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INTRODUCTION

In 1983 faculty status for librarians at Arizona’s three state universities was rescinded. At that time, the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) adopted the Conditions of Professional Service (ABOR Policy 6-301) to address the status of librarians and other non-faculty professionals. One of the categories of employees specified in this policy was “Academic Professional.” In this policy university librarians in the State of Arizona are designated as “Academic Professionals.” The other professional category delineated in this same policy is “Service Professionals.” Academic Professionals by virtue of their traditional roles as librarians are entitled to intellectual and academic freedom, continuing status, and other rights similar in nature to those accorded university faculty.

At Northern Arizona University the Council of Academic Professionals (CAP) was organized and charged with drafting a local implementation document for the Conditions of Professional Service in compliance with the mandate of the Arizona Board of Regents. As further mandated by ABOR, a “peer review group” known locally as the Committee on Academic Professional Status (COAPS) was created as a subcommittee of the Council of Academic Professionals. COAPS is responsible for administering the annual reviews of academic professionals and working with the Dean to assist academic professionals in related areas concerning academic status.

Membership of the Council of Academic Professionals is defined in the Council's by-laws. The Council is actively involved in academic affairs and is well represented by its members who serve on various campus governing bodies, including the Faculty Senate.

The purpose of this Handbook is to provide Academic Professionals of the NAU Cline Library with a compilation of the policies and procedures that pertain to service at the Library.

Other documents that Academic Professionals should also consult include:

- ABOR Conditions of Professional Service
- Northern Arizona University Personnel Policy Manual
- Cline Library Vision, Mission Statement, and Strategic Plan
- By-Laws for the Council of Academic Professionals
- American Library Association’s Code of Ethics
- Society of American Archivist’s Code of Ethics
- COAPS Review Calendar
TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. Table of contents

B. Annual Review of Academic Professionals: Policies and Procedures
   B.1. Annual Review
   B.2. Criteria for Academic Professional Reviews
       B.2.1. Position Effectiveness
       B.2.2. Professional Development and Contribution
       B.2.3. Service
   B.3. Self Review
   B.4. Statement of Expectations
       B.4.1. Position Description
       B.4.2. Annual Objectives
   B.5. Primary Evaluator
   B.6. Supplementary Reviewers
   B.7. Comments and Disagreements
       B.7.1. Comments
       B.7.2. Disagreements
           B.7.2.1 Informal Review
           B.7.2.2 Formal Resolution
           B.7.2.3 Documentation
   B.8. COAPS Review Procedures
   B.9. Confidentiality of Records

C. Performance Review of Continuing Status Academic Professionals
   C.1. Objective
   C.2. Criteria for Continuing Status Academic Professional
   C.3. Procedures For Review Process
       C.3.1. The Comprehensive Performance Review
   C.4. Outcomes of the Review Process

D. Promotion in Rank
   D.1. General qualifications of Academic Professionals
   D.2. Criteria for Promotion to Specific Ranks
       D.2.1. Assistant Librarian
       D.2.2. Associate Librarian
       D.2.3. Librarian
       D.2.4. Affiliate Librarian

E. Sabbatical Leave for Academic Professionals
   E.1. Policies and procedures
       E.1.1. Eligibility and Purpose
       E.1.2. Application and Review Process
       E.1.3. Criteria for Approval of Sabbatical
       E.1.4. Conditions Affecting Implementation of Sabbatical
   E.2. Professional Exchange Programs
       E.2.1. Policy and Principles
       E.2.2. Application and Review of Proposals
       E.2.3. Implementation of Exchanges
E.3. Extended Leave of Absence (Without Pay)
   E.3.1. Policy and Principles
   E.3.2. Application and Review of Proposals
   E.3.3. Implementation of Extended Leave of Absence (Without Pay)

F. Personnel Procedures for Academic Professionals
   F.1. Retirement
   F.2. Resignations
   F.3. Emeritus Status

G. Academic Professional Probationary Period
   G.1. Credit for prior service
   G.2. Award of Continuing Status in lieu of probation
   G.3. Extension of probationary period

H. Academic Professional Problem Resolution: Policies and Procedures
   H.1. Introduction to Resolution Procedures
   H.2. Definitions
   H.3. Informal Resolution
   H.4. Negotiation/Mediation
   H.5. Grievance Policy and Process
      H.5.1 Grievance Policy
      H.5.2. Grievance Process
      H.5.3. Grievance Hearing Process
         H.5.3.1. Report and Recommendation
         H.5.3.2. Final Decision
         H.5.3.3. Request for Review or Rehearing
   H.7. Grievances Regarding Denial of Continuing Status and/or Dismissal
      H.7.1. Procedures for Conciliation/Mediation as a Result of Suspension
              Without Pay or Dismissal
      H.7.2. Procedures for Hearings Resulting From an Appeal of a Notice of
              Dismissal or Suspension Without Pay
   H.8. Grievance Concerning Post-Continuing Status Review

Appendix (Forms)
   Format for Statement of Expectations
   Format for Self-Review
   Format for Supplementary Reviewer Assessment
   Format for Primary Evaluator Review
B. ANNUAL REVIEW of ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS:
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

B.1. ANNUAL REVIEW

The Arizona Board of Regents recognizes the need for an annual review process for Academic Professionals which identifies, assesses, and enhances performance with continuity of purpose. It is essential that the review process incorporate guidelines relevant to the identification and achievement of an individual's professional goals as well as the goals of the University. To that end, the annual performance review process for academic professionals provides opportunities for goal-setting, peer participation, and constructive and supportive feedback as a means for achieving University initiatives while encouraging professional growth and development.

The professional review criterion, as defined in ABOR policy (6-301, section H), provides a standard for advancing an employee to continuing status based on “excellent performance and the promise of continued excellence in performance.” As established by the Council of Academic Professionals, excellent performance and promise of continued excellence is based on position effectiveness, professional development and contribution, and service. Among these criteria, greater emphasis is given to position effectiveness in the review process.

**Annual review for Academic Professionals is designed to accomplish the following:**

- Review performance of the past year
- Establish objectives for the coming year
- Provide information for reappointment, continuing status, promotion in rank, and other personnel-related recommendations.

**Annual review incorporates these key elements:**

- Self Review
- Statement of Expectations
- Primary Evaluator Review
- Supplementary Review(s)
- COAPS Review

B.2. CRITERIA FOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL REVIEWS

B.2.1. Position Effectiveness

- The nature and extent of productivity in meeting goals outlined in the Academic Professional's Statement of Expectations.
The nature and extent of productivity in performing the duties of the position as outlined in the position description.

A demonstrated ability to perform job duties in the context of departmental, library, and university mission and goals, and in accordance with the standards of the profession.

An ongoing commitment to serving library clientele in the context of library policies and the guidelines and standards of the profession.

An ongoing acquisition and application of the professional knowledge and skills required for the position.

An ongoing ability to maintain effective communication with colleagues, supervisors and library patrons.

B.2.2. Professional Development and Contribution:

- An ongoing advancement of professional development, including but not limited to work-related seminars, workshops, and training opportunities that enhance performance.

- An ongoing pursuit and support of research and scholarship including but not limited to conducting workshops/seminars, presentation of papers, publishing, consultations, exhibits, and media programs.

B.2.3. Service:

- An ongoing involvement in Library and University activities related to the mission of the Library and the University.

- An ongoing participation in library governance, such as the Council of Academic Professionals, and through it participation in university governance through the University Advisory Council.

- Membership and active participation in appropriate national, regional, state, and local professional associations.

B.3. SELF REVIEW

The Academic Professional's Self Review is an assessment of his/her success in fulfilling the responsibilities outlined in his/her position description, and in meeting the past year's objectives. Supporting documentation may be appended to the Self-Review when, in the judgment of the Academic Professional, the documents further clarify information provided in the Self Review.

The Self Review is stated objectively, with the emphasis throughout placed on actions and results. When preparing the Self Review, the Academic Professional should also pay close attention to section B.2, above. The review process as a whole is intended to be performance-based, avoiding, to the degree possible, reliance on subjective judgments of intangible attributes.
B.4. **STATEMENT OF EXPECTATIONS**

The **Statement of Expectations** is a document containing the Academic Professional's current position description and performance objectives for the year. The **Statement of Expectations** is used by the Academic Professional in the Self Review to assess his/her past year's performance.

During the Annual Review, the Academic Professional first completes his/her Self Review of the past year's performance. He/she then prepares a preliminary draft Statement of Expectations for the coming year. Recommended changes in position description are included in the draft. Library and Departmental goals and objectives and the individual's position description are used to develop personal performance objectives. In addition to objectives associated with position responsibilities, objectives which relate to Professional Development and Contributions, and to Service, are included in the Statement of Expectations.

The draft Statement of Expectations is reviewed with the Primary Evaluator and appropriate Supplementary Reviewers to incorporate their comments and recommendations. When the draft document is acceptable to both the Primary Evaluator and the Academic Professional, the Primary Evaluator and the Academic Professional both sign the statement. The document is then forwarded to the next level of administration for further review and approval. Once approved by the Dean, the Statement of Expectations is an agreement among the Academic Professional, the Library, and the University. If warranted, the Statement of Expectations and Supplementary Reviewers may be renegotiated during the year to accommodate unforeseen circumstances.

If an Academic Professional does not concur with the final Statement of Expectations, mediation and/or negotiation as outline in section B.7. below should be considered.

