

Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Advancement

DRAFT

Annual Report, 2019-2020

Alanna Aiko Moore, Chair

Date: 8//20

Members:

Reid Otsuji (2nd year), Alanna Aiko Moore (2nd year), Teri Vogel (1st year), Xi Chen (1st year)

Appointment Files

For the 2019-2020 academic review period, CAPA did not review any appointment files.

Academic Review (AR) Files Summary:

CAPA followed academic review procedures closely this year and our peer review process was transparent, fair and thorough. This cycle was unprecedented due to the global pandemic and statewide “shelter in place” orders, which is addressed on page 10 of this report, “Impact of COVID-19 on Future Academic Reviews.”

- CAPA reviewed 18 Academic Review Files during the standard review calendar period and 1 off-cycle termination appeal file (not included in statistics below).
- Candidate rank at time of submission were: Assistant =3, Associate = 7, Librarian = 8
- Six files resulted in calling Ad-Hoc committees. (Career Status + Promotion = 1, Promotion = 4, Candidate Initiated = 1)

Actions:

There was agreement on actions for all 18 files between the Program Director (PD) recommendation, CAPA recommendation, Ad Hoc recommendation (when called) and the University Librarian (UL).

Points:

There was a divergence of opinions when it came to merit points, with a significantly smaller percentage of files receiving additional merit points than in previous years.

- 9/18 files (50%) included PD recommendations (and CAPA agreement) for additional points, up from 26% the previous year. These included eight recommendations for 1 additional point, and one recommendation for 2 additional points. Two of the nine files (11% of the total files, and 22% of the files requesting additional points) were ultimately awarded 1 additional point. No files with an action of promotion received additional points
- CAPA recommended 1 additional point for three files although the PD did not recommend an additional point. This was based on CAPA’s judgment reviewing similar files with comparable workload during the peer review process.

In contrast, for the 2018-2019 review cycle, all five academic review files requesting additional points received them. Four files were awarded 1 additional point, one file was awarded 2 additional points. For the 2017-2018 review cycle, 9/26 files (35% of total files) included PD recommendations for extra points. All nine files received additional points. Eight files were awarded 1 additional point, one file was awarded 2 additional points.

Table 1: Files by Rank and Program Director/AUL Recommended Action and Points

Rank at Time of Submission	PD/AUL Recommendation	# of Files
Assistant (3 files)	Merit Increase	1
	Merit Increase + 1 Additional Point	1
	Career Status + Promotion + 2 Additional Points	1
Associate (7 files)	Merit Increase	1
	Merit Increase + 1 Additional Point	2
	Promotion	2
	Promotion + 1 Additional Point	2
Librarian (8 files)	No Action	1
	No Action + 2 points	1
	Merit Increase	3
	Merit Increase + 1 Additional Point	3
TOTAL FILES		18

Table 2: Summary of Recommended Actions/Decisions by Reviewing Body

Action	Program Director Recommendation	Ad Hoc Recommendation	CAPA Recommendation	UL Decision
No Action	2	1	2	2
Career Status + Merit Increase				
Career Status +Promotion + Merit Increase	1	1	1	1
Merit Increase	11		11	11
Promotion	4	4	4	4
TOTAL Files Reviewed	18	6	18	18

Table 3: 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	2
No Action + Salary Points	1	1	1	
Granting Career Status only				
Career Status + Merit Increase				
Career Status +Promotion + Merit Increase		1		1
Career Status + Promotion + Merit Increase +1 additional salary point				
Career Status + Promotion + Merit Increase +2 additional salary points	1		1	
Merit Increase	5		4	9
Merit Increase +1 additional salary point	6		7	2
Promotion	2	2		4
Promotion + 1 additional salary point	2	2	4	
TOTAL Files Reviewed	18	6	18	18

Table 4: Committee Actions and University Librarian Decisions (Actions and Points)

Action	Ad Hoc Committee	CAPA	UL Decision
Agree w PD recommendation	5/6	15/18	10/18 ¹
Disagree w PD recommendation	1/6	3/18	8/18

¹ For the previous academic review cycle, the UL agreed with the PD recommendation in 17/18 files.

