

PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW AND ADVANCEMENT IN THE  
LIBRARIAN SERIES FOR REPRESENTED LIBRARIANS  
*University of California, Santa Barbara*

I. INTRODUCTION

The authority for the procedures outlined herein is the UC/UCAFT Professional Librarian Unit, Memorandum of Understanding, Article 4 and Appendix E.

In accordance with Article 4 - Process for merit increase, promotion and career status, librarians represented by the AFT must participate in the review process.

RESPONSIBILITY

The Executive Vice Chancellor has delegated to the University Librarian the responsibility and authority to provide for review of the qualifications of candidates for merit increases, promotion, and career status.

Advisory Review Committees, composed of appointees holding titles in the librarian series and appointed by the University Librarian, shall participate in the performance review process for unit librarians.

II. PERFORMANCE REVIEWS AND ADVANCEMENT

A. Definitions

1. The academic review record, often referred to as the "review packet" or "packet", is the set of documents related to the performance review of a particular librarian as described by (MOU 4-C-9). The review record or packet pertaining to a review cycle currently underway is normally housed in a single binder. The review packet consists of: The Certification Statement; Review of Qualifications, librarian series; candidate' Statement of Duties and Responsibilities; Biography for Academic Personnel; Documentation and letters of reference; Factual Resume; and evaluation from supervisors.
2. Accelerated merit or accelerated promotion is advancement in step or rank beyond that indicated in the normal review schedule. Accelerated advancement may be considered when there has been significant achievement and exceptional promise of continued growth and development.
3. An accelerated review is a performance review carried out ahead of completion of the candidate's normal review cycle. If a unit librarian believes his/her performance and contributions have been significant, then the librarian may request an accelerated review. (MOU 4-C-5).

4. The CALL is a set of documents related to academic reviews, which is distributed by the Library Human Resources Office to all unit librarians before the first action in a review cycle. The CALL provides each librarian with notice of his/her eligibility for review for merit increases, promotions and career status action; the calendar of due dates for the current review process; forms and procedures for the review process. (MOU 4-C-3)
5. Candidate's Statement of Duties and Responsibilities is a formal statement of job responsibilities, signed by the candidate and supervisors.
6. Career status is a continuing career appointment achieved after periodic review of performance, professional competence, achievement and promise, which indicates successful completion of a suitable period in potential career status. Career status may be granted as a separate action not associated with another review, such as a merit increase or promotion. (MOU 4-B-3)
7. A continuance or no action review is the maintenance of the same rank and step following a review. Continuance or no action can occur: a) when a candidate is eligible for a merit increase or promotion, but has not met the challenges and expectations of his/her primary responsibilities during the period under review, a recommendation may be for no increase; b) when a candidate is at the Associate Librarian, Step VII or Librarian, Step V level. Librarians may remain at these steps indefinitely without prejudice, however they are expected to participate in the regularly scheduled review cycle. (MOU 4-C-1.a)
8. A deferred review is the omission of a performance review in a year when a candidate's review would normally take place, due to a prolonged absence or other unusual circumstances. It is a neutral action, which can be only initiated with the written consent of the reviewee. (MOU 4-C-2)
9. Distinguished Step is the advancement from Librarian, Step V to Librarian, Step VI and is predicated upon a career history of outstanding service to the library, University, and the profession, and significant achievement in the period since attaining Step V.
10. The factual resume is a concise overview of the most significant accomplishments and activities engaged in under each of the criteria as appropriate, during the review period, indicating the levels of participation and contribution.
11. Former Review Initiators are individuals who supervised the candidate for more than half of the period since the last review.
12. A merit increase or "step increase" is one-step advancement in salary within the rank in the librarian series. (MOU 4-B-2)
13. An off-cycle review is a performance review that does not coincide with a regularly scheduled review. A finding of deficient performance usually precipitates an off-cycle review. (MOU Appendix E IV C-5e)

