the current and proposed rank and salary point.

   c. A statement indicating agreement or disagreement with the Program Director's recommendation for personnel action. Committees may also advise on Program Director's recommendation for salary points.

   d. CAPA ONLY: A summary report that gives the explicit reasons for CAPA's recommendation to the University Librarian. The report shall address each area of the criteria outlined in APM 210-4-e.

   e. The names and signatures of the committee members shall appear as the last item of the report, with the chairperson so designated.

f. In cases involving a minority opinion, the minority member of the committee shall also submit a written report. In the case of a divided opinion, two reports shall be submitted.

5. REVIEW COMPLETION
The committee chairperson shall add their recommendation to the Candidate's review file and transmit it to Library Employee Services. The Chairperson shall insure that all preliminary drafts and notes of the committee are destroyed.

E. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

1. UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN'S REVIEW AND DECISION
   a. When the reports of the Ad Hoc Committee, if applicable, and CAPA have been submitted, the file is ready for review by the University Librarian who, in accordance with campus procedures, has authority for making the final decision for personnel action.

   b. Using the criteria provided in the APM Sections 210-4-e and 360-10, the University Librarian shall review the documentation in each file.

   c. 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 point.

   d. Documents lacking in detail shall be returned for amplification, or additional documentation shall be requested through Library Employee Services. Such documentation shall be added to the review file after the Librarian under review has been given copies of any non-confidential material, or, upon written request, a redacted copy of any confidential material added to the review file. The Candidate and his/her Program Director shall be provided an opportunity to submit a written statement in response to the additions to the review record. The certification statement called "Checklist B" (see ARPM Appendix III) will be annotated to verify that these steps have been completed.

   f. The University Librarian, in consultation with the AULs and CAO, shall make a tentative decision after weighing each recommended action in relation to all others, and with regard to budgetary limitations.
      1) In the event that any tentative decision of the University Librarian is contrary to the recommendation of CAPA and/or the Ad Hoc committee, the University Librarian shall prepare for the review committees in question a written report outlining the reasons behind the tentative decision and shall ask for any further information that might suggest a different decision. This report, and any documentation created by the review committees in this process shall be placed in the review file and made available to the Candidate upon written request.

      2) If the report is addressed to the Ad Hoc Committee, the Ad Hoc Committee shall have the opportunity for further comment before the final decision is made. CAPA shall also have the opportunity for further comment before the decision is made.

2. CAPA'S REVIEW OF LETTER TO CANDIDATE
The University Librarian's final letter to the Candidate shall be forwarded to CAPA.

F. NOTIFICATION OF FINAL DECISION
(*MOU* Article 5.P)

1. CANDIDATE IS NOTIFIED OF DECISION
   a. When the personnel action has been decided by the University Librarian, that decision shall be communicated to the Candidate in a letter that contains the University Librarian's decision and the reasons for that decision. At a minimum, the letter shall inform the Candidate of the personnel action received, his/her new salary, and the number of salary points awarded. The letter shall summarize the consensus of those who participated in the review. The CAPA report shall also be included with the University Librarian's letter to the Candidate.

   b. The University Librarian's final letter shall be submitted to each Candidate through his/her Program Director.

   c. Library Employee Services shall place a copy of the University Librarian's final letter in the Candidate's folder.

G. CANDIDATE'S OPTION TO REQUEST DOCUMENTS
(*MOU* Articles 5.G.4, 5.P and 6)

1. After the final administrative decision has been communicated to the Candidate in the University Librarian's letter, the Candidate shall receive redacted copies of the confidential documents (redacted copies of reference letters may have already been received by the Candidate before the Program level recommendation was made to Library Employee Services) and complete copies of the non-confidential documents in the personnel review file.

2. For review files prior to the 1992-93 review cycle, the Candidate may request a summary of the substance of the confidential documents.

H. APPEALS
(*MOU* Articles 4.F, 5.Q, 24, 25 and 26, as appropriate)

1. If the Candidate contemplates appeal of the decision made, s/he may request a meeting with Library Employee Services to discuss questions involving the review.

