

THE ROLE OF NON-ACADEMIC SUPERVISORS (DIRECTORS) IN THE LIBRARIAN REVIEW PROCESS

The reclassification of the Associate University Librarians from their previous title code (which is an academic one) into the Managers & Senior Professionals title code (which is not), has created varying opinions as to their role in the librarian review process that the committee is bringing forward to LAUCD for discussion and vote. Some members believe it is important to maintain the supervisory line in the review process. Others believe it is important that academic appointees are reviewed only by other academic appointees. Below, we outline two options for the role of the AULs that take into account these different beliefs. The committee asks LAUC-D to decide which option is preferable.

You will be asked to vote for one of the following options:

Option 1. Librarians' evaluators should be in the direct supervisory line; thus, non-academic supervisors, e.g. AULs, should fulfill the same roles in the librarian review process as the AULs did when they were academic appointees. This means:

- Non-academic supervisors shall assess academic review files and agree or disagree with the review initiator's recommendation for librarians in their reporting lines. They also have the option of adding comments to the review files.
- Letters of evaluation by non-academic supervisors shall not be confidential.
- Non-academic supervisors shall serve as review initiators for the librarians they supervise directly.

Option 2: Non-academic supervisors shall not serve as review initiators for librarians. If a librarian's immediate supervisor does not hold an academic appointment then an academic appointee shall be selected to serve as review initiator through a process to be determined by the office of the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs.

The vote will be expressed in the annotated MOU in the following fashion.

If Option 1 is adopted the annotation to 5.E will be supplemented with the following:

“Persons at higher levels of supervision” may review the academic review file and make a recommendation regarding the review initiator's recommendation before the file is referred to the review committee”

If Option 2 is adopted the annotation to 5.E will be supplemented as follows:

“Non-academic appointees who are supervisors or “who are at higher levels of supervision” shall have the option to contribute confidential letters of evaluation to academic review files but shall not serve as review initiators, or assess academic review files or comment on a review initiator's recommendation.

If a candidate's immediate supervisor does not hold an academic appointment, an academic appointee shall be selected to serve as review initiator through a process to be determined by the office of the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs.”