

## **Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Advancement**

**Annual Report, 2021-2022**

**Michelle Mascaro, Chair**

**Date: 8/29/2022**

### **Appointment Files**

For the 2021-2022 academic review period, CAPA reviewed five appointment files:

- Scholarship Tools and Methods (STM) Program Director
- Collection Development and Management (CDM) Program Director
- Head of Digital Objects Metadata Management (DOMM)
- Assistant Program Director, Academic Engagement and Learning Services (AELS) Research Advisory Services
- Content Acquisitions and Resource Sharing (CARS) Program Director.

### **Academic Review (AR) Training**

We thank Teri Vogel, Xi Chen, Emily Escobar, and Rachel Almodovar for providing AR training in October/November 2021, via Zoom. Since there were no candidates undergoing their first review cycle, the fall training skipped much of the overview of the process.

### **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 flexible work arrangements, CAPA members were split between working onsite and remotely. So CAPA met hybridly for the entire review period.

- CAPA reviewed 16 AR files during the standard review calendar.
- Candidate rank at the time of submission: Assistant = 2, Associate = 3, Librarian = 11
- One candidate was a Program Director, so their Review Initiator was an Associate University Librarian (AUL). For the sake of clarity, we are using PD in the report text rather than Review Initiator (RI) or PD/AUL.
- Three Ad Hoc committees were appointed for files that included these recommended actions. Promotion = 1, Career Status + Promotion = 2.
- Five of the sixteen (31%) files included recommendations for additional salary points: three files for one additional point, and two files for two additional points. This is the same number of files recommended for extra points as last year, but as more files were reviewed last year (23), a higher percentage.
- Two files had “no action” recommendations because those candidates were at the top of the salary scale. One more file included a merit point recommendation that will place the candidate at the top of the salary scale going forward.

## Actions

- There was full agreement (16 of 16 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.
- CAPA recommended one file for one additional salary point where the PD recommended for standard merit. This was based on CAPA's judgment reviewing similar files with comparable rank during the peer review process.
- Six out of 16 files (38%) were awarded additional points, compared with five out of 23 files (22 %) in 2020-2021. Three files were awarded an additional salary point, and three files were awarded two additional points. However, there is some disagreement between the files that were recommended vs files that were awarded additional points.
  - Four 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 awarded an extra point that had been in CAPA's recommendation but not the PD's.

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

Rank at Time of Submission	PD Recommendation	# of Files
Assistant Librarian	Career Status + Promotion	1
	Career Status + Promotion + 1 Additional Point	1
Associate Librarian	Merit Increase + 1 Additional Point	1
	Merit Increase + 2 Additional Points	1
	Promotion	1
Librarian	No Action	2
	Merit increase <sup>1</sup>	7

<sup>1</sup> 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.

	Merit Increase + 1 Additional Point	1
	Merit Increase + 2 Additional Points	1
<b>Total Files</b>		<b>16</b>

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

	PD Recommendation	Ad Hoc Recommendation	CAPA Recommendation	UL Decision
No Action + No Salary Points	2		2	2
Career Status + Promotion + Merit Increase	1	1		
Career Status + Promotion + 1 additional salary point	1	1	2	2
Merit Increase	7		7	7
Merit Increase + 1 additional salary point	2		1	1
Merit Increase + 2 additional salary points	2		3	3
Promotion	1	1	1	1
<b>Total Files</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>

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	1/3	14/16	14/16

Disagree with PD Recommendation	2/3	2/16	2/16
Agree with CAPA Recommendation			16/16
Disagree with CAPA Recommendation			0/16
Agree with Ad Hoc Committee		2/3	2/3
Disagree with Ad Hoc Committee		1/3	1/3

Compared with last year, there was more agreement between recommended and awarded points, including complete agreement between CAPA and the UL. We do note there was more disagreement between Ad Hoc and PDs than the previous year.

**Recommendation:** We strongly encourage the UL to attend this fall's PD/RI training sessions (as he did last fall) 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.