The **Statement of Expectations** includes these basic components:

I. The Position Description

II. Annual Objectives

   A. Position Effectiveness

      1. Objectives specific to the position description
      2. Objectives specific to Library and Departmental goals and objectives

   B. Professional Development and Contribution

   C. Service

---

B.4.1. **Position Description**

---

1If an Academic Professional's position description delineates responsibilities divided between two departments, the Academic Professional will develop two Statements of Expectations in consultation with each of two Primary Evaluators to address objectives for each department.
The Statement of Expectations begins with a current position description. A position description is the formal statement of the duties and responsibilities of a position. It outlines the requirements of the position and serves as a guide for the person who holds the position.

It is acknowledged that an Academic Professional's position description will not be a complete reflection of the demands on the Academic Professional’s time. The Academic Professional's year encompasses taking appropriate actions in support of the Library's annual goals and objectives, achieving performance enhancement objectives, making professional contributions, performing professional development activities, and honoring service commitments.

During the annual review process, the position description provides a useful benchmark of duties and responsibilities that the Academic Professional and the Primary Evaluator can discuss objectively. The Academic Professional and Primary Evaluator are to review every statement in the position description for accuracy and completeness.

The position description contains the following:

- Title of the position
- Purpose and scope of the position
  - Identifies reporting structure and other critical organizational relationships. Explains the purpose of the position within the context of the Library's service mission.
- List of specific duties and responsibilities
  - These statements provide the basis for evaluating annual performance. Duties and responsibilities are listed in priority order.
- Date of the revision and initials of the Academic Professional.

**B.4.2. Annual Objectives**

Each Academic Professional performs a vital role in the achievement of Cline Library goals and objectives. In addition to position effectiveness, Academic Professionals in the Cline Library have responsibility for professional contributions and service to the University. Therefore, the formulation of individual objectives is not only an exercise to facilitate writing the self-review, but also evidence of the individual's contribution to the achievements of the Cline Library, the University, and the profession.

Individual objectives and a revised position description will be written by the Academic Professional and will reflect advisement by the Primary Evaluator and appropriate Supplementary Reviewers. New initiatives and changes in the University and the Library often call for changing emphases within a position.

The first group of objectives should be those that are directly linked to the position description. The second group should articulate the individual's role in helping to achieve the Library and departmental goals and objectives. Finally, objectives formulated for
professional development, contribution, and service, are to be listed as activities outside of the individual's position and departmental responsibilities which will result in development, contribution, and service. An objective may extend beyond one review period as a work-in-progress statement. An objective may include activities which will fall in more than one area of concentration.

The Academic Professional is responsible for formulating objectives that are consistent with Cline Library goals and objectives. The following factors should be considered when formulating objectives.

- **Priorities**
  
  Individual objectives should clearly reflect the priority the Academic Professional places on each of the objectives. During the review interview, the Academic Professional and Primary Evaluator should reach a mutual understanding regarding the relative importance of each objective, the time commitment involved, the effect on departmental goals, and standards for accomplishment.

- **Attainability**
  
  Objectives must be realistic and achievable. If objectives have side-conditions, state those conditions. When obstacles to achievement are anticipated, include those with the objective statement. Evidence shows that common barriers to achieving objectives include:

  1. individual objectives set unrealistically high
  2. lack of balance between duties of the position description and high-visibility objectives
  3. changed conditions in work unit
  4. inadequate planning and/or training
  5. insufficient motivation
  6. failure to follow established procedures
  7. lack of cooperation among staff or from other units

  Examining the viability of objectives using the above list may alert the Primary Evaluator and the Academic Professional to the need for restructuring objectives before the review process is completed.

- **Measures of Achievement**
  
  Objectives should have some measurable or observable outcome which can either be quantified or clearly described in narrative form.
Changes or Revisions

The Primary Evaluator and the Academic Professional are encouraged to meet regularly to review the Academic Professional's progress toward achieving objectives. This practice allows recognition of unanticipated obstacles such as a change in the position description, changes in priorities, department realignments, etc. Formally negotiated amendments to the Academic Professional's Statement of Expectations should be documented, signed, and dated by the Academic Professional, the Primary Evaluator, the Associate University Librarian, and the Dean and University Librarian. The amended statement becomes part of the formal review package.

B.5. PRIMARY EVALUATOR

The Primary Evaluator is the person to whom the Academic Professional directly reports in any given year. The Primary Evaluator is responsible for:

- completing an annual review based on the Academic Professional's Statement of Expectations for the past year.
- preparing comments on the Academic Professional's Self Review for the past year.
- reviewing and refining the Academic Professional's draft Statement of Expectations for the coming year.

Primary Evaluators, in responding to Academic Professionals' Self Reviews and Statements of Expectations, must take account of all information presented, including Supplementary Reviews, and integrate this information with their own perceptions.

B.6. SUPPLEMENTARY REVIEWER

A Supplementary Reviewer is a person who can effectively assess a significant aspect of the Academic Professional's responsibilities. A Supplementary Reviewer may be the Chair of a committee or task force on which the Academic Professional has served or the Resource Selection Librarian for subject specialists. Although Supplementary Reviewers are generally Cline Library Academic Professionals, others, such as university faculty, may be designated. A Supplementary Reviewer serves these functions:

- reviews the Academic Professional's performance within the past year addressing those portions of the Statement of Expectations within the Supplementary Reviewer's purview.
- assists in developing the coming year's Statement of Expectations for the Academic Professional's performance objectives which are within the Supplementary Reviewer's purview.

Supplementary Reviewers are identified during the development of the Statement of Expectations in preliminary consultations between the Primary Evaluator and the Academic Professional. Blind reviewers may be solicited in preliminary consultation with the Primary Evaluator. An Academic
Professional shall have one to three Supplementary Reviewers in a review cycle.

B.7. COMMENTS AND DISAGREEMENTS

B.7.1. Comments

In the Annual Review meeting, the Academic Professional is given the opportunity to add comments to the Annual Review as part of the official record.

B.7.2. Disagreements

B.7.2.1. Informal Review

In the event that an Academic Professional disagrees with the Primary Evaluator's performance review, or proposed modifications to the Statement of Expectations, and such disagreement cannot be resolved bilaterally, the Academic Professional may within three working days after the Annual Review meeting, prepare a written disagreement to attach to the Primary Reviewer's comments and request an informal review of the evaluation or Statement of Expectations at the next higher administrative level. This review will be accomplished in consultation with an ad hoc peer review advisory committee. This committee will be comprised of two peers and the Administrator. Within the context of this document, the term "Administrator" shall mean an Associate University Librarian or the Dean. The Administrator will convene an ad hoc peer review advisory committee within three working days after receiving the Academic Professional's Request.

The Administrator who chairs the committee will propose two peers to serve on the ad hoc committee. A peer is defined as a continuing eligible Academic Professional or an Academic Professional with continuing status. The proposed two peers will serve after mutual consent from the Academic Professional and the Primary Evaluator. In the event that mutual consent on peer selection cannot be achieved, the Administrator will appoint the peers.

Within three working days after convening, the ad hoc Peer Review Advisory Committee will forward the results of the committee's review to the Academic Professional and the Primary Evaluator. The recommendations of the ad hoc committee shall become part of the Academic Professional's performance review.

Upon receipt of the review results, the Academic Professional and the Primary Evaluator will meet again and complete the Annual Review incorporating the recommendations of the ad hoc committee.

B.7.2.2. Formal Resolution

If the Academic Professional is not satisfied with the outcome of the informal review, he or she may seek resolution through the Grievance Policy and Process detailed in section H.5, below.

B.7.2.3. Documentation
The Academic Professional's written disagreement and request for review along with the ad hoc committee's review results will be attached to the Annual Review documentation and become a part of the official record.

B.8. COAPS REVIEW PROCEDURES

The Committee on Academic Professional Status (COAPS) is an elected committee responsible for all personnel actions requiring peer review and recommendations (CAP By-Laws, X.1.).

The COAPS review process is outlined in a calendar provided by the Committee. Dates for review and evaluation shall be in accordance with the university Administrative Calendar, which shall be prepared annually by the chief academic officer and furnished through the Dean to COAPS.

COAPS reviews the annual review packet (Self Review, Statement of Expectations, Primary Evaluator's Review, and Supplementary Review(s)) and forwards its evaluation and, when appropriate, personnel recommendations to the Associate University Librarian and/or the Dean and University Librarian.

Details of the procedures COAPS follows will be provided to Academic Professionals by COAPS at the beginning of the review process. At the end of each review cycle COAPS will review these procedures and recommend changes to the Policies and Procedures Committee (PPC). PPC will present these changes to CAP for approval prior to the beginning of the next review period.

B.9. CONFIDENTIALITY OF RECORDS

Annual review documentation is filed in each Academic Professional's personnel file in the Library Office. Documentation is confidential to the extent permissible by Arizona law and is only accessible in most instances to the Academic Professional, the Primary Evaluator, the Associate University Librarian, the Dean, COAPS, the Provost, and the President.
C. PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF CONTINUING STATUS ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS: POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

C.1. OBJECTIVE

The performance review of continuing status academic professionals is designed to assess and enhance performance and to promote continuing professional growth and development in accordance with the mission and priorities of the Library and the University. To facilitate this objective, the review is a collegial process concerned with identifying strengths and/or areas for development or improvement of the Academic Professional’s performance. The review shall focus on: the Statement of Expectations, Peer Evaluations, and Primary Evaluations. The annual review and evaluation shall be based on the criteria and standards set forth below.

