

---

## 3094: MERIT, PROMOTION, APPRAISAL REVIEW

---

### A. CRITERIA FOR ADVANCEMENT

Consistent with the provisions of **APM 365-4** and **365-10.a**, and the substance of **APM 360-10.b**, reviews will be based on criteria including the following:

1. Qualifications and accomplishments consistent with the planning and management of operations of the University Library
2. Professional competence and quality of service within the Library;
3. University and public service; and professional activities outside the Library;
4. Research and other creative activity.

Merit increases are not automatic and must be justified by the quality of professional and administrative service rendered by the appointee (**APM 365-18**).

Promotion from Assistant University Librarian to Associate University Librarian must be justified not only by excellence of service and attainment, but also by demonstrated professional growth and accomplishment and/or the assumption of greater responsibility (**APM 365-10.a**).

### B. INITIATION OF A REVIEW

It is the responsibility of the University Librarian to consider for review each Assistant University Librarian and Associate University Librarian. **APM 365-18.c** provides that there is no “normal” period of service at either title, but as a general practice, appointees shall be considered for merit increases at two-year intervals. At UC Merced, a merit review will normally be held biennially for an appointee to the Assistant University Librarian title and triennially for an appointee to the Associate University Librarian title. When the candidate is already at the top of the salary range for his or her title, and no promotion is under consideration, the University Librarian and the candidate may agree, with the concurrence of the Provost/EVC, to extend the review period by up to two years.

Those candidates who request (or agree) that a normal merit review be deferred should provide a memo to that effect to be included in the personnel file. If, however, it is advisable in the judgment of the University Librarian, a review will be conducted at the normal time.

Normal periods of review will be based on a fiscal-year appointment. Reviews for the previous review period will begin during July, with a recommendation to the Provost/EVC by May 1st with any salary increase to take effect the following July 1st. A year of service will follow prescribed policy for review purposes (a six-month or greater period of appointment is considered to be a year of service).

Candidates who are judged to be deserving of advancement before a normal review cycle may be recommended for an accelerated merit increase or promotion.

The University Librarian will submit a recommendation for a merit increase, promotion, or denial of advancement.

### C. DOCUMENTATION AND GENERAL PROCEDURES

In January, the University Librarian prompts each Assistant University Librarian and Associate University Librarian who has completed a two-year or three-year period of service, respectively, to prepare a review file, to include:

1. A letter of self-assessment of the quality of the services the appointee has rendered during the review period. It should include a statement of the candidate’s professional achievements and administrative accomplishments during the review period. For example, the narrative may

- highlight accomplishments in leadership, change-management, and policy-setting;
  - enumerate contributions to and detail impact for the Library as a whole and at the campus or the system levels as well as to the profession;
  - advance goals for the coming review period.
2. A job description or statement of the candidate's primary duties and responsibilities;
  3. An updated curriculum vitae; and  
Any supporting or supplemental documentation that the candidate deems relevant (i.e., publications, evidence of presentations or other such materials).

Campus policy does not require letters of evaluation as part of the review process for positions in the AUL series. The candidate may, however, request, in writing, that the University Librarian solicit letters from specific individuals for additional information to be included in the file. At his or her option the University Librarian may solicit letters or other evaluation information from other constituents internal and/or external to the Library for use in the review process. In both cases, requests for letters or other evaluation information should include the University's **Statement of Confidentiality**. The identities of referees will be kept confidential from the candidate.

The candidate may also provide names of persons who, in the view of the candidate, might not objectively evaluate him or her in a letter. Any such list will become part of the case file going forward.

This file should be provided to the University Librarian by March 1.

Following the initial review discussion with the candidate (including initiation of the Procedural Safeguard Statement) and subsequent receipt of all relevant materials from the candidate, it is the responsibility of the University Librarian to review the file, to supplement it as necessary and appropriate with any additional letters and documents, including any requested by the candidate, and to prepare the entire file for submission to the Academic Personnel Office with a letter of recommendation. The opening of the letter should include:

1. Name, date, rank and salary of the candidate's initial appointment at UCM;
2. Existing rank and salary of the candidate;
3. Number of years at the existing salary; and
4. Recommended action.

The University Librarian's letter of recommendation should also include the following:

1. A comprehensive assessment of the candidate's performance and accomplishments together with specific evidence to support the evaluation. This evaluation should follow the same criteria and areas of Librarianship outlined in **APM 210-4.e.3** and **APM 365-10**, but with primary emphasis on administrative performance within defined responsibilities.
2. An evaluation of the candidate's plans and goals for his or her division, professional and/or personal goals, and a comparison of the previous review file's statement with actual accomplishments since that date.
3. In the case of a recommendation for promotion, an assessment of the candidate's professional growth or increased responsibilities, and sustained successful performance at the rank of Assistant University Librarian.

Recommended actions may be one of the following:

- No Merit
- Meritorious (with a typical salary increase of 7% based upon available funding); or
- Extra-Meritorious (with specific salary increase based upon available funding).

The University Librarian will forward his or her recommendation, along with the complete review file, to the Academic Personnel Office by May 1st. APO will review the file for compliance with policy and procedures, and forward to the Provost/EVC, who will provide a final decision. Any action will take effect July 1st.

#### D. APPEALS

In cases in which a candidate wishes to allege procedural violations (as outlined below), the candidate will first review the issues with the University Librarian in an effort to reach a resolution. If after this discussion the candidate still wishes to submit an allegation, a formal written allegation statement will be sent to the Provost/EVC via the Academic Personnel Office.

Disagreements or questions regarding academic judgment are not procedural violations and are not subject to appeal.

A procedural violation is deemed to have occurred when:

1. Procedures followed in the review process were not in consonance with the applicable rules and requirements of the University or the Merced Campus, as outlined here and in the APM; and/or
2. The challenged decision was reached on the basis of impermissible criteria including (but not limited to): race, sex, or political conviction.

The Provost/EVC will appoint an *ad hoc* appeal committee when he or she receives a formal written allegation of procedural violation. The Provost/EVC will request a written response to the allegations from the University Librarian, and both documents, along with the original review file, will be forwarded to the committee. The Provost/EVC will inform the candidate of his or her right to a hearing before the *ad hoc* committee. The committee will make a recommendation to the Provost/EVC, but is not empowered to reevaluate the academic qualifications or professional competence of the candidate. The Provost/EVC will inform the University Librarian of the final action in the case.