## Reference Letters

During this review cycle, nine review files (56%) included requests for confidential reference letters. While the majority of these candidates were up for career status, promotion, and/or additional points, there were also candidates that were up for standard merit that requested letters. For the most part, CAPA found these letters to be extremely useful when used appropriately in helping us understand the impact of the candidate's work and activities outside the library, including I.A work with others on campus. CAPA reminds candidates that generally letters should not be requested for standard merit files, unless there are extraordinary circumstances.

CAPA also received one unsolicited letter, which was not treated as confidential.

Table 4: 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	2	0	0	0	0
Career Status + Promotion	1	1	2	2	2
Career Status + Promotion + 1 Additional Salary Point	1	1	4	4	4

Promotion	1	1	4	4	4
Merit Increase	7 <sup>2</sup>	3	3	3	0.4
Merit Increase +1 Additional Salary Point	2	1	3	3	1.5
Merit Increase +2 Additional Salary Points	2	2	5	5	2.5

## 2021 Academic Review Observations and Recommendations

### Timeliness of the AR Process and Deadlines

Ten of the 16 files (62%) were submitted to Library Human Resources (LHR)<sup>3</sup> by the February 18 deadline compared with 11 of 23 files (48%) submitted by the February 12 deadline last year. All files were submitted within 30 days, compared with 3 files being submitted more than 30 days late last year. LHR received some files before February 18, giving CAPA an opportunity to begin reviewing files early.

Files submitted to LHR	Number of Files
By February 18 (Original Deadline)	10 (first file received by CAPA Jan. 25)
1-30 Calendar Days Late (By March 18)	6
More than 30 Calendar Days Late	0

Compared with last year, there was no significant change in the number of files submitted on time (though the percentage of files submitted on time was significantly higher due to the smaller number of candidates up for review). This year the deadline for candidates to submit their self-reviews was a week later (January 10) than last year (January 4) to allow candidates time after winter break to have others review their self reviews. CAPA noticed significantly fewer errors with files this year as a result of the additional time.

CAPA completed its work by the April 22 deadline. (CAPA submitted their last report on April 21 with the final signature completed on April 22.) Like last year, all academic review

<sup>2</sup> One file included an unsolicited letter.

<sup>3</sup> Business and Employee Services (BES) was restructured during the time period that files were being reviewed and broken into two programs: Library Human Resources (LHR) and Library Business and Finance (LBF). For clarity, we are using the latest name of the program throughout this report.

documentation was routed electronically with signatures gathered in DocuSign. CAPA found the electronic process to be efficient and the electronic documents easy to work with. One rough spot in the process is gathering PD and candidate signatures on the review packet. The majority of files were submitted to LHR without electronic signatures and had to be routed by LHR for appropriate signatures in DocuSign before being forwarded to CAPA. Since different documents in the file required different signatures, coordinating and tracking the electronic signing added significant workload to LHR and created a significant delay between when LHR received a file and CAPA received it. LHR is currently responsible for routing CAPA and AdHoc reports for signatures, which being a much simpler process is working well.

#### **Recommendations:**

- Since the extended deadline for submitting self-reviews did not impact CAPA's ability to complete reports on time, CAPA recommends keeping the same timeline next year.
- Keep the academic review documents electronic; do not revert to print documentation as more librarians return onsite.
- Require PDs to be responsible for obtaining electronic signatures before submitting review files to LHR. Include training on using DocuSign as part of the fall CAPA training.
- For LHR to continue to route CAPA and AdHoc reports for signatures. We will review this workflow again next year to make sure it is still working and has not become an added burden for LHR.

This was the first year that CAPA had to factor in hybrid work schedules of members. Each of the members of CAPA had a hybrid work schedule, with two being primarily onsite (three or more days a week) and two being primarily offsite during the time we were reviewing files. Due to the frequency that CAPA needs to meet to complete our work ontime, we needed to hold regular hybrid meetings, where those onsite met (masked) in the Quince Room and Zoomed with those working offsite. Due to decreased private conference rooms with the renovation we could not rely on there being enough room available for each member working onsite to have an individual private meeting room. There was a bit of a learning curve as we got used to the technology, but we developed a good rhythm that enabled CAPA to conduct its work while respecting members' work modality.

