Professional Librarians Unit (LX) Contract/MOU, effective 4/1/19-3/31/24 <u>Article 5 - Personnel Review Action Procedure</u>	University of California, San Francisco Implementation of LX Contract, Article 5
A. Local campus procedures shall provide for the selection of members of a review committee to advise the designated University official on the merit increases, promotions, and career status actions for members of the Librarian series in this bargaining unit. Appointees holding titles in the series shall comprise the majority of this committee.	The local review committee is designated as the Committee for Appointment, Promotion and Advancement for Librarians (CAPA). CAPA members shall be selected in accordance with the LAUC-SF Bylaws.
B. The performance of each appointee shall be reviewed periodically and the review shall include participation by a review committee. A standard review is one that takes place every two (2) years at the Assistant and Associate rank and every three (3) years at the Librarian rank. Service at the top of the Associate Librarian or Librarian rank may be of indefinite duration, therefore, an abbreviated review may be conducted every two (2) years for Associate or three (3) years for Librarian.	On-time action is calculated within the UCSF Advance system, the web application used to manage academic review at UCSF. An overview of on-time actions within the unit is available to Human Resources (HR) Shared Services and Review Initiators.
C. All members of the librarian bargaining unit shall be informed in writing, on a yearly basis, of their eligibility for review. A member of the bargaining unit 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 and shall not be subject to the grievance and arbitration procedure of the MOU.	Notification shall be issued outside of Advance by HR Shared Services in consultation with the Review Initiator and CAPA. For an off-cycle review taking place earlier than the standard review, the reviewee should consult with their Review Initiator (RI).
D. The CALL for merit increases, promotions, reviews, and career status actions and the calendar of action due dates for the review process shall be issued and distributed each year to every member of the librarian series. The calendar shall establish deadlines that are designed to ensure that all reviews will be completed and salary actions can be processed to take effect at the start of the next fiscal year. The calendar shall be adhered to by all parties. Deadlines may be extended upon the mutual agreement of the parties.	A standardized timeline establishing review process deadlines will be posted online and be made available to every member of the librarian series.
E. There shall be one (1) designated review initiator for a candidate, who shall make a recommendation for a personnel action, which will be included in the review file. Comments prepared by persons at higher levels of supervision (e.g., department heads, section heads, Assistant/Associate University Librarians) may be included in the academic review file. The candidate shall receive and have the opportunity to respond to all such evaluative comments in accordance with local procedures.	The candidate's direct supervisor in the Library is designated as the Review Initiator (RI). The candidate shall be provided with the opportunity to review and respond to the evaluative comments of the RI during the 7-day candidate review period (see section H).
F. The candidate shall be given the opportunity to ask questions and to supply information and evidence to be evaluated in the review according to the calendar established in the CALL.	Evidence provided by the candidate prior to the deadline established in the review timeline shall be included in the Advance review packet.
G. The University may solicit letters evaluating the candidate from qualified persons, including a reasonable number of persons whose names have been provided by the candidate. The decision from whom to solicit letters shall not be subject to grievance and arbitration. 1. The candidate may provide in writing to the review initiator or other appropriate person, names of persons who in the view of the candidate, for reasons provided by the candidate, might not objectively evaluate in a letter or on a committee, the candidate's qualifications or performance. Any such statement provided by the candidate shall be included in the academic review file. The University decision regarding the requested disqualification shall not be subject to grievance and arbitration. 2. In soliciting letters of evaluation or following the receipt of an unsolicited letter related to the review, the University may send a statement regarding confidentiality of such letters. 3. All such letters used in the review, even if unsolicited, shall be included in the academic review file.	The candidate may input referee contact information directly into the Advance review packet or send this information to HR Shared Services to be inputted into the Advance review packet on their behalf. The candidate may provide to the RI and HR Shared Services a list of persons who may not objectively evaluate the candidate, which shall be uploaded to the Advance review packet by HR Shared Services. References are solicited by HR Shared Services via the Advance system, which provides referees with access to a statement of confidentiality. Both unredacted and redacted versions of unsolicited references shall be uploaded to the Advance review packet by HR Shared Services.