C.2. CRITERIA FOR CONTINUING STATUS ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS

Continuing Status Academic Professionals are reviewed using the same criteria in section B.2. above.

C.3. PROCEDURE FOR THE REVIEW PROCESS

Academic Professionals with continuing status will be reviewed yearly as outlined in section B. above. In addition, however, a comprehensive performance review will be conducted every three years.

C.3.1 The Comprehensive Performance Review

The comprehensive performance review includes:

- Yearly Performance Reviews for the past three years (including the current year)
- Primary Evaluator Review covering these three years
- A Written Review by COAPS

If appropriate, COAPS will forward recommendations to the Associate University Librarian and/or the Dean and University Librarian.

Disagreements may be resolved as outlined in section B.7. above. All documentation will be retained in the employee’s professional review file in the Library Administration office subject to the restrictions noted in section B.9. above.

C.4. OUTCOMES OF THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW PROCESS

If the review process determines that the performance and professional activities of the continuing status academic professional being evaluated meet reasonable expectations, all documentation will be included in the employee’s professional review file and the performance review is concluded.
If the review process determines that the performance and professional activities of the continuing status academic professional falls below the criteria established by the Council of Academic Professionals for satisfactory performance, the continuing status academic professional will enter into a remediation process. This process will contain the following components:

1. If the continuing status academic professional does not contest the assessment of the primary evaluator, the academic professional shall sign that he/she agrees with the performance review. The academic professional, the primary evaluator, and a member of COAPS will confer to create a **Professional Development Plan** for addressing deficiencies which have been identified and a time frame for implementing the plan. The plan provides a means by which the academic professional can meet expectations in a systematic manner over a period of time. Each plan must include: a) identification of deficiencies, b) objectives to address the deficiencies, c) specific activities to implement the plan, d) time lines for meeting expectations, and e) a process for annual progress review. The final plan shall be in writing and signed by the academic professional, the primary evaluator, and the COAPS member.

2. If the academic professional does not agree with the assessment of the primary evaluator, he/she will submit in writing a statement to that effect, and the case will be forwarded to the Associate University Librarian (or Dean and University Librarian) for attempted resolution. If the Associate University Librarian (or Dean and University Librarian) determines that the academic professional is meeting performance and professional expectations, she/he shall so state in writing, and the review process is concluded. If the Associate University Librarian (or Dean and University Librarian) agrees with the primary evaluator that performance and professional expectations are not being met, she/he shall so state in writing. These procedures for disagreement are outlined in Section B.7. above.

If after a significant period of review as defined by the Council of Academic Professionals, the continuing status academic professional does not show adequate improvement in performance of professional activities as stated in the development plan and evidenced by written reviews of the primary evaluator, COAPS member, and Associate University Librarian (or Dean and University Librarian), then dismissal procedures will be initiated. Dismissal policies and procedures are outlined in the **Conditions of Professional Service**, Section I, which states in part:

“Professional employees holding continuing appointments shall not be dismissed except for just cause. Just cause shall include, but not be limited to, any of the following:

1. Demonstrated incompetence or dishonesty in professional activities related to the fulfillment of assigned duties and assigned responsibilities associated with the position;

2. Substantial neglect of properly assigned duties;

3. Personal conduct that substantially impairs the individual’s fulfillment of properly assigned duties and responsibilities;

4. Substantial incapacity (physical or mental) to perform properly assigned duties, but due consideration shall be given to the nature and duration of the incapacity;
5. Violation of the Code of Conduct of a serious nature.”

The academic professional shall be given the opportunity for a hearing for just cause as outlined under Section K of the Conditions of Professional Service.
D. PROMOTION IN RANK

D.1. GENERAL QUALIFICATIONS OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS

The Academic Professional’s academic preparation for an appointment is established on the basis of the graduate professional degree or special certification. The basic quality which must be evident for promotion in rank is the ability to perform at a high professional level in areas determined by the candidate's statement of expectations and assignments and which contribute to the educational and research mission of the institution. These include, but are not limited to reference service, collection management, community outreach, bibliographic organization and control, and application of information technology.

Evidence of this level of performance will be judged by COAPS, with advice from academic professional colleagues, members of the academic community outside the library, and/or from professional colleagues outside the academic institution.

Additional evidence for promotion in rank may include:

1. Contributions to the educational function of the university. For example, teaching, not necessarily in a classroom situation; organization of workshops, institutes, or similar meetings; public appearances in the interest of librarianship or information transfer; participation on library and university-wide committees. Evaluation of such activities may be on the basis of the judgment of those who are instructed and by the considered opinion of colleagues.

2. Contributions to the advancement of the profession. For example, active participation in professional and learned societies as a member, an officer, a committee member, or a committee chairperson.

3. Activities related to inquiry and research. For example, publications, such as in professional and scholarly journals; presentation of papers; reviews of books and other literature; grants; consulting; service as a member of a team of experts task force, review committee or similar body. Innovative developments and approaches to information technology. Such activities shall be judged by colleagues on and/or off the campus on the basis of their contribution to scholarship, the profession of librarianship, and library service.

D.2. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO SPECIFIC RANKS

D.2.1. Assistant Librarian

The rank of Assistant Librarian is a continuing status eligible position. Generally an Academic Professional can not be granted Continuing Status at this rank. Academic Professionals at the rank of Assistant Librarian who believe they have met the criteria for promotion to the rank of Associate Librarian may apply for promotion.

To be eligible for the rank of Assistant Librarian, the academic professional must comply with at least the following:
a. Demonstrate effectiveness in librarianship; or, in the case of a new appointment, promise of effectiveness if the candidate has no prior library experience;

b. Show promise of scholarly and/or creative activities;

c. Show promise of service to the profession and/or the university community; and

d. Have earned a graduate degree in the discipline of the academic professional or another combination of graduate education and appropriate experience.

D.2.2. Associate Librarian.

The rank of Associate Librarian is a continuing status eligible or continuing status position. Normally, an academic professional becomes eligible to apply for the rank of Associate Librarian in the sixth year of full time service at the rank of Assistant Librarian at NAU. Usually, an academic professional will be promoted to the rank of Associate Librarian at the time continuing status is achieved. Any prior service credit to be counted must be agreed to in writing at the time of hire.

To be eligible for the rank of Associate Librarian, the academic professional must accomplish at least the following:

a. A record of librarianship that shows substantial evidence of effectiveness in librarianship and other library-related responsibilities;

b. A sustained record of scholarly and/or creative activities;

c. A record of service that shows a pattern of sustained service to the profession and the university community, and the potential to assume a leadership role within the profession as one moves toward the rank of Librarian; and

d. Have earned a graduate degree in the discipline of the academic professional or another combination of graduate education and appropriate experience.

D.2.3. Librarian.

The rank of Librarian is a continuing status position, unless at the time of initial appointment the Notice of Appointment indicates it is at the rank of Librarian without continuing status. Librarians are academic professionals who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of librarianship, service and/or research. Normally, an academic professional becomes eligible to apply for the rank of Librarian in the sixth year of full time service at the rank of Associate Librarian at NAU (including prior service credit). Academic professionals at the rank of Associate Librarian who believe they have met the criteria for promotion to the rank of Librarian may apply for promotion. Academic professionals who apply must demonstrate outstanding accomplishment in at least (a) or (b) below.

To be eligible for the rank of Librarian, the academic professional must provide the following:
a. A record of an emphasis on librarianship that shows substantial evidence of effective librarianship and other library-related activities;

b. A record of national or international recognition in his/her field and a demonstrated, sustained pattern of high quality scholarly activity, and/or creative endeavors related to the academic professional’s discipline, as well as evidence of leadership.

c. A record that shows a mix of service to the profession and the university community and evidence of leadership within the academic professionals department (e.g., demonstrated ability to assume leadership roles within the department and the university at large, and to mentor junior academic professionals);

d. Have earned a graduate degree in the discipline of the academic professional or another combination of graduate education and appropriate experience.

D.2.4. Affiliate Librarian.

Affiliate Librarians are appointed to one of the academic ranks provided for in this section. The ranks of affiliate librarians shall not be continuing status eligible positions.

To be eligible for one of the ranks of Affiliate Librarian, the academic professional must at least hold a graduate degree in the discipline of the academic professional and certification and/or licensing (where appropriate). Persons considered for affiliate ranks shall hold the qualifications for those ranks as specified by the library.

Any exception to these criteria must be approved by the Provost in consultation with the Dean and University Librarian and COAPS.

An affiliate librarian shall have no expectation of continued employment beyond the end of the current appointment period.
E. SABBATICAL LEAVE FOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS

E.1 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

E.1.1. Eligibility and Purpose

Academic Professionals who have completed six years of regular full-time service may be eligible for sabbatical leave. Exceptions may be made under special circumstances.

It is understood that the sabbatical leave is an administrative action which should be employed in those instances where it is deemed necessary for a member of the Academic Professionals to keep abreast of his/her field, remain effective in his/her present position, or render the greatest possible service to the university.