2. Following the meeting with Library Employee Services, if the Candidate believes that either the documentation was not factual or the review was not objective, s/he may appeal in writing to the University Librarian.

3. The University Librarian will send the written appeal to CAPA. CAPA will use this as a basis for its review to make a recommendation to the University Librarian whether it believes the Candidate's appeal is warranted or not. The University Librarian will make the decision as to whether the appeals process will move forward, taking into consideration CAPA's recommendation.
   a) If CAPA does not feel an appeal is warranted, they shall submit a written recommendation to the UL stating why.

b) If CAPA does feel the appeal warrants further consideration, it shall recommend to the UL that a new Ad Hoc Committee be appointed, according to ARPM Section IV.D.2.d.

4. Library Employee Services will call the Ad Hoc Committee, at the request of the UL. The Ad Hoc Committee shall not see the reports of CAPA, the previous Ad Hoc Committee (if applicable), or the University Librarian. However, any additional documentation originally requested by one of the review committees shall remain in the file with any Ad Hoc committee members' names removed.Both the Ad Hoc Committee and CAPA should proceed by following the instructions for review as documented in Section IV.D.3 to complete their respective reviews.

5. Following any appeals Ad Hoc Committee review, CAPA shall review the file again and submit a report to the University Librarian.

6. The University Librarian will review all new applicable documentation and make a final decision, then notify the Candidate of the decision. CAPA shall also be notified of the outcome of the appeal.

7. The membership and deliberations of all Ad Hoc Committees are strictly confidential and may not be revealed to the Candidate under any circumstances.

8. After using the appeal procedure stated above, if the Candidate wishes to grieve the process, they shall follow the procedure in accordance with the APM Section 140: Appeals Policy, the MOU Articles 4.F and 5.Q, and the PPM Section 230-5.

I. <u>FILE COMPLETION</u>
The completed file will be forwarded to the Academic Personnel Services, which initiates processing for payroll instructions. The original file is retained by Library Employee Services in the confidential portion of each Librarian's personnel file.

V.   REVIEW PROCEDURES: APPOINTMENTS

A. DEFINITIONS
(*APM* Sections 360-8-b and 360-8-f)

An appointment occurs when an individual is employed in one of the three ranks in the Librarian Series and when the individual's immediately previous status was
1. not in the employ of the University; or

2. in the employ of the University, but not with a title in this series.

3. in the employ of the University in the Librarian Series, but at another campus.

B. CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT

Refer to APM Sections 360-10 and 210-4-e.

C. POLICY

The Library shall conduct its own recruitment program for Librarians. Applicants will be considered on the basis of their experience, qualifications, skills, education and recommendations of previous employers evaluated within the context of the stated criteria and the University's ongoing academic personnel programs (for example, Affirmative Action). See also the statement on *Nondiscrimination* in *MOU* Article 2, as appropriate.

D. RECRUITMENT
1. ANNOUNCEMENT
    a. When a Potential Career or Career Status position in the Librarian Series is to be filled through open recruitment, the Recommending Officer (Program Director or AUL as appropriate) and Library Employee Services (Director or Coordinator) shall prepare the position description.

    b. The line AUL shall submit the position description to Cabinet for approval.

    c. The Recommending Officer and Library Employee Services (Director or Coordinator) shall determine recruitment procedures consistent with University recruitment policies. The Library Employee Services Coordinator will prepare the Academic Personnel Services Recruitment Plan for the University Librarian's review and signature.

    d. Available positions, except for internal recruitments, shall be announced at the national level in sources selected to attract a wide and diverse pool of qualified Candidates. [See *PPM* 230-6 for related policies.]

2. SCREENING
    a. A Screening Committee shall be created comprising of a Library Employee Services representative, and others as appropriate, reporting to the Recommending Officer.

    b. The Screening Committee shall identify the applicants for whom references shall be requested, conduct pre-screening, and select Candidates to be interviewed.

