

CACLS Tips for Writing Review Documentation

For ALL:

1. Read and familiarize yourself with the following documents:

- *APMs*:
 - [360](#) (Appointment and Promotion – Librarian Series)
 - [210-4](#) (Instructions to Review Committees),
 - [160](#) (Academic Personnel Records)
- *PAMs*:
 - [2.1](#)
 - [2.2](#) (if you only read one document, make it this one)
- *MOU*: For represented librarians, the APM applies only to the extent provided for in the MOU.
- *The Call*, issued by Academic Personnel
- This Tips sheet

These and other useful documents can be found at <http://library.ucr.edu/view/laucr/peer-review/> .

2. Start early. The Chancellor's Committee on the Librarian Series (CACLS) cannot emphasize this suggestion enough.

- Make sure you and your review initiator
 - a. have sufficient time to make revisions, and
 - b. take the time to check your file for completeness before it moves forward.
- Reviews should **demonstrate depth and breadth; significance and impact.**
- The University Librarian (UL), CACLS, and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP) are **reading many files**. Anything you can do to **help them read** the files is appreciated: **length, content, readability, organization**, and the like.

3. Pay attention to deadlines. Note the dates in *The Call* from the VPAP. CACLS recommends that candidates and review initiators use the calendar, highlight the significant dates appropriate to their reviews, and refer to it frequently during the review process.

4. Make sure the file is complete before moving on to the next stage of the process. Do not expect someone further along the line to catch inadequacies. There have been cases where essential pieces of the file were not included and this was not noticed before the file left the Library and arrived at the Academic Personnel Office. Use the *Documentation Checklist* to keep track of what documents are being added to the file.

(The Library Personnel Office normally provides the *Documentation Checklist* form for the file and goes over it with the candidate just before it leaves the Libraries. You can find a copy of it in Appendix B of *The Call*.)

Note: Although the VPAP or CACLS can ask for clarifying information, neither has a responsibility to solicit information for the purpose of completing the file.

January 2014 update: The 2013 version of the *MOU* has decoupled the Distinguished Librarian status from the rank and step/point system. The procedures for the current version of this review action have yet to be codified.

Acceleration has disappeared from the language of the *MOU*. [However, read *MOU Article 14. B. 2. C. ii.*]

All text quoted from the *MOU* come from the *Complete T.A. with All Negotiated Articles*, the only text J. Lee could find (1/31/14). The link to the document can be found at <http://ucaft.org/category/unit/librarians> .

CACLS Tips for Writing Review Documentation

For CANDIDATES:

1. First, write, update, or review your Statement of Primary Responsibilities (your job description) and do not repeat information from it in your Statement of Professional Achievements.
Example: If serving on a particular committee is one of your primary responsibilities, do not put it in your Statement of Professional Achievements unless you can cite specific accomplishments on the committee which are exemplary and go beyond what would be expected, such as chairing a subcommittee, or volunteering to take minutes.
2. Only include activities and accomplishments for the period under review. Provide dates for activities and accomplishments whenever possible.
3. **Length.** Excessive length can detract from the case you are trying to make and can even work against you. Avoid too much detail or inclusion of non-essential materials (padding). The Statement of Professional Achievements can be between 2 and 4 pages, with the possible exception of acceleration files, in which a stronger case must be made. The key is the **readability** of the document.

For significant review actions, consider having a "tightly written" document for your review and a **supplemental addendum** to hold examples or further description of your work.

