

Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Advancement

Annual Report, 2020-2021

Teri Vogel, Chair

Date: 8/31/2021

Members

Xi Chen (2nd year), Michelle Mascaro (1st year), Michael Smith (1st year), Teri Vogel (2nd year)

Appointment Files

CAPA reviewed one appointment file:

- Assistant Program Director, Academic Engagement & Learning Services

The CAPA Chair, along with members of the LAUC-SD Executive Committee, met with and gave feedback on the candidates for the Associate University Librarian, Learning and User Services position. However, CAPA as a committee did not review any files or submit a report related to this search.

Academic Review (AR) Training

We thank Alanna Aiko Moore, Reid Otsuji, Rachel Almodovar, and Emily Escobar for providing the AR training in October 2020, via Zoom.

Recommendation:

- For the upcoming candidate and program director/review initiator (PD/RI) training, we would like to spend more time addressing issues that have been identified in this report (and in reports from previous CAPA committees) related to best practices for writing the self-review and academic biography. If all of the candidates have been through at least one AR, then maybe we can forego some of the more basic information about the process in the upcoming training.

Academic Review (AR) Files Summary

CAPA followed academic review procedures closely this year and our peer review process was transparent, fair and thorough. Due to COVID-19 and the ongoing “work from home” order that has been in place since March 2020, CAPA met remotely via Zoom for the entire review period.

- CAPA reviewed 23 AR files during the standard review calendar. 24 files were initially expected, but one candidate was granted a one-year deferment on their review.
- Candidate rank at the time of submission: Assistant = 1, Associate = 7, Librarian = 15 (including one Distinguished Librarian).

- Several candidates were Program Directors, so their Review Initiator was either an Associate University Librarian (AUL) or the University Librarian (UL). *For the sake of clarity, we are using PD in the report text rather than Review Initiator (RI) or PD/AUL/UL.*
- Four Ad Hoc committees were appointed for files that included these recommended actions. Career Status = 1, Promotion = 2, Career Status + Promotion = 1.
- Five of the 23 (22%) files included recommendations for additional salary points: three files for one additional point, and two files for two additional points. This is down from last year, when nine of 18 (50%) files included recommendations, plus three additional files where CAPA recommended additional points.
- Four files had “no action” recommendations because those candidates were at the top of the salary scale. Three more files included merit point recommendations (2 or 3 points) that will place those candidates at the top of the salary scale going forward.

Actions

- There was full agreement (23 of 23 files) between the PDs, CAPA, Ad Hoc committees (when applicable), and the UL on the recommended actions for the candidates this year. This is consistent with last year’s review cycle.

Recommended Points Across Reviewing Bodies

- Of the five files with recommendations for additional salary points, CAPA agreed with the PD on four of those files, and on the remaining file disagreed only on the *number* of additional points.
- Five of 23 files (22 %) were awarded additional points, compared with 2 of 18 files (11%) in 2019-2020. Four files were awarded an additional salary point, and one file was awarded two additional points. However, there is some disagreement between the files that were recommended vs files that were awarded additional points.
 - Three files had full agreement between the PD, CAPA and UL regarding the number of additional points.
 - For one file, CAPA and the UL disagreed with the PD regarding the *number* of additional points.
 - For one file, the UL disagreed with the PD and CAPA on awarding additional points.
 - For one file, the UL awarded an extra point that had not been in the PD or CAPA’s recommendation.

Table 1: Files by Rank and PD/RI Recommended Action and Points

Rank at Time of Submission	Program Director Recommendation	# of Files
Assistant Librarian	Career Status + Promotion + 1 Additional Point	1
Associate Librarian	Merit Increase	3
	Merit Increase + Career Status	1

	Merit Increase + 2 Additional Points	1
	Promotion	2
Librarian	No Action	4
	Merit Increase ¹	8
	Merit Increase + 1 Additional Point	2
	Merit Increase + 2 Additional Points	1
Total Files		23

Table 2: Summary of Recommended *Actions and Points* by Reviewing Body:

	Program Director Recommendation	Ad Hoc Recommendation	CAPA Recommendation	UL Decision
No Action + No Salary Points	4		4	4
Career Status + Merit Increase	1	1	1	1
Career Status + Promotion + Merit Increase				1
Career Status + Promotion + 1 additional salary point	1	1	1	
Merit Increase	11		11	10
Merit Increase + 1 additional salary point	2		3	4
Merit Increase + 2 additional salary points	2		1	1
Promotion	2	2	2	2

¹ Includes 1 file with only a 2 point recommendation because the candidate was only 2 salary points from the top of the scale. For the remaining tables, we will consider this as one of the merit increase files, without noting the points difference.

