

**Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Advancement
Annual Report 2013-2014**

Submitted by Adele Barsh, Chair
drafted: August 25, 2014; submitted 10/27/14

Members

Adele Barsh (2nd year), Susan Shepherd (2nd year), Annelise Sklar (1st year), Teri Vogel (1st year)

Overview

For this cycle, CAPA handled 13 academic review files and 11 appointment files

Academic Review Files: Summary of Recommended Actions by Reviewing Body

Action	Department Head Recommendation	CAPA	Ad Hoc	UL Decision
No change	0	0	0	0
No change + greater than standard salary points recommended	0	1	1	1
Granting of Career Status only	0	0	0	0
Career Status + greater than standard salary points recommended	2	2	2	2
Merit increase	4	4	0	5
Merit increase + greater than standard salary points recommended	5	5	5	4 ¹
Promotion	1 ²	0	0	0
Promotion + greater than standard salary points recommended	1	1	1	1
Total files reviewed	13	13	9	13

Appointment Files

CAPA reviewed 11 recruitment files for 9 positions (1 program director, 4 librarians, and 4 temporary positions).

Additional CAPA Activities

This year, CAPA was unusually active, due both to the impact of the library reorganization and the changes in the MOU: AFT-UC which were finalized in November. In addition to the file review activity reported above, it accomplished:

¹ UL decision in all cases of merit increase + additional salary points disagreed with CAPA recommendation. UL recommended one point less for 4 cases and only a standard merit increase for 1 case.

² This file resulted in no change + greater than standard salary points.

- Chair participated in 2013 ARPM revision; Chair plus two 1st year members are continuing to participate in 2014 ARPM Revision II
- Chair participated on 2013 job description task force team; document discussed at LAUC-SD membership meeting in November
- CAPA combined its training sessions with the Admin and LHR session, incorporating contract changes in scale due to contracts, and changes in process due to organization and job descriptions
- CAPA members surveyed 41 participants in this year's academic review process, 59% response rate; compiled results and drafted report (aka the CARPS Survey)
- CAPA members surveyed other UC CAPA groups about process changes related to contract and to check out best practices and training materials
- We worked closely with LHR to update review forms and contents on the website
- CAPA members contributed to LAUC-SD-wide and advised LAUC-SD Exec Board discussion of process changes
- CAPA members attended several meetings with Admin to discuss process changes
- We held approximately 24 face-to-face file review meetings between January-June.

Among CAPA's standard activities, the training workshop, which normally takes place in November, took place in February – much later than usual due to the MOU contract process, which wasn't completed until November. The compressed time frame resulted in combining the CAPA, Admin & LHR training for candidates and Program Directors into one mega-training for everyone. There was feedback from the CAPA survey (CARPS) that the combined workshop was useful in this year of transition, but should occur earlier in the review process. CAPA intends to go back to the November training time frame, if at all possible, given the second round of ARPM revisions coming in 2014 may delay that training somewhat, as well. CAPA, Admin and LHR likely will go back to the usual two training sessions, one focused on candidates and the other focused on PDs. The sessions will be held with CAPA, LHR and Admin and open to all.

New in 2013-14 year were a recommended job description format and a substantial ARPM revision. Also, in order to support its work and guide future process changes, ARPM revision and training document changes, CAPA undertook its survey during summer of 2014 of everyone involved in contributing to files, from the candidate to the Ad Hocs, excluding Admin and CAPA committee members.³ The survey yielded a 59% completed response rate of 41 potential respondents.

During summer 2014, CAPA members also surveyed all UC librarian peer review committees to determine their activity with regard to recommending salary points, and to gather best practice ideas for changing local process guidance and training documentation. The outgoing Chair and two CAPA members staying on for 2014-15 currently are participating in the second revision of the ARPM (aka ARPM rev II). The two outgoing CAPA members anticipate updating training materials in the fall of 2014. This 2013-2014 CAPA also held a preliminary debrief meeting with Admin to exchange views on the process and gathered information on issues that surfaced during this review season. There also was the

³ The CAPA Academic Review Process Survey results summary report is stored at P:\CAPA Documents\2014CAPA\2014CAPAsurvey, and available on request by LAUC-SD members from CAPA Chair.

usual, official Admin-CAPA debrief in September, attended by both the outgoing and incoming CAPA members.

Observations and issues

The entire process ran late this year, because many parts took longer:

- Incorporating changes in the MOU to the ARPM (and the concomitant activities of approval of changes by LAUC-SD membership and agreement from LAO);
- Scheduling training workshops (dependent on above);
- Incorporating secondary evaluation documents and gathering all the signatures (some new processes);
- LHR's receipt of files.