14. A promotion is advancement to a higher rank within the librarian series, normally the next higher rank in the series. (MOU 4-B-1)
15. The Review Initiator is considered the candidate's immediate supervisor and is responsible for coordinating the evaluation. Ordinarily a Department Head or Assistant/Associate University Librarian (AUL), this person initiates the review, informs the candidate about the review process, writes an assessment of the candidate's performance, and makes a recommendation for a personnel action.
16. The Reviewing Officer is the AUL to whom the Review Initiator reports. When the Review Initiator is an AUL, the Reviewing Officer's role is taken by a committee of AULs (excluding the Review Initiator) appointed by the University Librarian.
17. Secondary evaluators provide an evaluative letter on specific, limited activities as written in the candidate's statement of responsibilities. The review initiator in h/her recommendation shall use information from the secondary evaluator letter. The secondary evaluator's comments are entered on sections of the Review of Qualifications form and are included in the non-confidential portion of the review packet
18. Termination is the dismissal of a candidate following a review. If based on a review, the candidate has failed to maintain a satisfactory level of performance and has not met the criteria for continuation or advancement, there is no obligation on the part of the University to continue or to promote and therefore the recommendation can be for termination. (Appendix E, III A-2a)

#### B. Criteria

The criteria for advancement in the librarian series is outlined in the MOU Appendix E III A- 2 and IV, A - B. Criteria for advancement to the Distinguished Step is outlined in Section III (of this document).

#### C. Provision for Peer Review

1. Objective and thorough review of the performance of members of the librarian series by peers as well as administrators is mandated by MOU Article 4. Participation of an advisory review committee composed of members of the librarian series, in each performance review, is in accord with this requirement. The report of the review committee is to form the basis for further administrative or committee review, according to MOU 4 C-17.
2. The LAUC-SB Committee on Advancement and Promotion (CAP) is composed of members of the librarian series, selected according to LAUC-SB procedures, as provided in MOU 4 A-1-2. Within its appointed review, each CAP constitutes a standing review committee with the discretion to review the recommendations of ad hoc committees, and to independently advise the University Librarian on review actions for members of the librarian series. The chair of CAP participates

with the Administrative Group in the assignment of individual evaluations to ad hoc committees. During the review process, the chair of CAP and the AUL-Human Resources both work with the ad hoc review committees insuring that procedures outlined in this document are followed. A member of CAP normally serves as chair of each ad hoc review committee.

3. Members of ad hoc review committees are appointed by the University Librarian, after nominations have been received from CAP. Each ad hoc review committee assesses the qualifications of candidates for specific review actions as provided in the review packets assigned to the committees ( MOU 4.c. 14) applying the criteria for advancement given in the MOU, Appendix E III 2. On completion of its deliberations on each review packet, the ad hoc committee prepares for consideration by the University Librarian a written account of its analysis, referring to supporting documentation, and an appropriate recommendation for a specific review action. (MOU 4.C. 17)
4. A committee member, who has acted in a line supervisory capacity for a candidate, within in the period under review, will not participate in peer review committee deliberations on an evaluation of that candidate. In addition, any committee member who, for various reasons, may lack objectivity with regard to a candidate's performance in the period under review should refrain from participating in the evaluation of that candidate. If, despite having been assigned a particular review packet, a committee member perceives a possible conflict of interest with regard to the candidate, the committee member will be excused from deliberations on that packet.
5. The deliberations of CAP are to be strictly confidential; both the membership and the deliberations of ad hoc committees are to be strictly confidential, as required by MOU 4-C-17 c. At the time when a review committee releases a review packet, all committee notes relating to the deliberations on that packet are destroyed. In the interest of preserving confidentiality, the AUL-Human Resources normally acts as a liaison between review committees and all other parties to a review, transmitting review packets, committee requests or instructions and fulfillment's thereof, to parties concerned.