Agree w CAPA recommendation			7/18 ²
Disagree w CAPA recommendation			11/18
Agree w Ad Hoc recommendation		3/6	3/6 ³
Disagree w Ad Hoc recommendation		3/6	3/6

These statistics in Tables 1-4 show that there is a disconnect between the PD recommendation/CAPA agreement and the UL on what is considered “standard” and what is “beyond exceptional” in level of work, magnitude of work, and what is deserving of an additional point. Although CAPA has addressed the difference between “standard” and “beyond exceptional” in past trainings, we feel there needs to be more clarity regarding the criteria for “standard” files and “beyond exceptional” files, with examples to help illustrate each, to bridge this disconnect for candidates, review initiators, Program Directors and for CAPA members themselves.

Reference Letters:

During this review cycle, 12 review files included reference letter requests for confidential reference letters to be included in the academic review file. 9/12 (75%) review files with reference letters requests were up for career status, additional points, or promotion. There were several files where the PD recommended an additional point but the recommendation took place well past the deadline for reference letters. A reference letter would have been welcome to help illustrate the IB-D accomplishments, but CAPA understands that PD’s may not decide on an additional point until after they read the entire candidate self-review.

Table 5: Confidential Reference Letters Requested by Recommended Action

Program Director Recommended Action	Number of Files	Number of Files Requesting Letters	Total Number of Letters Requested	Average Number of Letters per Total Files
No Action + No Salary Points	1	0	0	0
No Action + Salary Points	1	1	4	4
Granting Career Status only				
Career Status + Merit Increase				
Career Status +Promotion + Merit Increase				

² For the previous academic review cycle, the UL agreed with the CAPA recommendation in 15/18 files.

³ Although CAPA and the UL have the same number of agreement/disagreements for the Ad Hoc recommendations, the CAPA agreements/disagreements are for different files than the UL’s.

Career Status + Promotion + Merit Increase + 1 additional salary point				
Career Status +Promotion + Merit Increase + 2 additional salary points	1	1	2	2
Merit Increase	5	3	6	1.2
Merit Increase +1 additional salary point	6	3	11	1.8
Promotion	2	2	5	2.5
Promotion + 1 additional salary point	2	2	5	2.5

Impact of Reorganization and Vacancies in the Library

There were several impacts from our recent Library reorganization and vacancies that affected the 2019-2020 review files and may continue to do so in the future.

Loss of senior management/admin team:

The ARPM (Section IV.E 1e - f, p.20) refers to the UL consulting with Associate University Librarians (AUL) before making tentative decisions on academic reviews. In previous years, three AUL's and the UL discussed the academic review files, with the UL making the final decision. In this model, even with one AUL recusing themselves if they contributed to a file as the recommending officer, at least 2 AULs could consult with the UL on that candidate's file. With our current AUL position vacancies, the review processes this year consisted of one Interim AUL and the UL discussing files. The Interim AUL recused himself from files that he contributed to, which resulted in several files being evaluated solely by the UL. Depending on when the library Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) and two AUL positions are filled, this may remain a concern for the upcoming review cycle.

Re-organization:

The library's recent reorganization may impact librarians who have changed PDs and or direct supervisors during their review period, requiring secondary evaluations due to change in reporting lines. As a reminder, these evaluations are not optional and must be sent to the current PD by the due date. In addition, CAPA recommends if a librarian has moved into a program whose PD is not in the librarian series, it is essential that the PD attend the fall CAPA academic review process training.

Formation of AELS Program:

The reorganization created a very large program in AELS, by adding librarians from dissolved programs, including RAS and LSV. CAPA has several concerns related to the size of AELS:

- The AELS program currently has 21 librarians--making it the program housing the largest number of librarians. This means that one PD will be putting forth the majority of recommendations for actions and points for librarians in a given year.
- Having a large number of librarians in a program also creates a heavy workload for the PD. Even with some reviews delegated to direct supervisors, the PD still has to review all of the files, add comments to what the Review Initiator wrote, and make a recommendation for actions and points by the deadline. CAPA wants to recognize the PD workload, while also

ensuring that all files reach BES in a timely manner, so files can be reviewed alongside their peers in other programs.

- Finally, a single large program affects the formation of Ad Hoc committees. Previous CAPAs have had more flexibility to nominate potential Ad Hoc committee members outside the candidate's program (or department), while still identifying those with the same functional experience. This will be difficult with many librarians now under one program and Ad Hocs for AELS candidates may now include multiple members of the home program. However, with multiple reporting lines in AELS, CAPA should at least be able to nominate Ad Hoc members who are not in the same immediate reporting line as the candidate up for review.