1

v. 04/22

Professional Librarians Unit (LX) Contract/MOU, effective 4/1/19-3/31/24 University of California, San Francisco **Article 5 - Personnel Review Action Procedure** Implementation of LX Contract, Article 5 4. Redacted copies of solicited letters shall be provided to the candidate Redacted versions of solicited and unsolicited upon receipt in accordance with local procedures. references are made directly available to the candidate during the 7-day candidate review 5. Unsolicited letters related to the review will be subject to redaction, if period (see section H) and can be provided to received by the University with the understanding that the identity of the the candidate upon request once the Advance author will be held in confidence to the extent permissible by law. Redacted review packet has been completed. copies of such letters will be provided to the candidate in accordance with local procedures. H. An academic review file shall be prepared for each candidate who is being The academic review file shall be prepared in considered for a merit increase, promotion, or career status action. The Advance by HR Shared Services in consultation review initiator is responsible for preparing the candidate's academic review with the RI. file, which consists of the review initiator's recommendation together with The RI's recommendation and report shall be pertinent additional letters, if any, including those letters solicited from provided in the Chair Letter page of the Advance individuals, as provided for above, and required documents. Review packet. The review initiator's recommendation, without disclosing the identities of HR Shared Services shall initiate the 7-day sources of confidential documents, shall discuss the proposed personnel candidate review period of the Advance review action in light of the criteria and substantiated by supporting evidence packet, during which time the candidate shall contained in the file. The recommendation shall provide a comprehensive have direct access to all of the non-confidential assessment of the candidate's performance, together with detailed evidence materials, including the report and to support the evaluation. The recommendation may also present a report of recommendation of the RI, and to redacted consultation with appropriate members of the professional library staff and copies of any confidential material included in others in a position to evaluate performance and may include any dissenting the Advance review packet. (cf. LX Contract, opinions. **Article 6 - Personnel Files**) The review initiator's final recommendation shall be provided to the HR Shared Services may coordinate with the candidate, along with all documents to be included in the academic review Office of Faculty and Academic Affairs (OFAA) to file. The candidate must be allowed a reasonable period of time, seven (7) reset the 7-day candidate review period should consecutive calendar days, to review and respond to the file. By mutual an extension be agreed. agreement of the parties, this period of time may be extended. The candidate The candidate may upload a written statement may submit for inclusion in the record a written statement in response to or to the Advance packet during the 7-day review commenting upon material in the file. period or may ask that HR Shared Services upload the statement on their behalf. I. Upon completion of the procedures described above, a Certification The candidate shall sign the Certification Statement shall be signed by the candidate certifying that the prescribed Statement and Documentation Checklist and procedures have been followed. A Documentation Checklist listing the submit offline to HR Shared Services. contents of the academic review file shall also be signed by the candidate. The HR Shared Services shall upload these Certification Statement and the Documentation Checklist shall be included in documents to the Advance review packet. the academic review file. J. Decisions and recommendations of the review committee(s) shall be based The OFAA shall provide CAPA with direct access solely upon material within the academic review file. to all of the materials included in the Advance review packet. K. If during subsequent review the academic review file is found to be The OFAA would send an official request for incomplete or inadequate, additional information may be solicited through additional information via the Advance system the designated University official who will inform the candidate that such new on behalf of the designated University officials material is being added to the review file. The candidate shall have access to (University Librarian (UL) and/or Vice Provost for all non-confidential material added to the file. A redacted copy of the Academic Affairs (VPAA)). confidential documents shall be provided to the candidate. The candidate Additional information would be provided shall also be provided the opportunity to submit a written statement in offline via HR Shared Services to the OFAA, response to the additions to the review file, which shall become part of the which shall upload that information to the file. The review shall then be based upon the academic review file as Advance packet. Prior to additional information augmented. being forwarded to the OFAA, that information would be reviewed by the candidate, who would have the opportunity to include a written statement with that information.