Total Files	23	4	23	23
--------------------	-----------	----------	-----------	-----------

Table 3: Agreement and Disagreement between groups (All disagreements below are based on awarded points, since there was no disagreement on the actions: merit, career status, promotion, no action.)

Action	Ad Hoc Committee	CAPA	UL Decision
Agree with PD Recommendation	4/4	22/23	20/23 ²
Disagree with PD Recommendation	0/4	1/23	3/23
Agree with CAPA Recommendation			21/23 ³
Disagree with CAPA Recommendation			2/23
Agree with Ad Hoc Committee		4/4	3/4 ⁴
Disagree with Ad Hoc Committee		0/4	1/4

Compared with last year, there was more agreement between recommended and awarded additional points. However, we note the following:

- There were also fewer candidates this year with recommendations for additional points, which may be partly due to last year’s review cycle.
- There is still some disconnect on the question of additional points between the UL and PDs (and to a lesser extent CAPA).

Recommendations:

- We strongly encourage the UL to attend this fall’s PD/RI training sessions to share his philosophy on standard merit increases and what he is looking for in a file to determine if a candidate should be awarded additional points. While CAPA can provide guidance on much of the AR process, the UL has the final decision making authority on awarding points, and is best positioned to communicate those expectations to those actually making the point recommendations.

Reference Letters

During this review cycle, seven review files included requests for confidential reference letters. These candidates were up for career status, promotion, and/or additional points. For the most part, CAPA found these letters to be extremely useful in helping us understand the impact of the candidate’s work

² For 2019-2020, UL agreed w/ PD 10/18 times. For 2018-2019, UL agreed w/ PD 17/18 times.

³ For 2019-2020, UL agreed with CAPA 7/18 times. For 2018-2019, UL agreed with CAPA 15/18 times.

⁴ For 2019-2020, UL agreed with Ad Hoc committees 3/6 times. For 2018-2019, UL agreed with Ad Hoc committees 8/9 times.

and activities outside the library, including I.A work with others on campus. However, there were a few letters that, while they were positive, were too vague in their assessment of the candidate to be of value to CAPA. We encourage candidates and their PDs/RIs to think strategically in their selections for reference letters, and consider quality over quantity.

CAPA also received three unsolicited letters, which were not treated as confidential. One letter was for one of the aforementioned seven files, while the other two were for files that had not requested letters. Some were more helpful than others in our assessment of those files.

Recommendation:

- Include the due date for reference letters in the AR calendar, so candidates can provide the date to potential references when asking for letters. One candidate reported confusion over this.

Table 6: Confidential Reference Letters Requested by Recommended Action

Recommended Action	Number of Files	Number of Files Requesting Letters	Total Number of Letters Requested	Total Number of Letters Received	Average Number of Letters per File
No Action	4 ⁵	0	0		0
Career Status + Merit Increase	1	1	4	2	2
Career Status + Promotion + 1 Additional Salary Point	1	1	5	5	5
Promotion	2	2	5	5	2.5
Merit Increase	11	0	0	0	0
Merit Increase + 1 Additional Salary Point	2	2	7	7	3.5
Merit Increase + 2 Additional Salary Points	2 ⁶	1	3	3	1.5

⁵ One no-action file included a collection of nomination letters for an award, counted as one unsolicited letter.

⁶ Each file included an unsolicited letter. One came with the review file when submitted to BES, the other came to BES after CAPA had received the file.

2021 Academic Review Observations and Recommendations

Timeliness of the AR Process and Deadlines

11 of the 23 files (48%) were submitted to BES by the February 12 deadline compared with 8 of 18 files (44%) submitted by the February 10 deadline last year. All but two of the files were submitted within 30 days, although an additional file was submitted incomplete and was not completed until after the 30 days. BES received some files before February 12, giving CAPA an opportunity to begin reviewing files early.

Table 7: Timeliness of Files Sent to BES

Files submitted to BES:	Number of Files
By February 12 (Original Deadline)	11 (first file submitted January 20)
1-30 Calendar Days Late (By March 12)	9
More than 30 Calendar Days Late	3 ⁷

Unlike last year, CAPA committee members signed all of the reports. The chair submitted the reports to BES, who then routed them via DocuSign, with no technical problems. Although the entire academic review cycle was virtual this year, CAPA completed its work by the April 23 deadline. The first report was submitted and signed on March 1, and the last report was signed on April 20. One CAPA member was working onsite once a week while we were reviewing files, but this had little-to-no impact on our ability to meet. However, this may prove more challenging for the next CAPA committee. With the move to hybrid scheduling, the frequency which CAPA meets during review season, and the need to schedule the meetings several months in advance, they may need to schedule virtual sessions *and* book the Quince conference room (or equivalent) so members who are onsite have the needed privacy to meet with those working from home.