Five files came in one month late, one file was two months late, and only four of thirteen met the extended Feb. 28 deadline. All delays in turn impacted the ad hoc committees, CAPA and the Admin review, but all the files were reviewed in time by CAPA and Admin for reporting any actions to campus so that pay changes could be processed normally. In the Admin-CAPA July meeting, we discussed that although all parties attempt to get the files in 'on time' for the campus cycle, CAPA is not bound to that schedule and may ask for clarification of files. We explored in discussion the potential ramifications of turning files in late to campus.

Only 30% of the files this cycle represented requests for standard merit reviews. Every other file this year took more than the usual amount of care and attention to shepherd through the process in order to ensure fair peer review, given the changes in the MOU and the Library's reorganization. Primarily, this situation reflected uncertainty about definitions of greater than standard performance. CAPA's decision, where this uncertainty appeared in files, was to gather as much peer input on files as possible. In the future, we suggest updating the guidelines of when an ad hoc is needed in light of the new point system.

With the Library's summer 2014 re-visioning of the subject librarian reporting lines, it is anticipated that the ARPM Revision II changes related to secondary evaluations will streamline the process of gathering documentation and signatures for the majority of those librarians who originally were appointed to more than one program. It is noted that not all librarians with multiple departmental assignments are subject librarians, and the continuing impact on these individuals for required secondary evaluations needs to be monitored and perhaps the process adjusted.

The CARP Survey (CARPS) sought feedback from this cycle's academic review participants. The ARPM Revision II and the 2014 CAPA training materials will address most of the issues the CARPS illuminated about difficulties with training and procedure. Selected examples of CARPS suggestions were:

- Better training for all LAUC-SD members who might be called for ad hoc committees to know their roles, such as having all LAUC-SD members attend training.
- Streamline the signature process, especially around secondary evaluations.

CAPA noted several places where PDs put forward a recommendation form that had incorrect dates of the candidates' service. We suspect this was due to use of an older form. We recommend LHR, the candidates and PDs carefully inspect their recommendation forms for any discrepancies.

Two factors compelled CAPA to use salary points in its recommendations this year, which was a departure from the traditional process of agreeing and disagreeing with PD/RI recommendations. First, CAPA noted that throughout the process, the UL actively discouraged the PDs and candidates from recommending or referring at all to salary points. CAPA also observed during the review process, and in the follow up survey, that there was much confusion about how to proceed if no points could be referenced. The UC-AFT literature clearly stated, “There is **NOTHING** in the new MOU that prevents you, or your RI, or your peer-review committee from recommending a specific number of points.” (<http://ucaft.org/content/merit-increases-and-acceleration>) [emphasis from original document]. CAPA noted that several of this year’s Academic Review files came in with indistinct recommendations. CAPA subsequently felt that in order to do a proper peer review and to be clear about its recommendations, it needed to refer to salary points. There simply was no other way to designate unequivocally its peer review judgment. CAPA recommends that PDs be given the power to specify salary point recommendations along with the actions, and that the recommendation form be updated accordingly.

Another difficulty that led CAPA to refer to salary points was the complications presented by the ULs UC-wide advocating for standard language for review actions that appeared more restrictive than the MOU seemed to indicate. The local version of the recommended language document came out in December/January, and showed that the UL adopted the terminology Greater than Standard (GTS) to represent the equivalent to the former ‘Accelerated’ categories of actions⁴. However, the original information CAPA had on the MOU changes led them to interpret the term greater than standard merit as more holistically representing anything above a standard Merit increase. The differences in interpretations resulted in many individual questions from candidates, RIs, supervisors, secondary evaluators and PDs regarding how to proceed under what seemed like two different sets of terminologies. Indeed, by February, this confusion seemed to occur at several UC campuses, prompting the UC-AFT page mentioned above to further state:

Merit Increases and Acceleration

Submitted by bquirk on February 28, 2014 - 11:35pm

Accelerations (where the review was on schedule, but you skipped a step or more) exist in a different form under the point system. Instead of an acceleration, one simply requests a greater-than-minimum number of points. There is no maximum number of extra points you can request.

- The university is recommending model language for review initiators that is being read to prohibit them from recommending a specific number of points as part of the recommended action. Instead, the language guides RIs to indicate only whether the review should receive a “standard” or “greater-than-standard merit increase.”
- Some campuses are insisting that candidates and peer- review committees utilize the same language, leaving the deciding official (often the UL) without any specific guidance on the number of points to award.

As these conditions emerged, CAPA felt the most expeditious, fair and clear way to proceed was to incorporate salary point recommendations with its peer review. CAPA recognized it was uniquely

⁴ “UC San Diego Model Language for Review Letters 2013 Dec 09,” discussed at LAUC-SD membership meeting January 17, 2014. Stored at P:\CAPA Documents\2014CAPA

positioned as a ‘last stop’ to offer a *peer recommendation* on salary points, where there had been mixed messages from the UL and AFT about the ability for candidates and PDs to freely refer to salary points. One additional CAPA observation is that in the new system, we have lost a facet in referring to librarians moving through the ranks; formerly we could refer to the steps. There currently was no way to portray in clear language CAPA’s assessment and the intent of its recommendations regarding the relative differences between files, as it traditionally had, without referring to salary points.