#### D. Procedures for Performance Reviews

1. Initiation of reviews
  - a. As required by MOU 4-C 3, 4 no later than 30 days before the due date of the first required action of the regular review cycle, the AUL-Human Resources issues to each librarian the CALL which consists of:
    - (1) notice of h/her eligibility for review,
    - (2) a copy of the review schedule for the year, giving completion deadlines for each sequence of the cycle,
    - (3) referral to a set of instructions for reviews, based on the MOU, Article 4 and Appendix E III, IV, and this document, and
    - (4) a referral to the Review of Qualifications, librarian series form.
  - b. The AUL-Human Resources make a comprehensive list of persons scheduled for review actions in the current review cycle in keeping with the frequency

for review at various levels required by MOU 4 C-1-b, computing eligibility on the basis of number of intervals since each candidate's review. This list is verified by the AUL's and the Chair of CAP for each candidate's status. Copies of the final list are distributed to library Review Initiators and members of CAP, prior to the first scheduled action of the review cycle.

- c. As provided in MOU 4 C-5 a librarian not normally scheduled for review may request, in writing, from h/her Review Initiator, an accelerated review to coincide with the current cycle, no later than 30 days before the first scheduled action of the current cycle. The Review Initiator forwards the request, accompanied by the Review Initiator's written statement of intent to review the candidate ahead of schedule to the AUL-Human Resources, no later than 10 days before the first scheduled action. The AUL-Human Resources amends the list of candidates to be reviewed, and informs other parties concerned, as necessary.
- d. A librarian may be scheduled for an off-cycle review, subject to the approval of the University Librarian, if there is reason to doubt that the career appointee is performing satisfactorily, in keeping with the MOU, Appendix E IV C-5 e. In these cases, the candidate receives from the University Librarian a written statement of the need for an off-cycle review 30 days prior to the first scheduled action of the cycle. The off-cycle review follows the same procedures in evaluating the librarian as are followed for other librarians in that year.
- e. Should a Review Initiator judge that the performance of a librarian warrants consideration for an accelerated merit or promotion, the Review Initiator follows the same procedures in evaluating that librarian as are followed for other librarians reviewed in that year.
- f. A librarian or the Review Initiator may request a deferment of review when there has been insufficient evidence to evaluate performance due to prolonged absence or other unusual circumstances within the period under review. A deferral is a neutral action, which can be initiated only with the written agreement of the librarian. (MOU 4-C-2) Requests for deferment of review, setting forth the reasons, must be in writing and submitted to the Review Initiator, the AUL, and the Chair of CAP within 10 calendar days following receipt of the CALL. All documentation and recommendations at the various levels must be forwarded to the University Librarian for a final decision. (MOU 4-C-2 a) If approved by the University Librarian, the deferment is for a period of one year regardless of the librarian's normal cycle.
- g. Candidates at Associate Librarian, Step VII or Librarian, Step V, VI, and VII who do not wish to be considered for merit or promotion actions, are not required to undergo evaluation for these actions, in keeping with MOU 4 C-1-b. Reviews at these steps must, however, be conducted every three years unless the candidate request an earlier review and are subject to the same procedural requirements and criteria as reviews for merit actions, though the action sought will normally be continuance or no action.

## 2. Deadlines for Completion

Deadlines for completion of each step in the review process, in keeping with the schedule or "review calendar" distributed in the CALL, are to be adhered to by all parties to a review.

- a. Participants requesting an extension of a deadline must include a statement detailing the reasons for the extension. That statement will be included in the review packet. Normally an extension is granted for a period not to exceed ten working days.
- b. If a candidate fails to provide the Review Initiator with a completed review or to secure an extension the Review Initiator will complete h/her portion of the review and forward the packet to the next level, in keeping with the review calendar.
- c. Because the performance of each appointee shall be reviewed periodically, the failure of a candidate to complete a review, adhere to deadlines, or extension of deadlines may result in a corrective action. (MOU 4-C-1)

### 3. The Candidate

- a. Reviews the formal Statement of Duties and Responsibilities and updates it to reflect responsibilities in the period under review. If changes are necessary secures revision of Statement through administrative channels.
- b. May prepare a list of names of individuals from whom letters are appropriate to assist the Review Initiator in assessing the performance and qualifications of the candidate or in evaluating specific activities. (MOU 4-C-8) The list should include names of persons the candidate believes can evaluate a specific area or substantial portion of the candidate's professional activity. It should include the names and specific professional activity to be reviewed.

Candidates being reviewed for merit, continuing appointment, or promotion have the option of requesting letters. Candidates being reviewed for promotion, acceleration, or advancement to Librarian VI (the distinguished step) are advised to provide a list of names.