Compared with last year, there was no significant change in the percentage of files submitted on time. The deadline for candidates to submit their self-reviews has been moved earlier in recent years, and this last year they were due the day we returned from the holiday break. This puts pressure on candidates to complete their self-reviews over the holiday, and possibly limits their ability to get feedback from colleagues. If the intent in pushing this date earlier was to give everyone else involved in contributing and/or evaluating the files additional time, is it working when the PD/RIs continue to submit about 50% of the files to BES on time?

Recommendation:

⁷ One file was submitted to BES in early March but was incomplete. CAPA did not receive the file until after March 12.

- We strongly recommend that next year's self-review deadline be moved to the beginning of Week 2, then CAPA can work with BES and the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) to adjust the other deadlines accordingly.

Timeliness of the Administrative Review and UL Decisions

As noted in the Academic Review calendar, candidates were to be notified about the outcome of their reviews on June 18, also the date for BES to forward the completed files to the Academic Personnel Office. This year the UL letters went out on June 25, a delay that is comparable to last year. However, while reviewing these dates, CAPA noticed that for May 21, the calendar read: "Library Administration completion of Formal Reviews," and we were not sure if this completion included the writing of the letters.

Recommendation:

- BES, SLT, and CAPA should revise the calendar so that the completion date for the formal reviews is distinct from the dates when the UL letters are being drafted.

CAPA received copies of the UL letters on July 1, as suggested by the chair since PD/RIs had been advised to share the letters with their candidates no later than June 30. CAPA appreciates the thoughtful comments that the UL provided in the letters.

Ad Hoc Committees

Three of the Ad Hoc committees completed their work in the two-week turnaround time. The fourth was delayed due to scheduling challenges, but that did not impact CAPA. We thank the members of those committees for their service this year.

Impact of COVID-19 on Academic Reviews

One significant concern from candidates last year was how they should write about the impact of COVID on their I.A and I.B-D activities since the work from home order was announced on March 16, 2020. A few librarians had returned to campus on a limited schedule, while most were still fully remote as of December 31. After multiple conversations involving CAPA, LAUC-Exec, the UL, and/or the LAUC membership, it recommended that candidates include a brief statement in their self-reviews under Criteria III, the available but not regularly used section to identify "other factors related to performance."⁸ The statement was based on the one that candidates included in their self-review to account for lost days due to the furloughs. Beyond that, candidates and PD/RIs were encouraged to write about the impact of COVID on their work as appropriate, while still keeping within the accepted page limits for self-reviews.

⁸ Criteria III was last used by LAUC membership at large for the furloughs, where candidates listed their time reductions from October 2009-September 2010. Unlike this year, it's likely that few (if anyone) wrote about the impact beyond that one-sentence statement about the furloughs..

CAPA agreed this flexible approach was successful. Candidates noted where specific opportunities were lost (e.g. presentations that were not delivered or lost professional development activities due to conference cancellations). They also used the narrative section to describe broader challenges and opportunities that had arisen in their I.A-D areas due to the pandemic. In a few cases, librarians chose not to mention the impact beyond the Criteria III statement.

For the candidates in this review cycle, COVID impacted 9.5 months out of the 24 or 36 months of the period under review. Librarians coming up for review at the end of 2021 will have been substantially impacted by COVID-19 for a greater portion of their review period.

Errors with Files

There were a number of files with assorted errors made by candidates or PDs, including incorrect librarian rank, recommendations, percentages, signatures and dates, and missing positions descriptions and/or organization charts. Most were minor, but several were significant enough that CAPA had to pause their review until these were resolved.

Recommendation:

- We urge that candidates and their PD/RIs review the files carefully before submitting them. This will be addressed in the training, and it is possible that moving the deadlines could help reduce these errors.

Self-Reviews and Placement of I.A vs I.C Activities

CAPA saw a lot of variation in where candidates placed certain activities in their self-reviews. Most of these were related to I.A (Professional Competence and Service within the Library) and I.C (University and Library-Related Public Service), including:

- SILS activities, which blur the lines between I.A and I.C as work that may be directly related to the local functional group level, but still have a UC-wide impact.
- GLRI (Geisel Library Revitalization Initiative) participation was another activity placed under different criteria.
- Library leadership roles undertaken by virtue of your PD position, including those related to library/campus closure.
- Internal working groups and committees that are not explicitly listed in the position description.