Normally, sabbatical leave will be for research and other creative endeavors, Academic Professional renewal and/or retraining, and is not to be used for employment at other institutions. Ordinarily, a sabbatical leave will not be granted for publication efforts that are primarily commercial. Sabbatical leave may be granted for completion of an additional degree if the evaluation (as outlined in section E.1.2 below) is such that the applicant and the Library will sufficiently benefit. The sabbatical leave shall be for six or twelve months for an Academic Professional on a fiscal year contract basis. An Academic Professional will be remunerated at full pay for a six-month sabbatical and at three-fifths of the recipient’s salary for a 12-month sabbatical.

E.1.2. Application and Review Process

The review and evaluation process will follow the procedures set forth as follows:

1. By March 1 in the spring semester preceding the application, a notice of intention to apply for sabbatical leave for the following fall, spring, or summer of the next academic year must be provided to the head of the department. Exceptions may be made under special circumstances.

2. Applications for sabbatical must be submitted by the Academic Professional to his/her department head or primary evaluator and must include a sabbatical proposal, current vita, and supporting documentation as required.

3. The department head or primary evaluator will then make a recommendation in writing. This recommendation, sabbatical proposal, current vita, and supporting documentation will be submitted to the Associate University Librarians for review.

4. The Associate University Librarians will make a written recommendation. This and any other recommendations, sabbatical proposal, current vita, and supporting documentation will be submitted to the Dean and University Librarian for review.
5. The Dean and University Librarian may obtain letters of reference evaluating the worth of the proposal from appropriate persons, inside or outside of the Library, competent to judge the proposal. These letters shall be placed in the academic professional’s personnel file where they may be reviewed. The names of the references and other identifiers will be removed from the letters.

6. The Dean and University Librarian shall submit with each approved application for sabbatical leave a letter indicating how the operations and services in the library will be maintained during the absence of the academic professional. All applications evaluated and approved according to the above will be forwarded in writing to the Office of the Provost for his/her recommendation and then submitted to the President for his/her final approval. Recommendations shall be priority ranked by the Dean and University Librarian.

7. If an Academic Professional chooses to revise the time frame of the original sabbatical, this revision must be submitted to the department head or primary evaluator and the Dean and University Librarian six months prior to the requested leave. Such revisions are not automatically granted but are considered in light of staffing needs.

E.1.3. **Criteria for Approval of Sabbatical**

1. At each level of review, the applicant’s proposal must be evaluated as having merit according to one or more of the following criteria:

   a. Value to the mission of Cline Library;
   b. Enhancing the applicant’s effectiveness as an Academic Professional;
   c. Adding to the reputation of the institution;
   d. Contributing to knowledge in the subject field;
   e. Providing outstanding public or professional service at a local or national level.
   f. Availability of resources to replace (as needed) the efforts of the individual on sabbatical.

2. At each level of review, the application and supportive materials will be reviewed and a positive recommendation that the sabbatical leave be granted may be forwarded if the following conditions are met:

   a. The proposal is judged worthwhile;
   b. There is a high probability that the Academic Professional will carry out the proposal; and
   c. The library department’s level of service or operation will not be adversely affected during the Academic Professional’s absence.

E.1.4. **Conditions Affecting Implementation of Sabbatical**

1. The total number of requests submitted during the current year will be taken into consideration before granting sabbatical leave.

2. Eligibility for sabbatical leave time may be affected by a previous unpaid leave of
absence. The Academic Professional and Northern Arizona University must reach agreement prior to an unpaid leave of absence as to the effect of such leave on time toward sabbatical eligibility.

3. An Academic Professional granted a sabbatical leave is required to return to NAU as an Academic Professional for a period of time equal to the sabbatical following the leave. Failure to return may result in a requirement that the academic professional refund to NAU the amount of pay received during the sabbatical leave.

4. During the semester following completion of the sabbatical leave, the Academic Professional must do the following:
   a. file a written report (illustrating that the purposes of the sabbatical leave were met) with the department head or primary evaluator, providing copies to the Dean and University Librarian, University President and the Provost; and
   b. present a public seminar or lecture on the results of the leave.

5. An Academic Professional shall not be eligible for another sabbatical leave until the Academic Professional has served an additional six years of continuous full-time service as an Academic Professional after the year in which the sabbatical leave was taken.

6. Consideration of any sabbatical leave after the first or any subsequent leaves shall take into account whether expectations were met and whether provisions 4.a. or 4.b. (above) were fulfilled.

E.2. PROFESSIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

E.2.1. Policy and Principles

1. Cline Library encourages and supports the concept of a program of Academic Professional exchange between NAU and other institutions within the United States and abroad, so long as the exchange results in identifiable benefits to Cline Library and the individual concerned. The benefit to Cline Library as a whole shall be the primary criterion for evaluating program proposals.

2. The proposals of Academic Professionals for participation in exchange programs between institutions must comply with the university=s policies and procedures. Academic Professional exchange programs must be approved by the appropriate department head, Associate University Librarians, Dean and University Librarian and the Provost. Proposals will be considered for either unilateral or reciprocal exchanges.

E.2.2. Application and Review of Proposals

1. The review and evaluation process will follow the same procedures as set forth in the above sections regarding sabbatical leave.
2. Basic approval of the proposal is contingent upon satisfactory arrangements made to cover the professional responsibilities of the Academic Professional going on sabbatical leave. In order to accomplish this as well as the arrangements for the exchange itself, a significant amount of advanced planning time is required.

E.2.3. Implementation of Exchanges

1. NAU Academic Professionals whose proposals for exchange programs are approved shall, in the majority of cases, remain on the NAU payroll, in the interest of maintaining the integrity of their retirement, health insurance, and other university benefits. In those cases where they would otherwise be paid by the exchange institution, NAU will request that funds equivalent to the base salary be transferred to NAU.

Academic Professionals who serve in another public agency during an exchange are deemed to be employees of both NAU and the other public agency for workers’ compensation purposes.

If university employees are injured on the job, regardless of who is at fault, workers’ compensation coverage is provided through the State Risk Management Section. Employees engaged in university activities in foreign countries are covered by special programs and policies provided by the State Risk Management Section.

2. Exchange librarians coming to NAU from other institutions shall, in the majority of cases, continue to have their salaries and benefits paid by the home institution. In the case of demonstrated need for benefits which may be made available only by NAU, efforts shall be made to place the individual on the equivalent to the base salary of the individual concerned.

3. Academic Professionals proposing/engaged in an exchange program of any kind shall be responsible for assuming all costs exclusive of salary which are associated with the program (e.g., travel, housing, per diem, incidental expenses.)

E.3. EXTENDED LEAVE OF ABSENCE (WITHOUT PAY)

E.3.1. Policy and Principles

1. Extended leave of absence without pay may be granted by the President of Northern Arizona University to members of the Council of Academic Professionals upon written recommendation from the department head, Associate University Librarians, and the Dean and University Librarian. Requests for extended leaves of absence without pay, other than those of an emergency nature, shall follow the same procedures and time lines as requests for sabbatical leaves and shall conform with NAU Personnel Policy 4.04 requirements.

2. An extended leave of absence without pay assures the Academic Professional that following termination of the leave period, the Academic Professional may return to NAU
in the previous position or to another appropriate position as determined by the President in consultation with the Dean and University Librarian. Additionally, the Academic Professional is assured that the rate of pay upon return will not be less than the salary immediately prior to the leave of absence.

E.3.2. Application and Review of Proposals

1. Requests for extended leaves of absence without pay, other than those of an emergency nature, shall follow the same procedures and time lines as requests for sabbatical leaves.

2. To permit academic planning the following year, an Academic Professional on academic or fiscal year extended leave of absence without pay shall notify, in writing, the department head, Associate University Librarian, and Dean and University Librarian, by March 1, if the academic professional plans (or does not plan) to return. Failure to notify the department head and dean by March 1 shall be deemed a resignation and forfeiture of any right to appointment or renewal and result in forfeiture. The leave of absence may be extended for an additional period with approval of the president of the university if it has no adverse effects upon academic planning.

E.3.3 Implementation of Extended Leave of Absence (Without Pay)

1. Normally, periods of leave will be for a semester or academic year for Academic Professionals employed on a fiscal year basis (July 1-June 30). Fiscal year employees (i.e. employed for 12 months) do not accrue vacation time while on leaves of absence.

2. The period of one year or less granted as an extended leave of absence without pay may be counted towards years of service for promotion, continuing appointment, salary adjustments, and sabbatical leave when the leave is in the best interest of the Academic Professional and university as determined by the Provost. Whether the period of leave is or is not to be credited as years of service for promotion, continuing appointment, and sabbatical eligibility, such a decision will be so stated in the authorization which grants the leave.

3. Further information on specific types of leaves without pay are available in the Northern Arizona University Personnel Policy Manual. The leaves outlined in the manual’s section are federal and state mandates.

4. It is advisable for Academic Professionals going on a leave of absence without pay to anticipate some of the problems regarding group insurance and other benefits from normal employment at the university which may be affected while the Academic Professional is not on the payroll. Academic Professionals are advised to contact the Human Resources Office for details.
F. PERSONNEL PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL RETIREMENT, RESIGNATION, AND EMERITUS STATUS

F.1. RETIREMENT

All librarians anticipating retirement from the Cline Library should contact Library Administration and Human Resources (HR) Office at least six months prior to their retirement date if not earlier in order to arrange for the payment of final benefits, including retirement pay.

When notification has been received, the Library Office will:

1. Prepare the necessary paperwork; and

2. Schedule an exit interview with the Dean and University Librarian.

The department from which the librarian is retiring or the primary evaluator of the retiree shall prepare an announcement of the retirement to appear in the NAU faculty/staff newsletter.

