

Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Advancement

Annual Report, 2018-2019

Heather Smedberg, Chair

Submitted 8/23/2019

Members:

Arwen Hutt (2nd year), Heather Smedberg (2nd year), Alanna Aiko Moore (1st year), Reid Otsuji (1st year)

Appointment Files:

CAPA reviewed five appointment files:

- Biological Sciences Librarian
- Director, Content Acquisition and Resource Sharing Program
- Life and Health Sciences Collection Strategist & Subject Librarian in the Collection Services Program
- Metadata Specialist
- Social Sciences Librarian

The first four appointments resulted in the candidate accepting the position. The fifth file (Social Sciences Librarian) was just reviewed recently, and a final decision is not yet known.

Academic Review (AR) Files:

- CAPA reviewed 19 AR files. 18 of these were on the usual calendar, with 1 Off-Cycle review on an shifted timeline later in the spring.
- Ten files resulted in calling Ad Hoc committees: (Career Status = 2, Promotion = 2, Career Status + Promotion = 5, *Off-cycle in process* = 1).
- 5/19 files (26%) included PD recommendations for extra points, down slightly from 35% last year. These including three recommendations for 1 additional point and two recommendations for 2 additional points). 1 file was ultimately awarded 2 extra points while 4 were awarded 1 extra point.

Summary of Recommended Actions/Decisions by Reviewing Body

Action	Recommendation			Decision
	Program Director	Ad Hoc	CAPA	University Librarian
No Action	1		1	1
Career Status + Merit increase	2	2	2	2
Career Status + Promotion + Merit Increase	5	5	5	5
Merit increase	8		8	8
Promotion	2	2	2	2
<i>Off-cycle – currently under review</i>	Pending	Pending	Pending	Pending
TOTAL FILES	19	10	19	19

Summary of Recommended Actions *and Points*, by Reviewing Body:

	Program Director Recommendation	Ad Hoc Recommendation	CAPA Recommendation	UL Decision
No Action + no salary points	1			1
No Action + salary points			1	
Granting Career Status only				
Career Status + Merit Increase	2	2	2	2
Career Status + Promotion + Merit increase	2	2	1	2
Career Status + Promotion + Merit increase + 1 additional salary point	1	1	2	2
Career Status + Promotion + Merit increase + 2 additional points	2	2	2	1
Merit increase ¹	7		7	7
Merit increase + 1 additional salary point	1		1	1
Promotion	1		1	1
Promotion + 1 additional salary points	1	2	1	1
<i>Off-cycle review underway</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Pending</i>
Total files reviewed	19	10	19	19

Committee Actions and University Library Decisions (Actions and Points)*

Action	Ad Hoc	CAPA	UL
Agree with Program Director recommendation	8/9	14/18	17/18
Disagree with Program Director recommendation	1/9	4/18	1/18
Agree with Ad Hoc recommendation		5/10	8/9
Agree with CAPA recommendation			15/18

*One decision pending, numbers will change

¹ includes 2 librarians who reached the top of the scale, who were recommend/awarded Merit increase w/one salary point

Candidate rank at the time of submission

Rank	# of Files
Assistant Librarian	5
Associate Librarian	5
Librarian	9

Files by Rank and Program Director/AUL Recommended Action

Rank at Time of Submission	Program Director/AUL Recommended Action	# of files
Assistant Librarian*	Career Status + Promotion + Merit increase	1
	Career Status + Promotion + Merit increase + 1 additional	1
	Career Status + Promotion + Merit increase + 2 additional salary points	2
	<i>*Off-cycle review, pending</i>	1
Associate Librarian	Career Status + Merit increase	2
	Career Status + Promotion + Merit increase	1
	Promotion	1
	Promotion + 1 additional salary point	1
Librarian	No Action	1
	Merit increase	7
	Merit increase + 1 additional salary point	1
Total Files Reviewed		19

Confidential Reference Letters Requested by Recommended Action

Program Director Recommended Action	Number of files	Average # letters/file
Merit increase	7	.3
Merit increase + 1 additional salary point	1	3
Career Status + Merit increase	2	2.5
Career Status + Promotion + Merit increase	2	3
Career Status + Promotion + Merit increase + 1 additional salary point	1	2
Career Status + Promotion + Merit increase + 2 additional salary points	2	3
Promotion	1	3
Promotion + 1 additional salary point	1	4
<i>Off-Cycle Review Pending</i>	1	4

AR Observations and Recommendations

Training

CAPA believes it was valuable for review initiators and candidates to hear Erik, as our new UL, share his expectations for performance at each rank, and thanks Erik for participating. A hearty thanks to Kelly Smith, Marlayna Christensen, and Cassi Benavides for updating training documentation on LiSN pages and integrating the CAPA and BES sections into one presentation, to reduce duplication.