- c. May provide in writing to the Review Initiator a list of persons who, in the view of the candidate, for reasons set forth, might not objectively evaluate in a letter or on a committee the candidate's qualifications or performance. (MOU 4-8-a) The statement provided by the candidate shall be included in the review packet.
- d. Participates in one or more preliminary review conferences with the Review Initiator. Discusses with the Review Initiator the formal personnel action he/she wishes to put forward (merit, promotion, etc). Outlines the role of any secondary evaluators, if appropriate, in assessing his/her performance in a specific area. Discusses with the Review Initiator the entire review

process, including the criteria, documentation, and the calendar for review. Provides the Review Initiator with the list of names for confidential letters.

- e. Creates or reviews his/her "Biography for Academic Personnel" from the last review and updates as appropriate. If necessary request a copy from Library Human Resources Office.
- f. Using the form, Review of Qualifications, Librarian Series prepares a factual resume of activities and accomplishments for the period under review. The factual resume is a concise overview of the most significant accomplishments and activities engaged in under each of the criteria, as appropriate, during the review period, including the levels of participation and contribution.
  - 1. For merit action or if a candidate is at the top of a range (Associate, Step VII or Librarian, Step V, and not going for promotion) the resume must cover the period since the last review.
  - 2. If a promotion action is considered, the resume must encompass the full span of the candidate's career with the University of California. Candidates who have completed six years of service at the Assistant Librarian rank are required to prepare a resume for promotion action. Candidates at Assistant Librarian, Steps II & III and Associate Librarian, Steps VI & VII are normally eligible for promotion consideration. Eligible candidates need not secure approval from the Review Initiator to be considered for promotion.
  - 3. The resume should provide evidence of professional competence and quality of service within the library, as required by MOU Appendix E, III A-2- C-1. Service within the library is understood to encompass responsibilities, LAUC-SB and any assignments, committee work, task forces, etc within the library.
  - 4. As applicable, the resume may also contain evidence of:
    - (a) professional activity outside the library (MOU Appendix E III-A-2-C-2)
    - (b) University and public service (MOU Appendix E III A-2-C-3)
    - (c) Research and other creative activity (MOU Appendix E III –A-2-C-4).
- g. Submits the review packet together with remaining, unmarked sections of the Review of Qualifications form) to the Review Initiator. If further documentation or evidence to be included in the review packet is requested by the Review Initiator, the candidate responds to the request in a timely manner.
- h. Receives and reads the evaluation prepared by the Review Initiator. Participates in a review conference with the Review Initiator to discuss the evaluation.
- i. Reads the evaluation and inspects all documents to be included in the review packet other than confidential letters. (MOU 4 C-10). May submit for inclusion a written statement in response to or commenting upon material in

the packet. (MOU 4 C-12) May add to the packet any further documentation or evidence deemed necessary. The deadline for submission of comments or documentation is three (3) working days from receipt of the evaluation.

- j. Receives and reads the evaluation by the Reviewing Officer (usually the AUL). Participates in a conference with the Review Initiator and Reviewing Officer to discuss the evaluation.
- k. Reads the evaluation and inspects all documents to be included in the review packet other than the confidential letters. (MOU 4-C-10). May submit for inclusion a written statement in response to or commenting upon material in the packet. (MOU 4-C-12). May add to the packet any further documentation or evidence deemed necessary. The deadline for submission of comments or documentation is three (3) working days from receipt of the evaluation.
- l. May provide a written request to the Review Initiator for a written summary of the substance of all confidential letters in the packet, or redacted copies of all confidential letters. (MOU 4-C-11) Request may be made following the review conference with the Review Initiator and thereafter during the review process.
- m. Signs and dates the Certification/Documentation Statement upon completion of all review conferences. (MOU 4-C-13) Shall have access to all non-confidential material added to the packet. If non-confidential items are added to the packet, the candidate is notified and dates and initials the new items. May submit a written statement in response to any additions to the packet. (MOU 4-C-15)
- n. Receives a written statement from the University Librarian with the final personnel action and reasons for his/her decision. (MOU 4-C-20) The decision is normally provided to the candidate in a timely manner, according to the calendar in the CALL, but no later than nine (9) months after the first required action. This deadline may be extended upon mutual agreement of the parties. (MOU 4-C-3)
- o. May provide a written request to the AUL-Human Resources for a written summary or a redacted copy of the CAP ad hoc committee report. (MOU 4-C-20). Request may be made after receipt of the final statement from the University Librarian.