#### **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 17, also the date for LHR to forward the completed files to the Academic Personnel Office. This year the UL letters went out on June 16, a day early.

CAPA received copies of the UL letters on June 23, as suggested by the chair since PDs had been advised to share the letters with their candidates no later than June 22. CAPA appreciates the thoughtful comments that the UL provided in the letters.

## Ad Hoc Committees

Two of the Ad Hoc committees completed their work in the two-week turnaround time after being formed. The second requested some additional time, but that did not impact CAPA. For one ad hoc, due to scheduling conflicts, CAPA had to nominate additional alternates, which delayed the ad hoc being formed and almost impacted CAPA's ability to complete their work on time. We thank the members of those committees for their service this year.

### **Recommendation:**

- We recommend CAPA include both a first and second alternate in its initial nomination of Ad Hoc members to the UL. This change will not require a revision to the ARPM.
- In the fall AR training, include a reminder about the importance of serving on Ad Hocs when called.

## Impact of COVID-19 on Academic Reviews

CAPA employed the same flexible approach as last year where candidates were recommended to include brief statement in their self-reviews under Criteria III "other factors related to performance" and candidates and PD/DRs 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. While the pandemic consisted of 21.5 months of candidate's 24 or 36 month review cycle (90% or 60% respectively), compared to last year fewer candidates chose to include a COVID statement in section III or discuss significant or any impact of COVID in their narratives. There were a couple cases where PD/DRs briefly discussed COVID impact for candidates that chose not to in their self reviews. When the pandemic was discussed it was more often spoken of as an opportunity to pivot versus having a negative impact.

Next year there will be some full librarians up for their first review post-COVID, and CAPA recommends applying the same flexible approach for those whose work may have been impacted during the first year. CAPA should continue to evaluate the need for specific COVID impact statements in future reviews.

## Errors with Files

In general, CAPA saw fewer errors with review files compared to last year. We attribute this to the later due date for self-reviews, which allowed more time for documents to be reviewed prior to submissions, as well as better training in the fall on errors we saw last year, particularly formatting the academic biography.

## Organizational Charts

The most common error that CAPA encountered was missing organizational charts. CAPA uses organizational charts in the file to better understand the report line of the candidate during the

review period, therefore it is important that an organizational chart is provided for each change in report line a candidate undergoes during a review period. Additionally, submitted organizational charts should reflect the time period that the candidate is being reviewed for, versus the organizational chart at the time that the file is being submitted.

**Recommendation:**

- Highlight which organizational charts need to be included in the review file during fall training.

### Term Clarification, “Review Initiator” and “Designated Reviewer”

This year it was brought to CAPA’s attention that the fall AR training materials incorrectly referred to individuals that PDs delegate portions of the candidate’s academic review (e.g., the candidate’s director supervisor) as review initiators. Per ARPM III A.3, the PD (or AUL when the candidate is a PD) is always the review initiator, and therefore the candidate’s direct supervisor should be referred to as the designated reviewer if they are not the candidate’s PD. After consulting with LHR, it was decided that it was important to make sure the correct terminology was implemented in academic reviews this cycle. As this mistake was not caught until after the deadline for PDs to submit review files to LHR, there were a handful of files that had to be returned to the PD to have “review initiator” changed to “designated reviewer.” CAPA apologizes for our error and thanks all those involved with the affected files for making this correction and resigning the updated documents. CAPA will update the AR training materials for next year.

**Recommendation:**

- CAPA to highlight the proper usage of the terms “review initiator” and “designated reviewer” in the upcoming fall training.

### Length of Program Director’s Evaluation of Candidate

CAPA noticed a significant increase in the length in Program Director’s evaluations<sup>4</sup> this year. Per the ARPM IV.C.4.h.5 these “reviews should be brief and concise,” which has been defined in the fall AR training as one to two pages. This year only five of 16 evaluations (31%) were within the recommended page limit, with eight (50%) being over three pages. Three reviews were between four to five pages, which in one case resulted in the evaluation being longer than the candidate’s self-review.