3. REFERENCE CHECKS
   a. The Screening Committee shall identify references to be contacted for selected Candidates.

   b. The Screening Committee shall solicit references for Candidates under consideration.

   c. When telephone reference checks are conducted, the Library Employee Services Coordinator will coordinate the solicitation of references for Candidates under consideration. [ARPM Appendix IV contains guidelines for conducting reference checks.]

4. INTERVIEW
   a. The Screening Committee and others as appropriate shall identify the appropriate persons and groups to interview the applicants.

   b. The Library Employee Services Coordinator shall prepare and distribute interview schedules and copies of resumes to all those listed on the interview schedule.

   c. A LAUC-SD committee composed of a minimum of two members designated by the LAUC-SD Executive Board shall provide information to the Candidate including the role of LAUC.

   d. When recruitment is at the Program Director level, the Library Council shall interview the Candidate as a group. The Line AUL shall designate a leader who will be responsible for compiling interview questions and coordinating the report of the group.

   e. Each individual or group who interviews the Candidate(s) shall assess the qualifications of each applicant in relation to the criteria in APM Sections 360-10 and 210-4-e and the requirements of the position, and shall prepare a report for the applicant's file which is submitted to the Recommending Officer (Program Director or AUL as appropriate) with a copy to the Library Employee Services Coordinator. The report will provide a thorough assessment of the applicant's qualifications, but shall not make a specific recommendation for hire. Additionally, the Recommending Officer may request each individual or group to submit a statement that ranks the interviewed Candidates in relation to one another and outlines the reasons for the ranking.

5. INTERNAL CANDIDATES
   a. Librarians already employed in the Librarian Series at UC San Diego may apply for advertised positions and will be treated exactly as all other applicants for the position, except that the Recommending Officer will not provide a letter of reference or other documentation for the applicant's file.

   b. Internal Candidates should be interviewed before outside Candidates.

   c. If the internal Candidate would normally participate in the interviews because of his/her current position, s/he may attend the other Candidate presentation(s) may and sit in as an observer on any interview panel s/he would normally attend.

d. The internal candidate shall not interview, provide feedback, discuss impressions, or provide any documentation for the file.

E. RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT

1. NOMINATING TOP CANDIDATE
   a. The Recommending Officer will review file and rank viable Candidate(s) with the line AUL (if the line AUL is not the Recommending Officer).

   b. The AUL shall provide the University Librarian with the name(s) of viable Candidate(s) identified and reason(s) for selection. A decision is made to pursue the top Candidate; that decision is communicated to the Library Employee Services Director.

   c. Library Employee Services (Director or Coordinator) will notify viable Candidates(s) that they are still under consideration and ascertain their continued interest. Library Employee Services (Director or Coordinator) will provide feedback to the University Librarian, AUL, and Program Director.

   d. The University Librarian shall notify the Library Employee Services Coordinator, Library Employee Services Director, AUL and/or Recommending Officer of consensus to prepare the top Candidate's appointment file for CAPA's review.

2. RECOMMENDING OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT
   a. After reviewing the draft with the AUL (if the Recommending Officer is not the AUL), the Recommending Officer shall write a letter of recommendation and complete the Office of Academic Recruitment Services Selection Report. The Library Employee Services Coordinator will forward to the Office of Academic Recruitment Services (OARS) for final approval.

   b. The Library Employee Services Coordinator shall provide CAPA with advance notice of the upcoming appointment file.

   c. The Library Employee Services Coordinator will forward the appointment file to CAPA upon receipt of the Recommending Officer's recommendation letter.

F. CAPA REVIEW

1. CAPA shall review the appointment file and prepare a recommendation report for the University Librarian within three working days of CAPA's receipt of the file. [See ARPM Appendix V for document checklist.]

2. CAPA shall submit the recommendation report to the Library Employee Services Coordinator.

3. If CAPA requires additional information, a formal written request will be sent to the Library Employee Services Coordinator.