CAPA also received one self-review where I.B-D was incomplete, and another where membership lists were included in I.B (should be in the Academic Biography, section II.b).

Recommendation:

- While we are not sure that a consensus can be reached on where some of these activities should be placed, we want to give more time for this in the fall training. This would also be a

good time to revise the “matching exercise” to include examples from activities like SILS and GLRI. That was part of the in-person AR workshops, but not included in the 2020 online training (possibly due to time constraints).

Academic Biographies

There was an unusual amount of variation in the academic biographies, making it challenging at times for CAPA to review them.

- Some were underutilized and treated as an afterthought, rather than a cumulative document of your activities that is read by CAPA, along with other documents in the review file.
- Some unnecessarily repeated bullet points from the self-review (including I.A), making it harder to identify what was unique to the academic biography.
- Activities for the current review period were not always grouped together at the beginning of a section, but rather organized into categories and then by review period.
- There is confusion over the placement of professional development activities, such as workshops, webinars, and conference travel.
 - Some use Section 1, under the Education table. However, the document specifies this is for areas of sub-specialization or board certification, licenses or permits.
 - Others use Section II.g, the “other activities” section for everything that does not fit in the other sections.
 - From the academic biography training doc from 2018 for the Education section
 - *Also include in this section: Continuing professional education, workshops, webinars and/or trainings attended.*
 - *List general conference attendance in section II.e. [External Professional Activities]*

Recommendations

- We would like to reach an agreement on where these activities should be placed:
 - a. Everything under II.g (other activities), or
 - b. List conference attendance as part of II.e (external professional activities) and everything else under Education, as noted in the 2018 example.
- Spend more time in training on how best candidates can use their Academic Biography. *With the release of a new Academic Biography form (dated March 2021), this is a good time for candidates to “clean up” their own: make it more complete, more complementary to the self-review, put content in the correct sections, etc.*
- Update the academic biography example in the training materials if needed.

Academic Review Procedures Manual Revisions

The following changes were made to the ARPM this year, and incorporated into the current version (April 8, 2021). The 3 LAUC chairs and CAPA chair offered a session on March 19 for LAUC members to

discuss these revisions and ask questions. CAPA warmly thanks everyone who was involved in this process.

- Adoption of [Appendix XII - Procedures for Updating the ARPM](#)
- IV.E.1.f. - University Librarian's Review and Decision
 - Chief Administrative Office (CAO) added to the consultation process.
 - Associate University Librarians no longer need to recuse themselves from files where they served as Review Initiator.
- IV.F.1.c. & d. - Candidate is Notified of Decision
 - Redundant wording related to CAPA receiving copies of the UL letters was removed.
 - Language that Ad Hoc committee members could view the CAPA report and/or UL letter for the candidate they evaluated was removed.

Recommendation:

- CAPA will review last year's report to identify any outstanding ARPM issues to be addressed in the coming year.

Academic Review Procedures Manual Recommendations, 2020-2021

CAPA did not face any issues *this year* that would necessitate possible updates to the main ARPM document. However, we are making recommendations regarding two appendices.

- [Appendix II - Certification Checklist for Review of Librarians](#)
 - We recommend that BES review Appendix A for possible duplication of tasks, or clarification if these are meant to be separate tasks. Notably #7 and #11, and #5 and #8-10. For example, would "candidate provided the opportunity to inspect..." be different from "were shown to and discussed with the candidate?"
- [Appendix VII \(LAUC-SD Guidelines & Expectations for Merit Increases\)](#)
 - CAPA recommends that the UL, in consultation with the LAUC-SD Executive Committee, form a working group charged with reviewing the section of Appendix VII covering criteria for additional points, and if needed, recommend revisions that could go into effect by October 2022.
 - The current language in the appendix says little beyond, "unusual achievement and exceptional promise of continued growth" and "demonstrated superior professional skills and achievement," which are taken directly from APM 210-4-d(2) and APM 210-4-e(2), and has been repeated verbatim in multiple reviews. *Any recommended revisions would not replace the APM, but rather provide additional guidance and context for the criteria as stated in the APM.*
 - LAUC-UCSF is working on revising this section of their guidelines and at least two campuses (UCLA and UCSC) shared documentation. While the final decision-making authority on actions and points is the UL, CAPA believes that providing more guidance on the APM language would benefit everyone involved in the AR process, based on these past two review cycles.