Notably, there was not a correlation between “special actions” (e.g., career status, promotion, or extra points) recommendation and having a more lengthy evaluation. Five of the eight evaluations (62%) that were over three pages were recommendations for standard merit. Of the files up for promotion, two out of three files (67%) had PD evaluations that were within the

---

<sup>4</sup> Note: Program Director’s evaluation refers to the formal program level evaluation of the candidate, parts of which may be written by the designated reviewer versus the PD.



recommended page limit, and three out of five files (60%) that were recommended for extra points had evaluations that were 2.5 pages or less.

One factor that contributed to the length of some candidate evaluations was having two levels of organizational hierarchy (their direct supervisor (the designated reviewer) and Assistant Program Director (APD)) between them at the PD at the time of review, and all three contributed separate sections to the overall evaluation. To CAPA's knowledge, this is the first time that there was such a multilevel structure within a program, and therefore there was no precedent on how to handle this situation. Generally, CAPA did not find that the APD's comments added additional information beyond what was provided by the DR or PD. Reviewing the ARPM, we do not think it is a requirement for all levels of hierarchy to write a statement for the candidate's evaluation. (ARPM II.A.3.a, says that the "Program Director may choose to delegate certain tasks during the review process (noted below) to an individual" versus individuals.) We recommend that in future for such reporting lines that instead of the APD writing their own portion of the evaluation, they collaborate with the PD as appropriate. If the APD has significant comments then the PD may ask them to contribute a secondary evaluation. CAPA also notes that there were several lengthy evaluations for candidates in programs with fewer layers in their organizational structure and therefore this does not account for all extra length in evaluations this year.

The increase of the number of PD evaluations not adhering to the page length is problematic. Besides the increase of workload for CAPA for having to read and synthesize additional pages, it is challenging for CAPA to compare candidates of similar rank from different programs when one PD has followed the recommended page length and the other has significantly exceeded it. This discrepancy has the potential to lead to inequitable outcomes for candidates.

**Recommendation:**

- Emphasize the recommended page limit (one to two pages, in font no smaller than 11 pt) for PD evaluations and the importance of adhering to page limits in the fall AR training, including clarifying that the page limit applies to the full evaluation and not to the contributions of each individual contributing to the evaluation (i.e., when there is a DR it does not mean the evaluation can be an extra two pages in length).
- Codify the length of the PD evaluation in the ARPM. The recommended length of the self-review is stated in the ARPM, so there is precedence. See Academic Review Procedures Manual Recommendations, 2021-2022 section for recommended wording.

## Academic Review Procedures Manual Recommendations, 2021-2022

CAPA is recommending two minor revision to the ARPM to address process questions/issues that arose during the review cycle. We recommend these revisions are in place by October 2022 for the next review cycle.

### Clarification on when a secondary evaluation is required

The question arose if a secondary evaluation was required from their previous program director, when a candidate changes programs during the review period. CAPA noted that ARPM was not clear on this point. CAPA recommends the following revision to **ARPM IV.C.4.g.2.** to clarify:

*Current text:* When a Candidate has an official assignment split among two or more programs, a secondary evaluation is required from each Program Director.

*Proposed revision:* When a Candidate has an official assignment split among two or more programs, a secondary evaluation is required from each Program Director.

**Changing programs during the course of the review period is treated as a split assignment, and a secondary evaluation is required from the Candidate's previous Program Director.**

### **Codify length of PD evaluation**

CAPA recommends codifying the length of PD evaluation in the **ARPM IV.C.4.h.5.** (See section Length of Program Director's Evaluation of Candidate for full discussion of the issue.)

*Current text:* Reviews should be brief and concise. In preparing the documentation for the evaluation, the Program Director should follow the numbering and headings given in ARPM Section III.D above. Section 1.a must be discussed. Sections 1.b-d, 2 and 3 shall be discussed to the extent applicable.

*Proposed text:* Reviews should be brief and concise. **The suggested length for the entire evaluation should be no more than two pages.** In preparing the documentation for the evaluation, the Program Director should follow the numbering and headings given in ARPM Section III.D above. Section 1.a must be discussed. Sections 1.b-d, 2 and 3 shall be discussed to the extent applicable.