2020 Academic Review Observations on Format and Presentation

Timeliness

Date of File Submissions to BES	Number of Files
By February 10 (Original Deadline)	8
1-30 calendar days late (by March 10)	9
More than 30 calendar days late (March 23)	1

The deadline this year was one week earlier than the previous year. A total of 8 files (44%) were turned in by February 10, up from 6 of 18 (33%) last year. All but one file was turned in within 30 days of the deadline. CAPA thanks everyone for their efforts to complete their work in a timely manner, especially with the required telecommuting model implemented from March 16-18.

However, due to various impacts of working from home, CAPA was not able to meet the deadline of submitting all recommendations on formal reviews by April 20. CAPA returned 15 of the 18 files (83%) by April 27, one week after the initial deadline, submitting the final three files on May 1.

Recommendations:

1. Continue to emphasize the importance of adhering to deadlines during the fall training.
2. Have BES send reminders throughout the review season.
3. CAPA should continue to strive for early or on time submissions of reports, and if telecommuting continues as the norm, Google Drive should be used for all academic review business, as the P drive is not accessible to all CAPA members working with home technology.

Ad Hoc Committees

A total of 7 files had Ad Hoc committees-- 6 files required an Ad Hoc, and 1 candidate requested an Ad Hoc for their file. There were 28 eligible librarians who served as a member or an alternate on an Ad Hoc committee. CAPA extends our heartfelt thanks to our colleagues for their thoughtful reading, discussion and reports on the files while adhering to a tight timeline. Three of the Ad Hoc committees returned their files within the deadline of 10 working days, while 3 groups submitted their reports a few days beyond their due date. Six files (50%) were turned in by the deadline. The longest turnaround time was 27 working days for one file due to administrative complications during the Ad Hoc review process for that file.

CAPA noted that a few Ad Hoc members lacked understanding of the expectations and process, as this was the first year many librarians were eligible to serve. One Ad Hoc report noted that the candidate did not align their I.A-I.D activities and achievements explicitly with the library and university mission/goals. CAPA would like to make clear that this has never been a requirement, as it is expected that librarians *are* working to meet library and university missions and goals, and Ad Hoc committees should not use this as a measurement when reviewing candidate files.

Recommendations:

1. Continue with the practice of a 2 week/10 working day timeline for Ad Hoc work, with clear communication of the timeline to committee members.
2. Include more information either in Training or in the instructions sent to Ad Hoc Committee members to aid in the understanding of review criteria and process and stress that self-review alignment with library and university goals is not required.

Organization and Presentation

CAPA saw a wide range of files that varied in terms of organization and presentation in the self-review and Academic Biography. Some files would have benefitted from further review and revision before submission. Notable issues included excessive length, poor organization, incomplete sections, and material in incorrect places. Sections below address individual pieces of the review file affected by these issues.

Recommendations:

1. CAPA will stress the importance of organization and presentation in fall Training sessions.
2. Candidates: seek out and listen to guidance from Program Directors or Review Initiators and reach out to past CAPA members or other experienced LAUC members for review of the file.
3. Program Directors/Review Initiators: Offer guidance as needed to help candidates present their accomplishments in an organized manner.

Self-Reviews

CAPA also continued to receive self-reviews that did not follow the format as stated in the ARPM (below)—deviations from this format make it more challenging to review and compare candidates at a similar rank.

“...a page or so of vita-style enumeration of accomplishments keyed to the criteria outlined in Section III.D above, followed by a narrative discussion of no more than three of the most significant items within 1.a and no more than three of the most significant items within criteria 1.b-d. (rev. 11/2016)”

A few self-reviews also exceeded the suggested length of “no more than five pages” (exceptions are actions involving promotion, career status or recommendations for additional salary points upon merit increase).

Recommendations:

CAPA will encourage Program Directors and Review Initiators to work closely with candidates to ensure their self-reviews follow the format as laid out in the ARPM and are the appropriate length for the file.

Academic Biography

CAPA found that multiple candidates made avoidable errors when completing their academic biographies, these errors include 1) not using the most recent version of the form 2) only listing accomplishments from the current review period rather their entire career, or 3) not clearly distinguishing current vs prior activities; placing information in the wrong sections (external professional activities placed in memberships); or using sections that are more for faculty than librarians (student instructional activities).