2

v. 04/22

Professional Librarians Unit (LX) Contract/MOU, effective 4/1/19-3/31/24 <u>Article 5 - Personnel Review Action Procedure</u>	University of California, San Francisco Implementation of LX Contract, Article 5
L. No documentation other than the recommendation(s) of the review committee(s) may be added to the academic review file without annotation of the Certification Statement and the Documentation Checklist.	The candidate would sign the annotated Certification Statement and Documentation Checklist. The annotated documents would be forwarded via HR Shared Services to the OFAA, who would upload them to the Advance review packet.
 M. The academic review file shall be referred to a review committee. On the basis of all evidence in the academic review file, including the report from an ad hoc review committee, if any, the review committee will submit a comprehensive report and recommendation for action to the designated University official. 1. In conducting its review and arriving at its recommendation concerning a candidate, each review committee shall be guided by the criteria in Article 4. 2. The report of the review committee(s) shall be submitted to the University's deciding officer(s). 3. The deliberations and recommendations of the review committees are to be strictly confidential. 4. A person shall disqualify himself/herself if s/he questions his/her ability to make a fair and objective judgment in a particular case or in the case of a possible conflict of interest. 	The OFAA shall provide CAPA members with direct access to all of the materials included in the Advance review packet. CAPA shall submit its recommendation and report to the OFAA. The OFAA shall upload the CAPA report and recommendation as a confidential document to the Advance review packet. The OFAA shall provide the designated University officials (UL and/or VPAA) with direct access to all materials included in the Advance review packet, including the recommendation and report of CAPA. Each CAPA member would be responsible for self-disqualification in instances of concern regarding objectivity and/or possible conflict of interest.
N. In cases of promotion, conferral of career status, or recommendation for termination of appointment, if the preliminary assessment of the University's deciding officer is contrary to the recommendations of the review committee, the University's deciding officer shall notify the committee with respect to the assessment. The review committee shall be given the opportunity for further comment before the final decision is made.	A disagreement between CAPA and the UL with regards to recommendation is designated as a contested action. The University's deciding officer in a contested action is designated as the VPAA. A confidential communication from the VPAA would be provided to CAPA. Further comment from CAPA would be uploaded to the Advance Review packet by the OFAA.
O. If the University's deciding officer's preliminary assessment is to terminate appointment or not to confer career status, the candidate shall be notified of the opportunity to request access to records in the academic review file, subject to Article 7, Personnel Files. The candidate and review initiator shall then have the opportunity to respond in writing and to provide additional information and documentation.	The University's deciding officer for decisions to terminate appointment or not to confer career status is designated as the VPAA. A notification regarding the tentative decision of the VPAA would be sent from the Advance system by the OFAA. The candidate and review initiator would have the opportunity to respond in writing and to provide additional information and documentation, which would be forwarded via HR Shared Services to the OFAA, who would upload those materials to the packet.
P. The designated University official shall inform the candidate in writing of the final administrative decision including the reasons for his/her decision. The candidate shall receive a copy of the review committee and any redacted ad hoc committee reports. Such a statement shall not disclose the identities of persons who were sources of confidential documents.	A notification regarding the final administrative decision of the designated University officials (UL and/or VPAA) shall be sent from the Advance system by the OFAA. HR Shared Services would provide the candidate with a redacted copy of the complete Advance review packet upon request.

3

v. 04/22

Professional Librarians Unit (LX) Contract/MOU, effective 4/1/19-3/31/24 <u>Article 5 - Personnel Review Action Procedure</u>	University of California, San Francisco Implementation of LX Contract, Article 5
Q. An arbitrator shall have the authority to determine whether the University has violated a procedure set forth herein. However, in any grievance alleging a violation of this Article, the arbitrator shall not have the authority to review any decision to:	Local procedures shall follow the grievance and arbitration processes as defined in LX Contract, <u>Article 24 - Grievance Procedure</u> and <u>Article 25 - Arbitration</u> .
1. Initiate an academic review;	Any additions to the Advance packet subsequent to a determined point of violation would be removed and the review process would be repeated starting from this point.
2. Award or deny a merit increase;	
3. Award or deny a promotion;	
4. Award or withhold career status;	
5. Terminate a librarian following academic review.	
If the arbitrator finds that the alleged violation had a material, negative impact on the outcome of the review, the arbitrator's remedy shall be limited to directing the University to repeat, to the extent practicable, the review process from the point at which the violation occurred.	
R. Local procedures shall be consistent with the language of this contract.	Local procedures fulfilling the language of the contract are listed above.

v. 04/22

4