4. **Concentrate on the *impact* of your activities.** Use concrete examples.
Example: Do not just say, "I set up the library instruction program for the new X Department," but add: "As a result, five faculty members have already requested that a library instruction session be a part of their next year's course."
5. Consider your **audience**. There may be others who do not fully understand the nature of your work, even those who work directly with you. (E.g., the VPAP is not likely to be familiar with your work.) Write accordingly. Spell out acronyms the first time you use them. It is best to refer to your colleagues by the position title and name. If you list only the name, the reader may not know the person.
6. **Bullet lists are good**; but, please, no laundry lists. This is not a review process by weight, but **do provide** the reader with **some context** for your information.
7. Although the review initiator should address the significance and impact of your work, there may be some situations where you would not want to leave it totally to the review initiator to do so. E.g., the review initiator is new to this review process; or, the review initiator is not intimately familiar with and knowledgeable about your work.
8. **Use discretion** in what you include. How you document your file serves as a measure and reflection of your professional judgment. You want those reading your file to know what you have done and how that impacts the Libraries, the University, the community, and/or the profession. Some of the best files seen have been relatively compact.
9. **Adding comments to the file.** Candidates can add comments before the file leaves the library or after the file leaves the library. With the latter, be sensitive to the schedule in *The Call*; do not wait too long to submit them. The Candidate can submit comments or responses to the Academic Personnel Office (APO) within a reasonable time and they will be included in the file. Comments added after the file has left the library would be available to the APO, CACLS/Ad hoc committees, and the VPAP.

Other mention of candidates adding comments to the review file can be found in *MOU Article 5. H. and K.*

CACLS Tips for Writing Review Documentation

10. **Individuals who may not be objective evaluators to a candidate's review.** There are two situations to consider about these individuals: a) those who might not provide objective letters, or b) those who may not be objective members of a review committee for the file (i.e., CACLS or Ad hoc).

The Call covers both situations: See IV. A. 3.d and 3.e. If there are "...individuals who, for reasons set forth by the candidate, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications and performance," then the candidate should **provide the name(s) and reasons to a) the review initiator** (statement to be added to the review file using Appendix G, which covers the letters), **and to b) the VPAP** separately in writing about individuals not serving on a review committee (include names and reasons). There is no form for communicating with the VPAP.

MOU Article 5. G.1 states: "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."

11. Ask experienced colleagues for **advice** on your documentation. Past Chairs of CACLS are a particularly good source of advice, and willing to help. Keep in mind that your colleagues cannot answer specific questions pertaining to an individual case nor can they assist with writing the file.
12. We strongly recommend that you **request redacted copies** of confidential materials in the files (e.g., letters) as they are added to the file:
- from Library Personnel before the file leaves the Library, or
 - from the Academic Personnel Office after the file leaves the Library (preferably when the review is complete).

Career Summary (for promotion and career status)

In cases of promotion to Associate or Librarian rank or career status you **MUST** provide a summary and review of your entire career (both at UCR and before, if applicable). The "Candidate's Career Summary," can be concise (2-4 pages), highlight career achievements with dates whenever possible, and demonstrate the development and progression of your career. (*The Call – Appendix F*)

Note: Any promotion or career status file submitted without a "Candidate's Career Summary" **WILL** be considered **incomplete**.

In this career summary, it is not appropriate to include accomplishments of the period under review as they are already contained in your "Statement of Professional Achievements."

Letters

- Letters are necessary for promotion and career status.
- Letters from colleagues within the Library should be avoided, if only because you are disqualifying such colleagues from sitting on any committee that will review you. Note that unsolicited letters that contribute materially to the review may be added to the file. (*PAM 2.1, IV, 5*)
- As a courtesy to those who will write your reference letters, let them know in advance by using dates from the *The Call*:
 - When the Library will be requesting letters, and
 - When the letters will be due in the Library Personnel Office.

CACLS Tips for Writing Review Documentation

For REVIEW INITIATORS:

1. Make sure early on what actions the candidate might be seeking and advise them on the proper documentation. You don't want to be surprised by out of cycle reviews, deferrals, or Librarian promotions.
2. *PAM 2.1, IV* states that "**It is the review initiator's responsibility to ensure the completeness of the candidate's review file...**" Do not send incomplete files forward. Make sure the candidate submits correct file documentation.
3. Consider keeping a file or list of accomplishments and noteworthy observations on each of the librarians which you supervise, adding to it over time. This will help you when it is time to write the review.
Example: If you receive a comment from a staff member or patron, or witness a particular reference transaction or class, including mention of it will make for a more compelling file than a laundry list of accomplishments.
4. **Provide an evaluation.** Do not summarize the candidate's statement. Instead, review the performance. Include significance and impact: be it **positive or negative**. No one in the review process can take anything into account that is not included in the file.
5. The review initiator must recommend the correct action and check to see that the file supports it.
Make sure the recommendation fits your review. There have been occasions where a positive review was unaccountably accompanied by a negative recommendation, and vice versa, or a normal merit that should have been what was previously known as an accelerated file. (See next point.) Consult *PAM 2.2* or *APM 360-80* for the application of academic review criteria.
6. Although *PAM 2.2, I.C.3* indicates: "Acceleration is an unusual recommendation and is explicitly reserved for those individuals who have performed in an extraordinary manner during the review period," [acceleration has been removed from MOU language \(2013\)](#).