A question also came up this year about whether completing Section II (f) in the academic biography, “*Most significant contributions to promoting diversity,*” should be required of all librarians. While there is no relevant information in the ARPM on this section, the APM 210-1-d states:

“...Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements...”

Based on the APM statement, as well as the fact that job candidates are now asked to submit an equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) statement with their CV and references, CAPA strongly encourages librarians to include EDI contributions in their academic biography. However, it is not a requirement.

Recommendations:

1. CAPA will review “[CAPA Guidelines](#) for completing the Biography Form” to confirm the instructions for completing the form are clear, and include these in the training packet for candidates and PDs/RIs
2. CAPA will underscore in training that candidates should utilize the academic biography to its fullest extent, as it is a key piece of review discussions and decisions.
3. Candidates will be asked to review the relevant documentation on the recommended structuring of the form and strive to place materials in the appropriate sections, highlight material pertaining to the current review cycle and list items in chronological order.
4. PD’s and Review Initiators are encouraged to evaluate the Academic Biography for completeness before signing them, in order to ensure that it is fully utilized, organized and easy to read. CAPA will return the files if the Academic Biographies are incomplete or the candidates do not use the August 2019 version of the form.
5. Information on Section II (f) will be included in the “[CAPA Guidelines](#) for completing the Biography Form,” as this section is currently left blank on the example biography.
6. The fall review training will discuss adding EDI contributions in the academic biography. It may be that some librarians are already doing such activities without realizing it, and this would be an opportunity to consider their work within an EDI lens.

Training

A deep thank you to Heather Smedberg, Arwen Hutt and Rachel Almodovar for updating the training documentation and conducting the CAPA and BES integrated training for all candidates and review initiators and Program Directors.

Recommendations:

For the 2020-2021 Academic Review Cycle, CAPA acknowledges training sessions would benefit from the following:

1. Inviting Erik to address and attend all training sessions this year.

2. Inviting all AUL's and the CAO to attend all training sessions.
3. CAPA feels it would be valuable for both Program Directors, review initiators, candidates, CAPA members, and potential ad hoc members to hear Erik share his expectations and definition of what a "standard" review file and an "exceptional" review file should encompass for performance for each rank.
4. CAPA believes it will be valuable to have a standard statement re: working during the COVID-19 pandemic available for candidates to use, if they wish to include it, but we acknowledge we are not entirely clear what such a statement would encompass, since librarians were affected and impacted in many and various ways.

Impact of COVID-19 on Future Academic Review

CAPA would like to acknowledge the effects of the pandemic will be felt beyond this upcoming review cycle and will possibly impact the next 2-3 review cycles. In the May 12, 2020 LAUC-SD meeting, we shared a document⁴ that outlined our concerns regarding how librarians will be able to perform their work responsibilities impacted by the pandemic during library shutdowns, managing family caregiving, remote work and physical distancing. We also note that opportunities for activities that fall under areas 1B-1D will be reduced as well: professional activity outside the library, university and public service, and research and creative activity. The LAUC Committee on Professional Governance (CPG) also released a statement⁵ on the widespread impact of the stay at home order and concerns on how the four performance criteria that academic reviews are based on will be evaluated in the upcoming review cycles.

Looking to the future, we are also apprehensive about other repercussions from the pandemic that may affect librarian academic reviews, including the possibility of furloughs and the very real significance of budget cuts, which may directly affect requests for additional points.

ARPM Possible Revisions

A small team (Adele Barsh and Michelle Mascaro in conjunction with LAUC-SD Chairs and Library Admin) worked over the course of this academic review period on ARPM revisions that were identified at the end of the 2018-2019 cycle. These were presented to LAUC membership in November of 2019 for discussion. This set of recommendations is currently with Library Administration.

Over the course of the 2019-2020 review year, CAPA identified additional sections in the ARPM that need revisions or clarifications.

Recommendations:

1. CAPA and LAUC-SD Executive Board should propose a plan to begin work on the 2019-2020 revisions with a larger team of LAUC-SD members.
2. For all future years, the ARPM revision work should be completed, as much as possible, prior to the start of the new academic review season in October.

⁴<https://ucsdlibrary.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/LCC/pages/61276637/CAPA+2019-20+Impacts+of+Pandemic+on+Librarian+Academic+Reviews>

⁵ <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1rQ8cF6bF3bN21isdGU2mB5C2ZZeAxYidFimUP4k088Y/edit?pli=1>