G. OFFER

1. APPOINTMENT APPROVAL
    a. Library Employee Services Director shall convene a meeting with the Recommending Officer and/or line AUL, and AUL/Enterprise Services to reach agreement on rank and salary point, to discuss employment issues (e.g. visa needs), and to consider alternative or contingency strategies. The AUL/Enterprise Services shall review the proposed offer with the University Librarian.

    b. The Library Employee Services Director will notify the Library Employee Services Coordinator of the recommended rank, and other employment issues.

    c. Once CAPA's report is received, the Library Employee Services Coordinator shall complete the appointment file by adding CAPA's report, and review the file to make sure the Recommending Officer's recommendation, recommended appointment level and salary, reference letters, comments, application packet, etc. are included for the University Librarian's review.

    d. The University Librarian shall notify the AUL and/or Recommending Officer, Library Employee Services Director, and CAPA if the appointment is approved.

2. FORMAL OFFER
    a. The Recommending Officer will extend an informal offer to the Candidate, and discuss proposed rank, salary point, start date, removal needs, and other applicable employment issues. The Recommending Officer will not agree to any terms that have not been discussed with the Library Employee Services Director, AUL/Enterprise Services, and line AUL (if not the Recommending Officer).

    b. The Recommending Officer shall inform the Library Employee Services Director if the Candidate has requested any changes in the informal offer (e.g., additional salary points). The Library Employee Services Director will consult with the AUL/Enterprise Services and line AUL, who will consult with the University Librarian as appropriate.

    c. The AUL/Enterprise Services shall consult with the University Librarian if an exception requires Executive Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs approval.

    d. The Recommending Officer shall advise the Library Employee Services Coordinator and the Library Employee Services Director via electronic mail of the start date, rank and salary point, removal condition, and any other related issues.

    e. The Library Employee Services Coordinator will draft and finalize the formal offer letter with the above information for the University Librarian's review and signature. The offer letter must indicate a response date.

    f. The University Librarian shall forward the Candidate's written acceptance to the Library Employee Services Coordinator who will copy it for the Recommending Officer.

H. APPOINTMENT FILE COMPLETION

1. The Library Employee Services Coordinator shall inform CAPA of the final outcome.

2. The Recommending Officer will notify the Library Employee Services Coordinator of any changes (i.e. start date, etc.).

3. The Recommending Officer may make a public announcement only after the Candidate has formally accepted the offer in writing.

4. The Library Employee Services Coordinator shall organize moving arrangements in accordance with university policy and directly with the Candidate.

5. A position description shall be prepared and signed by the Candidate and supervisor within 30 days of the date of hire, Signed position description should be sent to LES for inclusion in the Candidate's file. The Candidate and supervisor should also retain a copy for their records.

I. TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS
   (*APM* 360-20-a, *MOU* Article 18)

   1. DEFINITIONS
      a. A temporary appointment is an appointment in the Librarian Series that has a specified date of termination.

      b. A given temporary appointment shall be for two (2) years or less, unless supported by external funds. Externally funded appointments may be continued for one (1) additional year. Positions funded by extramural funds may be continued for the duration of the fund. The anticipated length of the temporary appointment shall be included in the librarian's appointment letter. When the length of the appointment permits, the librarian shall be reviewed following the same procedures and review cycles set forth for review of potential career or career appointees.

   2. TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT REVIEW PROCEDURES
      Review procedures as described in ARPM Section V apply to temporary appointments, with the following exceptions:
      a. Recruitment procedures as described in ARPM Section V.D apply to temporary positions.
      -

      c. Normally, interviews will be more abbreviated than for Potential Career/Career Status positions.

   3. TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT PERFORMANCE REVIEWS
      a. Temporary appointees are expected to perform their duties with the same proficiency as Potential Career or Career Status appointees.

      b. When the length of appointment permits, temporary appointees are reviewed following the same procedures and review cycles set forth for reviews of Potential Career/Career Status appointees.