[According to the recently approved MOU, "\[a\] positive review shall result in an increase of at least two \(2\) salary points on the applicable scale for Assistant and Associate Librarian ranks, and at least three \(3\) salary points on the applicable scale at the Librarian rank. The University is not precluded from granting merit increases of a greater number of points." \(MOU Article 14. B. 2. C. ii\)](#)
7. If the candidate you are reviewing is also a supervisor, remember to evaluate the supervisory aspect of her/his work. (**Examples:** Impressions from the people he or she supervises, particular motivational projects the candidate has instituted, your observations of a well-handled situation etc...)
8. Pass files to the next level as soon as they are completed, the AUL's may have many files to review.

For CACLS/ AD HOC COMMITTEES:

1. For any action that is not a normal merit, a file can, at the discretion of CACLS, be assigned to an Ad hoc committee for review.
2. Ad hoc committee members must have **career status**. Normally, members with the same rank as the candidate will serve on the committee, except for Assistant Librarian files. (Sometimes, the committee will be composed of the majority rather than all of the members at the same rank as the candidate.)

CACLS Tips for Writing Review Documentation

3. **Confidentiality, confidentiality, confidentiality!**
4. The **Ad hoc committee functions as the review committee**, that is, this committee does the work of evaluating the review file. As such, the committee should provide documentation and justification for either the proposed action, or a different one if recommended.
5. Ad hoc committee members: please, **DO THE WORK**. Provide appropriate references and examples; support your recommendation. **Make the argument**: quote from the file; cite examples. **Do not expect the reader to work it out from the file**.
6. **Refer to** or cite appropriate sections of the **APM or MOU**. These documents apply to all campuses.
 - a. If you cannot find the wording from those documents, then use *The Call* for local interpretation and practices. This document is issued by the APO with input from the UL and CACLS.
 - b. Refer to the *PAMs* last, only if needed, and if your point cannot be found anywhere else. These documents are generated at the library level and are not vetted externally.
7. **Do not expect or place CACLS in the position of doing all the work**. That is why an Ad hoc committee is appointed. (The trend in CACLS is *not* to appoint an Ad hoc committee if the file is straightforward and CACLS can take care of the work. If other “sets of eyes” on an Ad hoc committee are needed or the action warrants it, then an Ad hoc committee will be appointed.)
8. **CACLS can refer the report back to the Ad hoc committee if it is not considered complete**. Such an action would likely **delay** the review process timetable for that particular file.

CACLS can also opt to constitute a **different Ad hoc committee if necessary**.

If there are problems with the report or work, CACLS should provide immediate feedback to the Ad hoc committee. Otherwise, those committee members would not learn and improve on their performance for and service to this level of the review process. (The VPAP feels it is appropriate for CACLS to address the Ad hoc committee at this point since the CACLS decision will not have yet proceeded to the VPAPs office.)

GENERAL NOTE: A review file can be sent back at any level of the process. Be sure that the review file contains the necessary components, both in form and content, because CACLS and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP) **can only go by what is included in the file**. Check the file against the requirements in PAM 2.1.

This document incorporates advice from *Tips for Writing Review Documentation*, compiled by Jeff Selth, February 1987. Reviewed annually by CACLS and updated as necessary.

REV. hh 11/03, jbr, kc, pb 11/04
REV. mp 12/06, my 11/07
REV. jl 1/14r2