F.2. RESIGNATIONS

All librarians who elect to resign from the Cline Library should notify their department head or primary evaluator and the Dean and University Librarian in writing as soon as the decision has been made. Normally, a thirty-day advance notice is the minimum expected of Academic Professionals.

Once notification has been received and the Human Resources Office notified, the Library Administration and HR will:

1. Prepare the necessary paperwork;

2. Schedule the exit interview; and

3. Place the appropriate notice in the NAU faculty/staff newsletter.

F.3. EMERITUS STATUS

Upon retirement an Academic Professional with continuing status is eligible for an emeritus or emerita title. Recommendations for awarding emeritus status can be initiated in writing by the department head, Associate University Librarian, or Dean and University Librarian. Such recommendations shall be forwarded through the appropriate administrative channels. The library may also request that the title be bestowed on an Academic Professional without continuing status at retirement. The President confers Emeritus status upon retired Academic Professionals who have ten years of service to the institution. The appointment of Emeritus status includes the following privileges:

1. A permanent ID card indicating status as an Emeritus member of the Academic Professionals;
2. Listing of name with the Academic Professionals in all University catalogues;

3. A certificate of Emeritus Status at the time of retirement;

4. Authorization to purchase a staff/faculty campus parking permit;

5. Library borrowing privileges (emeritus librarians are in the faculty borrower category);

6. Bookstore privileges accorded to Academic Professionals at NAU;

7. Invitation to take part in ceremonies and academic processions; and

8. Basic e-mail, Internet, and computer access.
G. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL STATUS

Initial appointment as an Academic Professional at Northern Arizona University usually carries the status of *continuing status eligible*. Academic Professionals with continuing-eligible appointments are considered "probationary" for a period of 6 years. Re-appointment during this period is based on annual performance reviews and recommendations from COAPS and the Dean and University Librarian.

G.1. CREDIT FOR YEARS OF PRIOR SERVICE

In the case of a *continuing status eligible* Academic Professional (AP) appointment, at the time of initial hiring, the Notice of Appointment will note any years of credit for prior professional activity toward *continuing status*. This credit will be negotiated at the time of hiring by the AP with the Dean and University Librarian (in consultation with the Provost), upon the recommendation of the candidate’s Department Head, the search committee and the Associate University Librarian (when appropriate) and shall be specified in writing. One to three years of credit may be applied to the candidate’s *pre-continuing status* probationary period. Normally, however, the probationary period will be six years (exceptions noted below). If prior credit is awarded at the time of appointment, the AP cannot subsequently expect to be granted an extension of the period of review for the granting of continuing status, unless extended pursuant to section G.3 below.

G.2. AWARD OF CONTINUING STATUS IN LIEU OF PROBATIONARY PERIOD

When substantial justification is provided by an AP candidate at the time of hiring and by an AP’s Department Head, Associate University Librarian, Dean and University Librarian, and the Provost, the President may grant *continuing status* at the time of appointment.

G.3. EXTENSION OF PROBATIONARY PERIOD.

The probationary period can be extended by the President upon request by the Dean and University Librarian on behalf of the AP for good cause. Good cause might include serious illness, disability, exceptional family care responsibilities such as pregnancy, childbirth, adoption, less than full-time service and any other good cause that is shown to interfere with an AP’s efforts to perform duties necessary to meet the criteria for continuing appointment.

Any extension of the probationary period will be confirmed in writing and placed in the review file of the AP and will be agreed to by the signing parties to that document.
H. ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL PROBLEM RESOLUTION: POLICY AND PROCEDURES

H.1. INTRODUCTION TO RESOLUTION PROCEDURES

The recommended starting point for resolving problems is at the primary evaluator or dean level through the informal resolution and/or mediation processes. If, however, the academic professional does not wish to follow this route, or this route has not provided acceptable resolution, she/he may use the grievance process. Definitions for information resolution, mediation and grievance are described in more detail below (see Definitions).

H.2. DEFINITIONS

Academic Freedom finds its origins at least in part in the United States Constitution. As such, its role as a right held by academic professionals has developed through decisions of our court systems. It is a right held not only by academic professionals and faculty, but in a somewhat different fashion, by students and by the University itself. The Arizona Board of Regents in its Conditions of Professional Service recognizes the importance of academic freedom and defines academic professionals as "non-classified employees involved with research or teaching programs who require professional and intellectual freedom and who report to a person below the level of vice president, including librarians, cooperative extensionists [sic] and researchers." [ABOR 6-301 B.5.a.]

Academic freedom thrives on the independent and uninhibited exchange of ideas among faculty, academic professionals, and students, and on autonomous decision making by the University itself. For example, discretion to determine, on academic grounds, who may teach and otherwise serve students' academic needs, is one of the essential freedoms of a university. Academic freedom is not a doctrine to insulate an academic professional from evaluation by the institution that employs that person. It is rather a right that enables the academic professional to engage in the pursuit of truth and knowledge through study and research, and to freely express that truth and knowledge.

In the United States, it is understood that academic freedom is more than a right, in that it also establishes a corresponding responsibility on the part of the Academic Professional. Academic freedom is understood at Northern Arizona University to be subject at all times to the Academic Professional's duty to fulfill all assigned responsibilities as described in the Academic Professional's annual Statement of Expectations, and in the policies set forth by the Arizona Board of Regents, and the University. Although the University has not adopted the definition of academic freedom issued by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in 1940, portions of that statement are relevant to the role of the academic professional as defined by the Arizona Board of Regents as follows:

Academic professionals are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties, but research for pecuniary return at Northern Arizona University shall be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
Academic professionals are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject but at Northern Arizona University, they shall be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial and other matter which has no relation to their subject area(s).

Academic professionals are citizens, members of a learned profession, and representatives of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational representatives, they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate they are not speaking for the institution.

Allegation is a (usually verbal) statement of a grievable issue presented to a respondent. It is based on the same standards as a grievance problem, but seeks remedy through the process of negotiation or mediation rather than through a grievance procedure.

Calendar day is a day of the week, including Saturday, Sunday, and holidays.

Discriminatory shall mean disparate treatment on the basis of sex; race; color; religion; national origin; age; disability; sexual orientation; veteran status; and/or any other discrimination prohibited by state or federal law. All cases involving discrimination must be reported to the Office of Affirmative Action.

AP Grievance Committee - a committee comprised of one administrator and two Academic Professionals. The chair of the Council of Academic Professionals will designate an administrator (Associate University Librarian, Dean and University Librarian, or Provost) as chair of the AP grievance committee. This administrator will be one who is not a party to the complaint and has a position in the administrative hierarchy at the next highest level in relation to the grievant and the respondent. The administrator will propose two peers to serve on the AP grievance committee. All Academic Professionals are eligible to participate on a committee.

Grievance is a written statement of a grievable issue that is filed by an individual with the Chair of CAP. A grievance is a signed, written statement alleging one or more of the following and specifying requested relief:

I. incorrect interpretation, application or violation of an Academic Professional’s terms and conditions of employment
II. discrimination (see definition above)
III. failure to follow established procedures.

Excluded from grievance are items that in general deal with employment status; position classification; salaries and benefits; employee performance ratings; and merit pay decisions.

However, a grievance may be filed if there is clear and documented reason to believe that:

1. There has been incorrect interpretation, application or an arbitrary and/or discriminatory application of university policy, regulation, or procedure which as applied to an Academic Professional violates his/her terms and conditions of employment.

2. S/He has been discriminated against on the basis of sex; race; color; religion; national origin; age; disability; sexual orientation; veteran status; and/or any other discrimination
prohibited by state or federal law. All cases involving discrimination must be reported to the Office of Affirmative Action.

A Group grievance will not be considered.

**Grievant** is the Academic Professional initiating a formal grievance. All APs as defined in the Conditions of Professional service may file a grievance.

**Improperly reached** means a decision was reached without the consultations required by ABOR, university, or departmental policies to arrive at such a decision.

**Informal Resolution** is a process of communication between and among all the affected parties to a dispute in an effort to seek mutual agreement outside formal grievance processes. The informal resolution process is often the most efficient method of resolving problems. An ombudsperson from the NAU Ombuds Office may be requested to facilitate, conciliate, and coordinate communication among the grievant, respondent, and those related to a problem. The purpose of this process is to discuss differences between the parties and to resolve the problem to the satisfaction of all parties without resorting to lengthy formal hearings. Seeking informal resolution is strongly recommended.

**Mediation** is a process in which parties work together with a neutral facilitator who assists them in finding a mutually acceptable resolution to a conflict.

**Mediation agreement** is an understanding or accord reached at the conclusion of a formal mediation process.

**Negotiation** is a process of communication through personal conference, discussion, and compromise aimed at resolving a conflict informally.

**Respondent(s)** is the person or persons responsible for allegedly taking the action that brought about the grievance.

**Unfair** shall mean arbitrary, vindictive, lacking justifiable cause or a basis in official policy, discriminatory with respect to treatment accorded to comparable individuals and without justifiable cause or a basis in official policy, or excessive in relation to what would be reasonable and available course of action.

**Working Day** shall mean calendar days excluding Saturday, Sunday, and days on which the University is officially closed.