Over the summer 2014, CAPA conducted a scan of what the other campuses’ peer review bodies did regarding recommendations.⁵ The document shows variations – one other UC had a CAPA that weighed in on points in one case. In at least three other campuses, the RI/PD recommended points and/or salary, and their CAPA-equivalents had the opportunity to comment on those recommendations. Other UCs still have the salary amount designation under the proposed status on their equivalents of our PD’s Academic Recommendation Form, but in 2013 our LHR office removed that feature from our forms without consulting CAPA or the ARPM review committee. *We advocate strongly for the revision the PD’s Academic Recommendation Form (ARPM Appendix XII) so that the PD can indicate fully the recommendation, including points and salary.* CAPA is working with LAUC-SD and Admin to resolve this issue for the next cycle.

CAPA notes that in moving to the new points-based system, we have lost a facet of referring to movement of candidates intra-rank (e.g., the steps). *We strongly recommend rosters begin listing all librarians by rank, and then in ascending order by salary.* We feel it is not necessarily to list the actual salary amount on the roster, however.

Another issue that surfaced was how to handle more systematically and fairly those files where criterion I.A. activities are out of sync with I.B-I.D. due to workload changes. *We strongly suggest a revision of Appendix VII (Guidelines for Accelerated Advancements) to reflect language in a document from UC Berkeley which addresses the same issue, [Peer Review Standards in a Time of Increased Workload](#).*

This review cycle, there only were MOU-represented librarians up for review. A revision of the APM was submitted to campus, and is making its way through the approval system, in an effort to make the pay scales and merit increase options for non-represented librarians parallel to the new MOU. The expected changes are not likely to be finalized until late 2014 and possibly into early 2015.

Academic Review Files Statistical Summary

Submitted by original February 15, 2014 deadline	0
By extended February 28 deadline	4
1-30 (calendar) days late	4
31-60 days late	4
More than 60 days late	1

Files by Rank at the time of submission

Rank	Number of Files
Associate Librarian	7
Librarian	6

⁵ ‘CAPA Survey of 10 UC Campuses – Were salary/points recommended?’ This document is stored P:\CAPA Documents\2014CAPA, and available on request by LAUC-SD members from CAPA Chair.

Files by Rank and Department Head Recommended Action

Rank at time file submitted	DH Recommended Action	Number of Files
Associate Librarian	Merit increase	1
	Career Status + greater than standard salary points recommended	2
	Merit increase + greater than standard salary points recommended	2
	Promotion	1
	Promotion + greater than standard salary points recommended	1
Librarian	No change	0
	Merit increase	3
	Merit increase + greater than standard salary points recommended	3

Committee Actions and UL Decisions

Action	Ad Hoc	CAPA	UL
Agree with PD Recommendation	8 of 9	12 of 13 ⁶	11 of 13
Disagree with PD Recommendation	1 of 9	1 of 13	2 of 13
Agree with Ad Hoc Recommendation	n/a	9 of 9	8 of 9
Agree with CAPA Recommendation	n/a	n/a	7 of 13 ⁷

⁶ One file had to go back to PD to clarify the terminology of what s/he was recommending, but with the clarification, PD and CAPA were in accord and the number is counted here among the 12 files where CAPA agreed with PD recommendation.

⁷ CAPA was the only level of review that attempted to communicate salary point recommendations, taking into account PD and Ad Hoc (where applicable) recommendations, as well as comparing files at similar rank and standing. In four cases where the UL and CAPA disagreed on points, there was general agreement that these cases were worthy of a standard merit increase as well as additional salary points. The UL awarded one less point than CAPA recommended for each of these. In the fifth case, the disagreement was over whether this file represented a standard merit that was worthy of any additional salary points. The UL awarded standard merit, whereas CAPA recommended additional points.

Rank at time file submitted	PD Recommended Action	Number of Files	Average Confidential* Letters per File	Total Confidential Letters/Average within Rank
Associate Librarian (7 files)	Career Status + greater than standard salary points recommended	2	2	
	Merit increase	1	0	
	Merit increase + greater than standard salary points recommended	2	2.5	
	Promotion	1	0	
	Promotion + greater than standard salary points recommended	1	6	
Librarian (6 files)	No change	0	0	
	Merit increase	3	1.33	
	Merit increase + greater than standard salary points recommended	3	1.33	
				8 / 1.33

* The 10 files under review also included 19 non-confidential letters from former supervisors, coordinators, and program directors responsible for secondary evaluations.

A grand total of 33 letters (15 confidential and 18 non-confidential) were in Associate Librarian files and 23 letters (8 confidential and 15 non-confidential) were in Librarian files.