Summary of Amendments to the ULF Bylaws

Submitted by the University of Libraries Faculty (ULF) Personnel Committee (2023-2024)

1/24/2025

Overview

The University Libraries Faculty voted to approve revisions to the Personnel Document. There are a total of 48 edits. The changes are minor and intended to provide clarify and improve language throughout the document, especially the annual review process. The document also references ULF's move towards virtual meetings, electronic ballots, and electronic filing.

Summary of Revisions

Personnel Document

- Edit 1: Replaced "librarian/archivist" with "faculty member"
    - Rationale: "Faculty member" applies to both librarians and archivists
- Edit 2: Replaced "written" with "documented"
    - Rationale: We ask for documentation, not necessarily in the form of a written narrative.
- Edit 3: Replaced "university's strategic plan" with "university priorities"
    - Rationale: "University's strategic plan" is too specific. "University priorities" are more general and allow for a broader range of activities in support of priorities.
- Edit 4: Deleted "written"
    - Rationale: Unnecessary
- Edit 5: Deleted "written"
    - Rationale: Unnecessary
- Edit 6: Added "merit-based"
    - Rationale: Clarifying that we are talking only about merit-based increases here, not COLAs or other salary increases.
- Edit 7: Added "Prior performance in years without merit raises will be taken into account when funds become available for salary increases."
    - Rationale: Per the Economic Welfare report, this language ensures that years without merit increases are still taken into account when merit increases become available.
- Edit 8: Replaced "electrionally and in the Office of the Dean" with "in the ULF electronic archive"
    - Rationale: Files are now preserved in the electronic archives only.
- Edit 9: Replaced "a letter to each" with "an email to all"
    - Rationale: The Dean sends an email to the faculty listserv.
- Edit 10: Moved "Instructions for formatting the section that pertains to Criteria B and C will be provided to the Dean by the Personnel Committee prior to this date."

- o   Rationale: Moved this point up from 2.1.J.3 as it makes more sense to talk about it here since the Dean sends both the date and instructions together.
- Edit 11: Deleted "By November 15 each year, written instructions for the section that pertains to Criteria B and C will be provided by the Personnel Committee."
  - o   Rationale: Added language about this point to 2.1.J.2.
- Edit 12: Added "Section 4.3.3 of The Redbook details how work outside the university should be accounted for in annual review materials."
  - o   Rationale: Changed this to reference the Redbook for information on accounting for work outside the university.
- Edit 13: Deleted "print and"
  - o   Rationale: Print is no longer accepted.
- Edit 14: Deleted "if needed"
  - o   Rationale: The annual review instructions detail when documentation is needed.
- Edit 15: Added ". The supervisor and Personnel Committee will work together toward consensus on an overall rating"
  - o   Rationale: Consensus was not originally mentioned until later in the document.
- Edit 17: Replaced "that... for the standards" with "standards and"
  - o   Rationale: Clearer language
- Edit 18: Replaced "supervisor" with "Personnel Committee"
  - o   Rationale: The Personnel Committee sends the evaluations to faculty and copies the supervisor.
- Edit 19: Deleted "The supervisor will share the final, written evaluations with the faculty member."
  - o   Rationale: Same as above.
- Edit 20: Deleted "ranking and subsequent"
  - o   Rationale: Ranking is no longer part of the annual review process.
- Edit 21: Added "be eligible to"
  - o   Rationale: Takes into account that we do not receive guaranteed raises each year and mirrors the language of the following sentence.
- Edit 22: Replaced "receiving the performance evaluation letter" with "completion of the faculty/supervisor annual review meeting"
  - o   Rationale: The faculty member should have a chance to discuss their rating with their supervisor before deciding to appeal an evaluation. The supervisor/faculty member meeting might be scheduled for several days or longer after receiving the evaluation letter.
- Edit 23: Replaced "revise" with "make a recommendation for revision of"
  - o   Rationale: The final decision about revising a faculty member's rating should fall to the Dean. K.5 says the Appeals Committee makes a recommendation to the Dean for a final decision.
- Edit 24: Added "service"
  - o   Rationale: Missing word
- Edit 25: Deleted "written"
  - o   Rationale: Ballots are generally electronic.