### H.3. INFORMAL RESOLUTION

Before filing a formal grievance, individuals are free to obtain services to informally resolve a problem or conflict. To assist individuals with the informal process the university provides the services of the University Ombuds Office to assist students, faculty and staff who seek a speedy resolution to problems. Northern Arizona University supports the neutral, impartial, and independent position of the University Ombuds Office in support of informal assistance in a confidential setting for employees and students who want to resolve work-related concerns.
Operating outside of and independent of ordinary University administrative structures, the ombudsperson shall serve as a counselor, mediator, and negotiator, but not as an advocate for any party to a dispute. An individual may choose to discuss an issue with the Ombuds Office.

The ombudsperson shall attempt to resolve disputes informally before they enter grievance channels. Once matters have proceeded to grievance channels, the informal resolution and/or mediation process may continue in order to reach resolution without a grievance.

As a first step in seeking resolution and before mediation, the grievant has the option of requesting the Ombuds Office to assist in resolving the dispute through informal negotiation, privately entered into with the respondent whose action or inaction gives rise to the allegation, provided the respondent is also agreeable to such negotiation. The Ombudsperson, or designee, may meet with the involved parties either separately or together.

Utilization of informal negotiation shall not preclude the opportunity for an individual to pursue a grievance through formal channels provided the option to file a grievance is exercised within 30 days of the occurrence of the event. An individual is not required to utilize informal channels before he or she may exercise his or her right to file a grievance.

Submission of any matter to the University Ombuds Office for mediation or other assistance does not relieve an Academic Professional of the requirement to meet applicable deadlines for filing or processing a grievance under these procedures or other policies of the University or the Arizona Board of Regents.

H.4. NEGOTIATION/MEDIATION

Mediation is a process in which the parties involved in a conflict work with a neutral trained facilitator who assists them in finding a mutually acceptable resolution to a problem. This process may begin on an internal level with the parties involved mutually requesting the intervention of another Academic Professional, colleague, department head, or administrator. Involved parties may also request the assistance of a mediator/neural party from outside of the particular university unit. Mediators-neutral parties may be selected with the assistance of the Affirmative Action Office, Human Resources, Employee Assistance and Wellness Center, or the University Ombuds Office. Mediation procedures followed shall be those established by the Ombuds Office University Mediation Program and agreed to by all parties.

Mediation is a voluntary, confidential process in which all parties agree to participate in good faith. The same confidentiality accorded to peer review processes shall be observed in the grievance procedure. A “need to know” standard shall apply to the confidentiality accorded to the grievance procedures and those involved who have a legitimate interest in resolving the grievance. If through negotiation the grievance is settled to the satisfaction of all parties, no formal record need be filed with the Ombudsperson, but a written record of such agreement may be so filed at the request of the grievant. If no agreement is reached through mediation/negotiation, parties have not waived their rights to other methods of resolution, including formal grievance procedures. However, a grievance still must be filed within 30 days of the original occurrence in order to proceed toward grievance.

Any interested party may contact the Ombuds Office for further information and explanation of mediation procedures.
H.5. GRIEVANCE POLICY AND PROCESS

All individuals with Academic Professional status, irrespective of their administrative duties or assignments at the time of the action or inaction prompting the grievance, may file a grievance. Academic Professionals alleging sexual or other prohibited harassment may file a grievance with the Office of Affirmative Action by following procedures developed by that office, or may pursue a grievance under this procedure, but not both.

- An Academic Professional Grievance Committee will hear a grievance which concerns procedures by which a decision is made regarding non-renewal of contract, promotion, and/or sabbatical leave.

- The committee will not hear grievances related to promotion and continuing status based on substantive issues but shall hear cases based on violations of prescribed university, college/school, and/or departmental/unit policies or procedures.

- When dismissal of an Academic Professional who has satisfactorily completed a continuing status eligible review period is recommended, the committee will, at the request of the either the grievant or the President, hear the case. For additional information, see the section entitled, Grievances Regarding Denial of Continuing Status and/or Dismissal.

- Issues related to workload assignments will be dealt with by the Committee on Academic Professional Status (COAPS). The library will establish procedures to deal with Academic Professional concerns over workload assignments. Issues related to annual performance evaluations and merit pay recommendations are also to be dealt with within the unit by procedures established therein. If an Academic Professional is not satisfied with the results of these reviews within the library and has taken the appeal to the Dean and University Librarian and remains unsatisfied with the outcome, the Academic Professional may appeal to the Office of the Provost. However, all internal unit appeal processes must be utilized before any appeal is directed to the Office of the Provost. Merit pay decisions are final within the college level with the ultimate decision coming from the Dean and University Librarian.

H.5.1. Grievance Policy

- The Arizona Board of Regents, the University President, faculty, staff, and administrators of NAU recognize the importance of providing a system of grievance.

- Grievance procedures for individuals with Academic Professional status shall be separate from the grievance procedures for students and for other categories of university employees.

- The informal resolution and/or mediation process of the Ombuds Office is separate from the grievance process. Academic Professionals may use the informal resolution and or/mediation process first, or not at all, before filing a grievance. By using the informal
process first, an Academic Professional may be able to obtain acceptable results without escalation to a grievance.

- The resolution procedure should be implemented at the internal level whenever possible. Internal shall be defined as the departmental level, or for non-departmentalized academic units, at the level of the school/college.

- The integrity of the grievance process is dependent on a swift resolution of all grievances. Grievances normally should be resolved within three months of their initial filing. Requests for deviation from this timetable must be made to the chair of the Council of Academic Professionals and the office of the President simultaneously.

- All parties involved in a grievance procedure have the right to expect fair and equitable treatment. Fairness to the grievant is the right to have the grievance heard by an impartial Academic Professional panel. Fairness to the respondents includes the right to demand that evidence be provided to support the charges, and the right to provide a rebuttal to the charges.

- Any respondent who has been falsely accused of an action during the grievance procedure shall have the right to remove the allegation from all official university files.

- At each level of the grievance process, the grievant shall be informed of the options available for redress and appeal if the grievance remains unresolved. All parties to a grievance are entitled to timely notification of the case.

- An annual report for all grievances shall be provided to the President by each office, board, or committee directly involved in the grievance process. The report should include the number of cases handled, number of cases resolved, number of cases pending, and number of cases referred to an outside agency.

- Grievances involving Academic Professionals who work off the main NAU campus shall be handled by the same grievance procedures described herein.

- Persons who change from Academic Professional status to another employment category at NAU are entitled to file a grievance as an Academic Professional if the incident causing the grievance occurred while in Academic Professional status.

- Retaliation against the grievant, witnesses, or other parties to the grievance procedure is not allowed and may result in disciplinary action being initiated against those who retaliate.

- The grievance process is intended to be a simple and uncomplicated process working toward appropriate outcomes. Should the grievant choose to use an attorney during a hearing, respondents will have use of the university attorney.

- If the University Attorney represents the respondent, the University Attorney will not provide advice to the Academic Professional Grievance Committee. In this case the grievance committee in need of legal advice may request independent counsel through the Office of the President.
These grievance policies and procedures, as well as any changes or amendments shall be approved by the Council of Academic Professionals, Provost, and the President.

**H.5.2. Grievance Process**

Filing a grievance:

Within 30 days of the occurrence of an action which formed the basis for a grievance, the grievant must file a written request for a formal hearing with the chair of the Council of Academic Professionals. A committee to review and determine if the complaint is grievable will be appointed by the Dean and University Librarian. At the same time, a copy of the request for a hearing and documentation of the alleged grievance must be provided by the grievant to each respondent. The request must include a statement of the basis for the grievance and the relief requested.

Elements to be filed as basis of the alleged grievance:

1. Grievant’s name, address, phone number and the date on which action is filed
2. Date of action which formed basis for grievance
3. Department, college, or unit involved
4. Names, addresses and phone numbers of parties involved who may be respondents
5. Statement and documentation of individual’s grievance and position taken on the issues
6. Names of witnesses who may be called to testify on behalf of the grievant and a brief summary of their anticipated testimony
7. Identification of exhibits intended to be offered as evidence
8. Remedies sought
9. Statement of intention regarding use of legal counsel; and, if an attorney will be used, the name of that counsel

No complaint will be reviewed under these procedures if:

- The complaint pertains to a subject that falls under the review of, or is specifically excluded from review by, any other Arizona Board of Regents or institutional policy (e.g., the NAU Safe Working and Learning Environment Policy);

- The complaint pertains to an official policy, regulation, or procedures of the Arizona Board of Regents or the institution; a decision or action by the Board of Regents or the President; or any matter the remedy for which would contravene or interfere with any such official policy, regulation, procedure, decision, or action;

- The complaint pertains to broad areas of fiscal management, staffing or structure of Northern Arizona University; or

- The resolution of the complaint is not under the control of the institution.
Academic Professional Grievance Committee:

Within three calendar days after receipt of a formal complaint, the chair of the Council of Academic Professionals will designate an administrator (Associate University Librarian, Dean and University Librarian, or Provost) to chair the AP grievance committee. This administrator will be one who is not a party to the complaint and has a position in the administrative hierarchy at the next highest level in relation to the grievant and the respondent. The administrator will propose two Academic Professionals with continuing status and a member of the faculty grievance committee to serve on the AP grievance committee. The two Academic Professionals will serve upon mutual consent from grievant and the person with whom the disagreement has occurred (respondent). In the event that mutual consent cannot be achieved, the administrator will appoint the Academic Professionals. The administrator will convene a grievance committee within ten calendar days after receipt of the written complaint.