#### 4. The Review Initiator and Other Evaluators

A (1) The Review Initiator schedules and conducts one or more preliminary review conferences with the candidate, in keeping with MOU 4-C-6-7, to discuss the review at hand and insure that the candidate is adequately informed about the criteria applied in considering review actions, and about the entire review process. The applicability of the formal Statement of Duties and Responsibilities to the period under review and the role of secondary evaluator (s) or Former Review Initiator should be discussed at the preliminary review conferences. The discussion should focus on what documentation is appropriate, what personnel action is to be put forward, and what, if any, confidential materials are to be requested. Any lists of

names prepared by the candidate should be discussed in the conference. Participants should reach an understanding of subsequent steps in the process each are to follow. Allow the candidate the opportunity to ask questions and to supply pertinent information and evidence to be used in the review.

A (2) Secondary evaluators contribute to the review by providing an evaluative letter to the Review Initiator. The letter should comment on the specific activities performed during the period under review. If requested the Review Initiator should provide a copy of the factual resume and appropriate confidential letters to the secondary evaluator. The Review Initiator in his/her recommendation shall use information from the letter. Letters from secondary evaluators are always identified in the packet and are not confidential and do not recommend a personnel action.

A (3) Former or previous Review Initiators are individuals who supervised the candidate for more than half of the period since the last review period. The Former Review Initiator is asked to provide a letter of evaluation. If requested the Review Initiator should provide a copy of the factual resume and appropriate confidential letters to the former evaluator. Letters from former Review Initiators are always identified in the packet and are not confidential and may provide a recommendation for a personnel action.

- B. If appropriate, the Review Initiator request confidential, evaluative letters from persons in a position to assess the qualifications or particular activities of the candidate in the period under review, including a reasonable number of persons whose names have been supplied by the candidate, but not limited to persons suggested by the candidate. (MOU 4-C-8) The Review Initiator is not required to request letters from all individuals suggested by the candidate, nor is the Review Initiator restricted to the list of names. The Review Initiator can request letters from other individuals when he/she deems them to be important sources for evaluation. Requests for letters of evaluation will be in writing, specifying activities or qualifications of the candidate's to be evaluated, and each will contain a statement regarding the University's policy on confidentiality of such evaluative letters. Requests for such letters, as well as the letters themselves, are included in the confidential section of the review packet.
- C. If the Review Initiator receives an unsolicited letter on behalf of a candidate, the Review Initiator must write the author of the letter and include the statement regarding the University's policy on confidentiality of such evaluative letters. (MOU 4-C-8b) Use of unsolicited letters in an academic review is at the discretion of the Review Initiator. Unsolicited letters, if used in the review, shall be included in the confidential file.
- D. The Review Initiator composes a substantive, written evaluation of the candidate's performance for the period under review, using appropriate sections of the Review of Qualifications form. The Review Initiator in all cases writes the summary evaluate comments, proposing and supporting a particular personnel action. In cases where the candidate is being considered for promotion, accelerated merit, or advancement to the

distinguished step the Review Initiator's evaluation must be substantive, thorough, and with significant depth.

