

Possible Amendments to the Proposed Librarian Review Documents
(May 19, 2014)

1. *Issue:* There are librarians (only one at present) who are not employed in either the Law or University Libraries. We need to make sure that their situation is addressed in the review process.

Proposed Response: The following annotation shall be added to the existing annotation to Article 5.A

Librarians who are employed by units other than the Law and University Libraries must be reviewed according to the criteria that apply to all librarians, but may modify the review process to fit their specific employment circumstances and reporting structures. Their files will, however, all be reviewed by CAPA.

In addition, LAUC will recommend that the VP-AA to add a category to the Delegation of Authority Chart to cover the reviews of librarians employed in units other than the Law and University Libraries.

2. *Issue:* There is some potential for confusion on the “Review Initiator’s Letter of Recommendation Form” because of the use of numbered salary points.

Proposed Response: The “Review Initiator’s Letter of Recommendation Form” shall be modified so that a dollar amount will be specified along with each mention of a Salary Point.

3. *Issue:* This one pertains to the discussion of the role of non-academic supervisors in our review process. Some librarians were not comfortable with the idea, under option 2 that Department Heads might have to serve as one another’s review initiators.

Proposed Response: Here is an alternative way of structuring the review process that still avoids having non-academics serve as review initiators.

The University Librarian would be the review initiator if there are no other academic appointees in the reporting lines between the candidate and the University Librarian. But, since the same person can’t be both the review initiator and the deciding official, reviews on which the UL would normally have made the final decision will instead be passed along to the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs.

The final bullet point under Option 2 of “The Role of Non-Academic Supervisors (Directors) in the Librarian Review Process” Document shall be revised in the following manner.

- Non-Academic Supervisors shall not serve as review initiators for librarians they supervise directly. In these situations the following formula to determine a librarian's review initiator shall be followed:
 - If the librarian has another supervisor who is in an academic job title, that person shall be the review initiator.
 - If there is no alternative academic supervisor, then the review initiator will be the next person at a higher level in the librarian's reporting line who holds an academic job title, ~~unless that person is the University Librarian.~~
 - **In every case where the University Librarian serves as review initiator the file will be forwarded to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs for a final decision.** ~~Otherwise, an academic appointee who is also a supervisor (albeit not in the librarian's reporting line) and whose position in the organizational structure of the library is at the same or higher level as that of the librarian shall serve as the librarian's review initiator.~~

How the Vote on “The Role of Non-Academic Supervisors (Directors) in the Librarian Review Process” will affect the Review Documents.

If LAUC adopts **Option 1**, nothing new needs to be said about non-academics serving as review initiators--that can be considered covered by existing contract language. Annotation is needed to address ambiguity in the language of the article pertaining to their role reviewing files. To this end, the annotation to MOU article 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 LAUC adopts **Option 2**, or **Option 2, amended**, the annotation to MOU Article 5.E will be supplemented with the following. The underlying text would be the annotation if Option 2 is adopted without amendment, the strikethrough and colored text reflect the way it would look if amended as proposed.

"Non-academic supervisors as well as "persons 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 is not an academic appointee, her/his review initiator shall be determined according to the following guidelines:

1. *If the candidate has another supervisor who is in an academic job title, that person shall be the review initiator.*
2. *If there is no alternative academic supervisor, then the review initiator will be the next person at a higher level in the candidate's reporting line who holds an academic job title, unless that person is the University Librarian.*
3. *If there are no academic appointees in the candidate's reporting line other than the University Librarian, then an academic appointee who is also a supervisor (albeit not in the candidate's reporting line) and whose position in the organizational structure of the library is at the same or a higher level as that of the candidate shall serve as the candidate's review initiator. In every case where the University Librarian serves as review initiator the file will be forwarded to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs for a final decision.*