H.5.3. Grievance Hearing Process

- Within seven working days after receipt of a formal complaint, the Chair of the Council of Academic Professionals will forward the request for a hearing to the respondent with instructions to respond within ten calendar days. The response shall contain the name, address, telephone number of respondent, and a statement of the respondent’s position on the issue. If the grievant uses independent legal counsel, the respondent may be represented by legal counsel.

- The chair of the AP Grievance Committee will set a hearing date in conjunction with all parties involved in the case. The hearing date should occur within thirty days of filing. The chair of the AP grievance committee sends a letter to the grievant and respondents announcing the hearing date at least 15 days prior to the hearing. All witnesses should be notified within at least five days of the hearing date.

- No later than fifteen working days before the hearing date, the grievant and respondent will submit complete written documentation of the complaint and a list of requested witnesses to the chair of the AP grievance committee.

- The chair of the AP Grievance Committee shall send copies of the written documentation and witness lists submitted by the grievant and respondent to the committee members within three working days after receipt. Grievant’s witness list and documentation will be forwarded to the respondent and the respondent’s witness list and documentation will be forwarded to the grievant by the chair within three working days after receipt.

- The hearing shall be closed to the public and shall be initiated no later than 30 calendar days from the date of the filing of the grievance. The hearing may be postponed only for good cause, as determined by the chair of the AP Grievance Committee.

- The hearing shall be recorded by an electronic recording device or by other reliable means which shall be provided by the AP grievance committee. Respondents and grievants may also record the hearing.
Any party may, at its own expense, use a court reporter. The cost of the transcript shall be paid by the party requesting the transcript.

If a specific issue(s) that constitutes the basis for a hearing has not been clearly established before the hearing, the chair of the AP Grievance Committee shall work to establish a clear definition of the issues and seek agreement on these issues by both parties before proceeding to the hearing itself.

Unless overriding reasons are given to the AP Grievance Committee and other appropriate parties, all parties shall have access to all information that is presented to the hearing body at no expense to them.

The grievant and spokesperson for the respondents will have an opportunity to present an opening statement. The opening statement should be brief and explain what the main problem is, what remedy is being sought, and how one intends to prove his/her case through witness testimony and exhibits.

After opening statements are completed, the grievant is allowed to develop his or her case before the AP Grievance Committee. Previously identified witnesses may be called and documents offered as exhibits. Exhibits offered by one party are subject to inspection by the other party. The grievant and respondents may question each other and witnesses during the hearing, and the AP Grievance Committee may question either party at any time. Rulings on the admissibility of testimony and exhibits shall be made by the chair of the AP Grievance Committee. The rules of evidence observed in judicial proceedings shall not apply to these hearings, provided that the chair may exclude privileged, irrelevant, immaterial, unduly repetitious and scandalous evidence.

The chair of the AP grievance committee may call additional witnesses and offer additional exhibits upon request of either party or on the chair’s initiative. The parties to the grievance must be informed of these witnesses and exhibits at least five working days before the hearing. The chair of the AP grievance committee may also require the reproduction of books, records, and other evidence to the extent required by law provided each party is notified of this action within 10 calendar days before the hearing.

At the conclusion of the hearing, each party may present closing statements.

A grievance hearing shall be dismissed if the grievant, after due notice of the hearing, fails to appear for the hearing and has not obtained postponement from the chair. If the respondents, after due notice of the hearing, fail to appear and do not request a postponement from the chair, the hearing may be held with only the grievant and his/her witnesses giving testimony.

The grievant should consult the Safe Working and Learning Environment Policy for a listing of deadlines to file for a hearing outside of the University.

If a grievant commences a grievance with an outside court or agency based on the same ground, the chair of the AP Grievance Committee may stay the internal grievance, after conferring with the University Legal Counsel. Legal Counsel handles complaints filed with outside agencies.
H.5.3.1. Report and Recommendation

At the completion of the hearing and within ten working days thereafter, the chair of the AP Grievance Committee will notify parties of the results and will forward a report with a recommendation to the Provost, with a copy to the Dean and University Librarian.

H5.3.2. Final Decision

As promptly as possible after receipt of the committee hearing report and/or the Provost’s report, the President shall decide the matter and forward a written statement to the grievant, the respondent, and the members of the AP Grievance Committee. If the President cannot issue a decision promptly the President will notify the parties of a delay, reasons for the delay, and the date on which the decision can be expected.

H5.3.3. Request for Review or Rehearing

1. An Academic Professional who is dissatisfied with the decision reached by the President may request a rehearing or review by filing a written request with the President no later than fifteen (15) days following the delivery of the written decision. The request shall be based on one or more of the following grounds:

   a. Irregularities in the proceedings, including but not limited to any abuse of discretion or misconduct by the Grievance Committee, Library Administration, or the Provost, which has deprived the Academic Professional of a fair and impartial grievance process;

   b. Newly discovered material evidence which could not have been presented during the grievance process;

   c. Excessive severity of the discipline applied; or,

   d. The decision is not justified by the evidence or is contrary to the law.

2. Following receipt of the Academic Professional’s request for a review, the President will make whatever review is deemed necessary to resolve the issues that have been raised.

   The President will respond in writing to the Academic Professional’s request for a review or rehearing within ten (10) days of receipt of the request. The President may uphold or modify the previous decision, or grant a rehearing on the issues raised by the request. The decision of the President is final.

H.6. GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

As required by the Conditions of Professional Service “Each University shall establish a procedure by which a professional who disagrees with the evaluation may request that his or
her performance evaluation be reviewed at the next administrative level."

In the event that an Academic Professional disagrees with the Primary Evaluator’s performance review, proposed modifications to the Statement of Expectations, the COAPS summary, the Associate University Librarian’s comments, or the Dean and University Librarian’s comments and such disagreement cannot be resolved bilaterally, the Academic Professional may within five working days after receipt of the relevant document prepare a written disagreement to attach to the evaluation package. The Academic Professional may also request a formal review of the evaluation packet or Statement of Expectations at the next higher administrative level (Department Head, Associate University Librarian, Dean and University Librarian, or Provost). This review will be accomplished in consultation with an ad hoc peer review advisory committee. This committee will be comprised of two peers and the administrator. Within the context of this document, the term "administrator" will mean the person at the “next higher administrative level.” The administrator will convene an ad hoc peer review advisory committee within five working days after receiving the Academic Professional’s Request.

The administrator who chairs the committee will propose two peers to serve on the ad hoc committee. A peer is defined as any Academic Professional. The proposed two peers will serve upon mutual consent from the Academic Professional and the person with whom the disagreement has occurred: i.e. a primary evaluator, COAPS chair, Associate University Librarian, or Dean and University Librarian. In the event that mutual consent cannot be achieved, the administrator will appoint the peers.

Within five working days after convening, the ad hoc Peer Review Advisory Committee will forward the results of the committee’s review to the two parties involved. Upon receipt of the review results, the Academic Professional and the appropriate party will meet again to complete the Annual Review, incorporating the recommendations of the ad hoc committee.

The Academic Professional’s written disagreement and request for review along with the ad hoc committee’s review results and recommendations will be attached to the Annual Review documentation and become part of the official record.

If a resolution is not achieved, the Academic Professional may initiate within five working days an additional review by the Dean and University Librarian or Provost, if the Dean has already been responsible for the evaluation in question. Should the Academic Professional disagree with the decision of the Dean or Provost, he or she may submit in writing within five working days the reason for his or her disagreement to the Provost. The decision of the Provost will be final in all cases.

If an ad hoc review committee determines that there has been a material failure by the academic unit to adhere to procedures governing the continuing status process, it will advise the Provost through its report to the President so that the following steps can be taken.

- The Provost will consult with the Dean and University Librarian to ensure that such a procedural failure does not reoccur. If applicable, the Academic Professional’s application will be returned to the academic unit with instructions to reconsider the application as soon as possible in accordance with the proper procedures.
If the Provost determines that it is not likely that the grievant can receive fair reconsideration from the academic unit, an ad hoc procedure will be devised by the Provost to determine if the Academic Professional has met the standards of the academic unit. Such a procedure might involve submitting the Academic Professional's application to a relevant committee from another university, or a committee composed of members of other academic units from this university or another.

The Provost will render a decision as promptly as possible and report this to the President.

H.7. GRIEVANCES REGARDING DENIAL OF CONTINUING STATUS OR DISMISSAL

In determining whether an Academic Professional may exercise one of the three options below for review of a decision to deny continuing status or dismissal, there must be evidence that there was discrimination or violation of established process in determination of such decisions. Upon receipt of a notice of dismissal, the individual may request a statement of reasons and then decide (within ten days from the original date of notice) whether to exercise one of the three options.

Under dismissal of a continuing status or continuing status-eligible Academic Professional there are three options that must be exercised within ten days of the notice of the intention to dismiss:

I. Informal Conciliation
II. Mediation
III. Formal Hearing

An Academic Professional who is recommended for dismissal or suspension without pay may have an opportunity to challenge the recommendations as described by ABOR. The burden of proving discriminatory action or unconstitutional grounds shall provide for the right of each party to obtain access to all relevant, non-privileged documents relating to the allegations which are subject to the other party’s control and which do not violate the privacy rights of non-parties; all disagreements relating to the disclosure of documents shall be decided by the chair of the AP Grievance Committee.