- E. Each section of the evaluation, whether prepared by the Review Initiator or a secondary evaluator, should be specific, thorough, and adequately supported by documentation within the review packet, and should adhere to the criteria for evaluation provided in MOU 4-C-9.
- F. On completing the evaluation, the Review Initiator returns the packet, excluding any confidential items, to the candidate. The Review Initiator schedules a conference with the candidate (which may also include secondary evaluators) to discuss the evaluation and recommendation for action, allowing at least one intervening workday for the candidate to read the evaluation.
- G. Following the evaluation conference, the candidate is allowed three working days to compose a response to the contents of the written evaluation and evaluation conference. When the candidate has completed, at his/her discretion, a written response or at minimum, has acknowledged with his/her signature having read the evaluation, the review packet is returned to the Review Initiator.
- H. Following the evaluation conference and upon the written request of the candidate, the Review Initiator will provide a written summary of the substance of all confidential letters in the packet, or redacted copies of all confidential letters. (MOU 4-C-11). The letters subject to redaction shall consist of the removal of name, title, organizational/institutional affiliation, and relational information contained below the signature block of the letter. The candidate's written request and redacted copies shall be included in the review packet.
- I. On reviewing the candidate's response, if any, the Review Initiator forwards the complete review packet to the appropriate AUL, or designated committee of AUL's. Copies of the candidate's written response may be forwarded to appropriate secondary evaluators as well.

#### 5. Reviewing Officer(s)

- A. Examines the review packet for completeness and adherence to the standards set forth in the criteria for merit and promotion. (MOU Appendix E III A 2, IV B)
- B. The Reviewing Officer(s) may request any additional information or evaluative letters deemed necessary. If additional information is added to the packet, the Reviewing Officer(s) will inform and allow the candidate access to all non-confidential information and have the candidate initial and date the new information. The candidate shall be provided with an opportunity to submit a written statement in response to the additions to the review file. Upon a written request, redacted copies of all confidential information shall be provided to the candidate. (MOU 4-C-15)

- C. When satisfied that the review packet meets the standards required by the criteria for merit and promotion, schedules and conducts a conference with the candidate and Review Initiator to discuss the review.
- D. Following the evaluation conference prepares a summary evaluative statement proposing and supporting a particular personnel action. The Reviewing Officer(s) returns the review packet, excluding any confidential material, to the candidate. The candidate is allowed three working days to compose a written response to the contents of the evaluation and evaluation conference. When the candidate has completed, at his/her discretion, a written response or at minimum, has acknowledged with his/her signature having read the evaluation, the review packet is returned to the Reviewing Officer(s).
- E. When the Review Initiator is an AUL, a committee of AULs (excluding the Review Initiator) who act as Reviewing Officers conducts the foregoing steps.
- F. Transmits the full review packet to the AUL-Human Resources who forwards it to a confidential ad hoc peer review committee.

6. Ad Hoc Peer Review Committees and CAP

- A. Each committee reviews evaluations assigned to it in accordance with the requirements of MOU 4-C-17 and the principles set forth in II C 1-5 of this document. Decisions and recommendations of the Review Committee (s) shall be based solely upon material within the review packet. (MOU 4-C-14)
- B. At minimum, a three-member review committee, including at least one member of CAP, deliberates on each review packet. In cases where a committee member has been absent from deliberations due to unforeseen conflict of interest, illness or other circumstances, resulting in an extant committee of less than three or absence of a CAP member, the vacancy is filled by the temporary appointment of a new committee member by the University Librarian, in consultation with CAP.
- C. If the Peer Review Committee finds the packet to be incomplete or inadequate, the committee shall submit a written request via the AUL-Human Resources for additional information. If appropriate the AUL-Human Resources will inform the candidate and the Review Initiator that such new information is being added to the packet. If additional information is added to the packet, the AUL-Human Resources will inform and allow the candidate access to all non-confidential information and have the candidate initial and date the new information. The candidate shall be provided with an opportunity to submit a written statement in response to the additions to the review file. (MOU 4 C-14) Upon a written request, redacted copies of all confidential information shall be provided to the candidate. (MOU 4-C-15)
- D. On completion of its deliberations, the ad hoc committee prepares a written report of its analysis for each evaluation. In keeping with MOU 4-C-17, the report provides an assessment of all significant evidence, favorable and unfavorable; is specific and analytical; is adequately documented by references to supporting material; sets forth the committee's evaluation of

the candidate with respect to the qualifications specified; and includes a recommendation to the University Librarian for a specific personnel action.