- Edit 26: Deleted ", however virtual participation in the discussion and voting will be allowed."
  - Rationale: Most meetings are now held virtually.
- Edit 27: Deleted ", state, or nation"
  - Rationale: Faculty members are evaluated on their contributions to the library, university, profession, and community.
- Edit 28: Replaced "his or her" with "their"
  - Rationale: Inclusive language
- Edit 29: Deleted "written"
  - Rationale: Ballots are generally electronic
- Edit 30: Deleted ", however virtual participation in the discussion and voting will be allowed."
  - Rationale: Most meetings are now held virtually.
- Edit 31: Replaced "triptych" with "file"
  - Rationale: "File" is truer to the current system of forwarding faculty files in Folio.
- Edit 32: Replaced "his or her" with "their"
  - Rationale: Inclusive language
- Edit 33: Replaced "has met the University Libraries criteria overall meriting a satisfactory rating or unsatisfactory" with "has merited an overall Satisfactory rating or is Unsatisfactory"
  - Rationale: There are no criteria for PCR, just an evaluation of past annual reviews to see if the faculty member has received Satisfactory or above ratings. This language leaves more room to deal with unusual situations like split ratings, where a faculty member undergoing PCR may have received a split Satisfactory/Needs Improvement rating during the period under review.
- Edit 34: Replaced "the definiciency(ies)" with "any deficiencies"
  - Rationale: Clarifying language
- Edit 35: Deleted "written"
  - Rationale: Ballots are generally electronic
- Edit 36: Replaced "a mail ballot may be used" with "the ballot can be distributed, collected, and tallied after the meeting"
  - Rationale: A "mail ballot" would generally now be an electronic ballot distributed outside of a meeting.

Appendix I

- Edit 37: Replaced "he or she is" with "they are"
  - Rationale: Inclusive language
- Edit 28: Added "add"
  - Rationale: Consistency among structure of bullet points with Oxford comma and "and"
- Edit 39: Deleted "service to the Libraries, University or community" and "including involvement in professional organizations"

- o Rationale: These bullet points are general factors expected of all faculty members; service and involvement in professional organizations are not expectations for term faculty
- Edit 40: Replaced "librarians and archivists" with "faculty members"
  - o Rationale: "Faculty member" applies to librarians and archivists

Appendix II

- Edit 41: Added "of the Personnel Document"
  - o Rationale: Clarifying what document is being referred to
- Edit 42: Replaced "his/her" with "their"
  - o Rationale: Inclusive language
- Edit 43: Replaced "It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide" with "Documentation that provides"
  - o Rationale: Consistency with the format of the other items on this list
- Edit 44: Replaced "his/her" with "their"
  - o Rationale: Inclusive language
- Edit 45: Replaced "editorial correspondence concerning the comments of peer reviewers and the author's response" with "relevant editorial and/or peer review correspondence"
  - o Rationale: While the Personnel Committee would not normally be concerned with editorial or peer review comments, some PC members felt we should leave room for submission of particularly positive feedback on an article to help us understand the quality of a work.
- Edit 46: Replaced "results of focus groups or usability testing for library initiatives" with "program evaluations, initiative assessment data, or other evidence of exceptional performance"
  - o Rationale: This seems to be an oddly specific item to include in an inexhaustive list of potential documentation. We broadened the language so that faculty could still provide evidence of impact and quality of work in areas other than scholarship and service.
- Edit 47: Replaced "addresses" with "contact information"
  - o Rationale: The Personnel Committee asks for email addresses
- Edit 48: Deleted "and" and added "and service activities."
  - o Rationale: Peer reviewers are asked to evaluate both research/creative activity and service