H.7.1. Procedures for Conciliation/Mediation as a Result of Suspension Without Pay or Dismissal:

Academic Professionals may appeal the recommendation by submitting written notice of appeal to the President no later than ten days following the date on which the recommendation is posted.

The President of the university shall refer such appeal to a Conciliation Committee. This committee shall be a University ad hoc committee consisting of the Ombuds Officer, an Academic Professional with continuing status appointed by the President, and one Academic Professional with continuing status appointed by the Dean and University Librarian. The committee shall meet with the Academic Professional and a
representative of the administration separately or together at the option of the Academic Professional.

- If conciliation fails, or after thirty days following the date on which the appeal was referred, the President shall provide the Academic Professional with a written notice of dismissal or suspension. The President may extend this deadline for up to thirty days if the prospect for successful conciliation is positive.

- As an alternative to meeting with the conciliation committee, an Academic Professional may agree to participate in a mediation process to be established by the University. In the case of mediation, the same deadlines for referral and termination of the procedures shall pertain as in the case of conciliation.

H.7.2. Procedures For Hearings Resulting From An Appeal Of A Notice Of Dismissal Or Suspension Without Pay:

- The Academic Professional may appeal a notice of dismissal or suspension without pay by providing the president and the chair of the AP Grievance Committee (as described in Section H.2. Definitions) with a copy of the notice of dismissal or suspension and a detailed statement of the Academic Professional’s position within ten days after receipt of the notice of dismissal or suspension. Failure to provide the written statement within the ten-day period shall immediately terminate the procedure.

- The chair of the AP Grievance Committee shall set a date and time for the hearing, which hearing shall commence not less than thirty, nor more than forty-five days after receipt by the Chair of COAPS of the notice of dismissal or suspension and the written statement of position from the Academic Professional.

- The chair of the AP grievance committee shall serve upon the parties a written notice of the hearing at least twenty days prior to the hearing. The chair may shorten or extend these time periods for good cause shown or upon the consent of the parties.

For the complete policy related to grievance hearings for Academic Professionals, see ABOR, Conditions of Professional Service (Section 6-301 K4, L).

H.8. GRIEVANCE CONCERNING POST-CONTINUING STATUS REVIEW

In cases that involve the dismissal of a continuing status Academic Professional under the post-continuing status review process described in Section C above, the following principles apply:

1. The appropriate administrators must demonstrate that the procedures and definitions described in the NAU Handbook for Academic Professionals pertaining to evaluation of Academic Professionals and post continuing status review are properly followed.
2. The burden of proof for all unsatisfactory ratings and the appropriateness of subsequent action lies on the primary evaluator, Committee on Academic Professional Status, and the Dean and University Librarian.

3. Dismissal of a continuing status Academic Professional under the post-continuing status review guidelines requires demonstrable proof of each of the following:
   a. that the duties assigned to the Academic Professional in his/her statement of expectations were reasonably and properly assigned.
   b. that the ratings of “unsatisfactory” that form the basis for any disciplinary action are justified.
   c. that the Academic Professional was given adequate resources and opportunity to adjust work assignments in the imposed Academic Professional development and improvement plans and the duties/expectations in these plans were properly assigned.
   d. at the completion of the Academic Professional improvement plan, the Academic Professional continues to be “unsatisfactory.”

APPENDIX

FORMAT FOR STATEMENT OF EXPECTATIONS

Cline Library
Academic Professional Annual Review
Statement of Expectations
Review Period from to

Academic Professional: Position:

Status: Continuing Continuing-Eligible Year-to-Year

This Statement lists the objectives to be achieved in the coming year by the Academic Professional. It is an agreement among the Academic Professional, the Library and the University. For each objective delineated in this statement, the Academic Professional and the Primary Evaluator will indicate the relative priority and the measures of achievement.

Guidelines for Developing Academic Professional Statements of Expectations

Academic Professionals are evaluated and considered for Continuing Status based upon evidence of a balance of contributions in the areas of Position Effectiveness, Professional Development and Contributions, and Service. The following guidelines and criteria are not intended to limit the types of activities that individuals may choose, but simply to assist in writing Statements of Expectations and Evaluations by allowing academic professionals and their supervisors to discuss the allocation of efforts to various responsibilities. The intent is to review and adjust the distribution on an annual basis at the time that the Statement of Expectations document is completed.

Exceptions:
It may be necessary occasionally to choose a distribution that does not fall within the designated ranges. These exceptions should be negotiated between the academic professional and his/her supervisor and approved by the appropriate AUL and the Dean at the time that the Statement of Expectations is signed.
I. **Position Description** [attach copy of current position description]

II. **Annual Objectives**

   A. **Position Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>60% - 80% Allocation</th>
<th>Current year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   1. Objectives specific to the Position Description
   2. Objectives specific to Library Goals and Objectives

Position effectiveness or job performance: Excellence in job performance weighs most heavily in evaluation and in consideration for reappointment and continuing status. Effectiveness implies evidence of innovative activity beyond the minimum required in assigned responsibilities. The professional should demonstrate an understanding of policies, procedures, and goals of the library and university, and demonstrate an ability to coordinate activities within that framework. The individual must show initiative in accepting and fulfilling his/her responsibilities, as well as demonstrate a commitment to the job and be an asset to the library and university.

B. **Professional Development and Contributions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10% - 20% Allocation</th>
<th>Current year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Examples: Professional Memberships and Activities, Teaching, Scholarship, workshops, courses and other position-specific training opportunities

Professional development and contributions include participation and leadership in state or national professional organizations. Other relevant activities include research and publication in areas related to librarianship or subject specialist responsibilities. Completion of objectives specific to performance enhancement, including workshops, courses, and other position specific training opportunities. Development of innovations that improve library service is also considered a contribution.

C. **Service**

Examples: Library and University Committees, Professionally related community service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10% - 20% Allocation</th>
<th>Current year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Effectiveness in the area of service can be demonstrated by participation in library and university committees and task forces. Professionally related community service might include on-campus advisory or consulting activities, on or off campus speaking engagements, and other public service in a professional capacity.

III. **Supplementary Reviewers (List)**

Signatures:

- **Academic Professional**
  
- **Primary Evaluator**
  
- **Associate University Librarian**
FORMAT FOR SELF REVIEW

Cline Library
Academic Professional Annual Review
Self Review

Review Period from ___________ to ________________

Academic Professional ______________________________  Position ______________________________

Based on the objectives established for the past year, use this format to provide a descriptive assessment of accomplishments, and a listing of significant activities, in each category. State each objective for the past year followed by a report on progress. Supporting documentation may be appended when, in the judgement of the Academic Professional, the documents further clarify information provided in the Self Review. Arrange documentation in the order of the categories below.

I. Position Description

Assessment of success in meeting position responsibilities.

II. Annual Objectives

Assessment of success in achieving objectives.

A. Position Effectiveness

1. Objectives specific to the Position Description
2. Objectives specific to Library Goals and Objectives

B. Professional Development and Contributions

Examples: Professional Memberships and Activities, Teaching, Scholarship

C. Service

Examples: Library and University Committees, Professionally related community service

III. Supporting Material (list materials and attach documents)

Signatures:

Academic Professional _______________________________________________ Date__________

Primary Evaluator ___________________________________________________ Date__________
FORMAT FOR SUPPLEMENTARY REVIEWER ASSESSMENT

Academic Professional Annual Review
Supplementary Reviewer

Review Period from ________________ to ________________

Academic Professional ______________________________ Position ______________________________

Supplementary Reviewer ______________________________ Position ______________________________

Based on the objectives established for the past year, use this format to provide a descriptive assessment of the Academic Professional's accomplishments only in those categories within purview.

I. Position Description

Assessment of success in meeting position responsibilities.

II. Annual Objectives

Assessment of success in meeting objectives.

A. Position Effectiveness

1. Objectives specific to the Position Description
2. Objectives specific to Library Goals and Objectives

B. Professional Development and Contributions

Examples: Professional Memberships and Activities, Teaching, Scholarship

C. Service

Examples: Library and University Committees, Professionally related community service

Signatures:

Supplementary Reviewer ____________________________________ Date __________

Primary Evaluator __________________________________________ Date __________

Academic Professional _________________________________________ Date __________
FORMAT FOR PRIMARY EVALUATOR REVIEW

Academic Professional Annual Review
Primary Evaluator

Review Period from _______________________ to _______________________

Academic Professional __________________________________ Position ______________________________
Primary Evaluator __________________________________ Position ______________________________

Based on the objectives established for the past year, use this format to provide a descriptive assessment of the Academic Professional's accomplishments in each category. Comment on the Academic Professional's Self Review and when appropriate, add further comments resulting from the evaluation interview. The Academic Professional has the opportunity to add comments to the Primary Evaluator's assessment.

I. Position Description

Assessment of success in meeting position responsibilities.

II. Annual Objectives

Assessment of success in meeting objectives.

A. Position Effectiveness

1. Objectives specific to the Position Description
2. Objectives specific to Library Goals and Objectives

B. Professional Development and Contributions

Examples: Professional Memberships and Activities, Teaching, Scholarship

C. Service

Examples: Library and University Committees, Professionally related community service

III. Comment on Self Review

IV. Summary Assessment

V. Primary Evaluator's Interview Comments

VI. Academic Professional's Interview Comments
Recommendation for personnel action, if any:

Signatures:

Primary Evaluator ____________________________________________ Date ______

Academic Professional _________________________________________ Date ______