- E. If the committee cannot reach a unanimous decision on a recommendation for a review action, the division of the committee and the reasons are communicated either in the body of the report or in separate concurring or dissenting statements by individual members, submitted with the main report and with the cognizance of other committee members.
- F. The final, comprehensive report(s) with recommendations(s) of the ad hoc review committee, released for submission to the University Librarian and bearing the signatures of the committee members, are considered the report(s) of CAP. The report(s) along with the full review packet, are transmitted to the University Librarian, via the AUL-Human Resources.

7. The University Librarian and the Executive Vice Chancellor

- A. The University Librarian reviews all evaluations and makes a decision on the final action in cases where merit, promotion, career status, or continuance is judged to be warranted. The University Librarian makes a recommendation for action and forwards this recommendation to the Executive Vice Chancellor in cases where termination is considered.
- B. In cases of promotion, conferral of career status, or recommendation for termination of appointment, if the preliminary assessment of the University Librarian is contrary to the assessment of the ad hoc peer review committee, the University Librarian shall notify the review committee. The ad hoc peer review committee shall be given the opportunity to comment further before the final decision is made. (MOU 4-C-18)
- C. In a case of promotion, conferral of career status, or recommendation for termination, if the University Librarian's preliminary assessment is to terminate or not to confer career status, the candidate shall be notified of the opportunity to request access to records in the review packet. The candidate and Review Initiator shall then have the opportunity to respond in writing and to provide additional information and documentation. (MOU 4-C-19)
- D. The University Librarian forwards all necessary documents relating to termination actions to the Executive Vice Chancellor, who makes the final decision in these cases. If the Executive Vice Chancellor's preliminary assessment is contrary to the recommendation of the University Librarian, the University Librarian shall be given the opportunity for further comment before the final decision is made. (MOU 4-C-18) The Executive Vice Chancellor may also choose to confer with LAUC-SB-CAP on matters of procedure and documentation.
- E. The University Librarian informs each candidate, in writing, of the final personnel action for his/her review in keeping with the calendar in the CALL but not later than nine (9) months after the first required action. (MOU 4-C-3) The University Librarian includes in the letter to the candidate the reasons for his/her decision. (MOU C-4-20).

- F. At the conclusion of the review cycle or any time thereafter, upon the written request of a candidate, the AUL-Human Resources provides the candidate with a written summary or redacted copies of all confidential documents in the review packet. (MOU-4-C-20).

8. The AUL-Human Resources

- A. Coordinates the entire review process.
- B. Ensures the Librarian, Review Initiator, and AUL receive copies of the final decision.
- C. Retains the completed review materials.
- D. Meets with the LAUC-SB CAP following the conclusion of the review cycle to discuss the review process and initiate any changes or modifications in procedures.

III. CRITERIA FOR ADVANCEMENT TO THE DISTINGUISHED STEP (Librarian VI)

Advancement to the distinguished step in the librarian series is an important and significant accomplishment. Advancement to this rank is based on 1) a career history of outstanding service to the library, University, and the profession, and 2) significant achievement since the attainment of Librarian, Step V.

Distinguished librarians are expected to have a consistent and outstanding record of performance with respect to criterion1 (MOU Appendix E III A 2. c.1) and a distinguished record with respect to one or more of the other criterion (MOU Appendix III A 2 c. 2-4). Librarian VI's personify the very best in the profession and stand out as exceptional librarians. Movement to Step VI is not merely an accumulation of a good career, but rather an extraordinary career history accompanied by increasingly higher distinction and continuing development. Candidates seeking advancement to this distinguished step must have a record demonstrating sustained growth in fulfilling responsibilities to the library, the University, and to the profession, which must be of the highest quality and level.

There are many pathways to excellence in the profession and recognition of a distinguished career can be on the local, regional, statewide, national or international level. Examples of distinguished achievement may be a publication which has become a standard tool within the profession; extensive service to a recognized professional organization/society resulting in achievement of a high office or a national award; relevant educational achievement; pioneering and innovative technological or teaching advances, etc. Distinguished achievements are evaluated upon their impact and significance on the University or the profession, and their durability of influence.

Candidates eligible for the distinguished step must complete a promotion packet detailing their career and achievements with the University of California. Confidential evaluative letters are a required component of the review packet.