Recommendations:

1. Post-training feedback recommends further shortening these sessions.
2. Invite Erik to address training sessions again this year.

Timeliness

Date of File Submissions:	# of files
By February 25, 2019 (original deadline)	6
1-30 calendar days late (by March 25, 2019)	12
More than 30 calendar days late	0
Off-Cycle Review	1

6 of 18 files (33%) were turned by the deadline, down from 11/26 (42%) last year. However, 6 of the 12 late files were just 1-4 days overdue and 100% of files were turned in within 30 days of deadline. This is a notable improvement over past years, and CAPA thanks everyone for their efforts to complete their work in a timely manner this year. Some files were close to 30 days late, a number we should continue to work to improve.

CAPA returned 9 of the 18 regularly-scheduled reviews by the April 29, 2019 deadline, submitting the remaining 9 files within two days of the deadline.

Recommendations:

1. Continue emphasis on timeliness in trainings
2. Continue reminders by BES/CAPA during the review season
3. CAPA itself should also continually strive for early or on time submission

Ad Hoc Committees

With 10 files requiring an Ad Hoc, nearly every eligible librarian served as a member or alternate, some serving twice. CAPA thanks our colleagues for their quick, but also thoughtful attention these files. 6 of 10 Ad Hoc committees returned their files within 10 working days, while 4 groups submitted reports a few days beyond their due date. The longest turn-around time was 14 working days, a substantial improvement over past years.

Ad Hoc chairs reported some first-time Ad Hoc members lacked understanding of the expectations and process. The coming years will continue to see newly eligible librarians join the Ad Hoc pool.

Recommendations:

1. Continue with practice of a short timeline for Ad Hoc work, with clear communication of this timeline in instructions to Ad Hoc Committees.
2. BES + CAPA: Seek improvements in the presentation/process for sending instructions to Ad Hoc Committees members.

Academic Biography

While it seems most candidates have adjusted the revised Academic Bio form, a few Academic Bios were either under-utilized, disorganized, or confusing to read when compared with other portions of the file.

Recommendations:

1. Candidates: review relevant documentation on the recommended structuring of the form and strive to place material in appropriate sections, highlight the material that pertains to the current review cycle, and list items in chronological order.
2. CAPA: continue to address these issues thoroughly in the training sessions.

Organization and Presentation

CAPA saw a wide range in how well files were organized and presented; some would have benefited from further review and revision before submission (e.g., excessive length, poor organization and/or general sloppiness).

Recommendations:

1. Continue to hit on importance of this during training sessions
2. Supervisors: offer guidance as needed, to help candidates effectively present their accomplishments
3. Candidates: seek and listen to feedback from supervisors, reach out to past-CAPA members or other experienced LAUC members to review files if needed.
4. Offer drop-in sessions attended by past CAPA chair(s), where candidates can receive feedback on files-in-process.

ARPM Revisions:

CAPA worked with BES, Admin Team, LAUC-SD Exec, and LAUC-SD membership to discuss and approve selected revisions to the ARPM. This included two recommendations carried over from previous years, and new topics arising during the 2017-18 review year. Approved revisions include:

- Clarifying language regarding review committees' recommendations on points as well as actions.
- Clarifying language in III.E Review Period, particularly related to the restart of the review cycle for librarians who change positions following an official appointment process.
- Timeline for writing and signing position descriptions -- to align with MOU.
- Minor edits to Appendices I. and XI. to reflect changes to forms mentioned therein.
- Updating library and campus unit names throughout

Unfortunately, CAPA set this work aside to turn to AR work, and the revisions remain in draft form at this time. Further, LAUC-SD members suggested new areas for revision, and a new MOU is now in effect.

Recommendations:

1. CAPA and LAUC-SD Exec should propose a plan to codify these approved changes, while also identify additional updates that may be required.
2. Complete as much of this additional revision work as possible prior to the start of the new AR season in October.