

Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Advancement

Annual Report, 2022-2023

Elizabeth Miraglia, Chair

Date: August 15, 2023

Appointment Files

Reviewed files

For the 2022-2023 academic review period, CAPA reviewed five appointment files (to date 07/07/2023).

- Electronic Resources and Serials Librarian (two recruitments)
- Arts & Humanities Collection Strategist/Visual Arts Liaison Librarian
- Life and Health Sciences Collection Strategist
- World History and Cultures Librarian

Role of CAPA in the appointment process

Currently, CAPA contributes to the appointment process by way of reviewing candidate interview summaries and providing a brief report. However, there is an apparent conflict between CAPA's charge and the ARPM.

Charge: "CAPA also reviews and makes recommendations on all job descriptions for appointments to the Librarian series, including part-time and temporary appointments. CAPA meets all candidates interviewing for appointment to the Librarian series to evaluate their potential for obtaining career status and to share information related to the Librarian review process."

ARPM: CAPA shall review the appointment file and prepare a recommendation report for the University Librarian within three working days of CAPA's receipt of the file.

Recommendation:

- CAPA should discuss with LAUC-SD Exec and Senior Leadership Team (SLT) to review the role of CAPA during the appointment process and during the creation/review of job descriptions and determine whether the charge should be updated

Academic Review (AR) Training

We greatly appreciate Michelle Mascaro, Mike Smith, Emily Escobar, and Rachel Almodovar for providing AR training in October/November 2022, via Zoom. CAPA anticipates holding the 2023 sessions via Zoom as well.

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 via Zoom for the entire review period.

- CAPA reviewed 16 AR files during the standard review calendar.
- Candidate rank at the time of submission: Assistant = 0 Associate = 5, Librarian = 11
- One Ad Hoc committee was appointed for one file that included these recommended actions: Career Status + Promotion.
- Seven of the sixteen (43%) files included recommendations for additional salary points: five files for one additional point, and two files for two additional points. This is an increase in the overall number of files recommended for extra points as last year and represents a higher percentage.
- One file had a “no action” recommendation because the candidate was at the top of the salary scale.

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 six files with recommendations for additional salary points, CAPA agreed with the PD on five of those files.
- Seven out of 16 files (43%) were awarded additional points, compared with five out of 16 files (31%) in 2021-2022. Five files were awarded an additional salary point, and two files were awarded two additional points. However, there is some disagreement between the files that were recommended vs files that were awarded additional points.
 - Six files had full agreement between the PD, CAPA and UL regarding the number of additional points.
 - For one file, CAPA disagreed with the PD regarding the number of additional points but the UL agreed with the PD.

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

Rank at Time of Submission	PD Recommendation	# of Files
Assistant Librarian	N/A	0
Associate Librarian	Merit increase	2

	Merit Increase + 1 Additional Point	1
	Merit Increase + 2 Additional Points	1
	Promotion	1
Librarian	No Action	1
	Merit increase	5
	Merit Increase + 1 Additional Point	4
	Merit Increase + 2 Additional Points	1
Total Files		16

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	1		1	1
Merit Increase	7		8	7
Merit Increase + 1 additional salary point	5		4	5
Merit Increase + 2 additional salary points	2		2	2
Career Status+Promotion	1	1	1	1
Total Files	16	1	16	16

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	1/1	15/16	16/16
Disagree with PD Recommendation		1/16	0/16
Agree with CAPA Recommendation			15/16
Disagree with CAPA Recommendation			1/16
Agree with Ad Hoc Committee		1/1	1/1
Disagree with Ad Hoc Committee		0/1	0/1

Compared with last year, there was a similar amount of agreement between PDs, CAPA, and the UL for recommended points, with only one file resulting in a disagreement between CAPA and the UL. There was full agreement between the PD, CAPA and the UL for the single ad hoc that was called this year. There was also full agreement between the UL and PDs on awarded points.

Recommendation: We continue to encourage the UL to attend this fall's PD/RI training sessions (as he has done every 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.

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	1	0	0	0	0
Career Status + Promotion	1	1	2	2	2
Merit Increase	7	2	2	2	0.29

Merit Increase +1 Additional Salary Point	5	3	5	5	1
Merit Increase +2 Additional Salary Points	2	2	5	5	2.5

2023 Academic Review Observations and Recommendations

Timeliness of the AR Process and Deadlines

Four of the 16 files (25%) were submitted to Library Employee Services (LES) by the February 17 deadline compared with 10 of 16 files (62%) submitted by the February 18 deadline last year. Eleven files (69%) were submitted within 30 days of the deadline, compared with 16 (100%) files being submitted more than 30 days late last year. LES received some files before February 17, giving CAPA an opportunity to begin reviewing files early.

Files submitted to LHR	Number of Files
By February 17 (Original Deadline)	4 (first file received by CAPA February 7)
1-30 Calendar Days Late (By March 19)	7
More than 30 Calendar Days Late	5

Compared with last year, there was a higher percentage of files submitted after the deadline and in particular an increase in the number of files submitted more than 30 days after the initial deadline. This year the deadline for candidates to submit their self-reviews was consistent with last year’s deadline to allow candidates time after winter break to have others review their self reviews. CAPA feels that this extra time does seem to benefit candidates and was not the cause for additional late files this year.

CAPA completed its work by the April 21 deadline. (CAPA submitted their last report on April 21 with the final signature completed on April 24.) Like last year, all academic review 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.

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.

This was the second year that CAPA had to factor in hybrid work schedules of members. Two CAPA members had hybrid work schedules while two were fully remote during the bulk of academic review work. Due to the frequency of CAPA meetings in order to complete our work on time, we needed to hold regular Zoom meetings. Occasionally, CAPA members required the use of an onsite conference room, relying on the Quince Room and WongAvery while Zooming with those working offsite. We did not encounter the same challenges as last year with regards to hybrid meetings but Quince remains essential to providing CAPA with a fully confidential conference room.

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 19, also the date for LES to forward the completed files to the Academic Personnel Office. This year the UL letters went out on June 16, three days early.

CAPA received copies of the UL letters on June 27. CAPA appreciates the thoughtful comments that the UL provided in the letters.

Ad Hoc Committees

Only one Ad Hoc committee was required this year. The Ad Hoc required some additional time beyond the two-week turnaround time after being formed, but that did not impact CAPA. Drawing on recommendations from last year, CAPA nominated two alternates during the initial nomination process in order to avoid delays. All of our initial nominations and alternates were approved by the UL.

Recommendation:

- Continue nominating two alternates for each required Ad Hoc committee
- 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. This year we had a large number of full librarians up for review whose files covered the entirety of the pandemic and resulting new modes of work. Many candidates still opted to include a COVID impact statement and consistent with last year, it was generally included to bolster the candidate’s ability to innovate and explore new opportunities. There were several

candidates who did include statements that outlined how COVID had negatively impacted their work.

Next year, as the review cycles continues to include more “post-COVID” timelines, CAPA should continue to evaluate the need for specific COVID impact statements in future reviews. It may be sufficient to include COVID as an example of a time to utilize Criteria III as opposed to recommending that librarians include it by default.

Errors with Files

In general, CAPA saw few errors with review files. We attribute this to the later due date for self-reviews and to LES doing a great deal of troubleshooting before files were sent to CAPA.

Organizational Charts

Consistent with last year, 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:

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

Length of Program Director’s Evaluation of Candidate

Last year, CAPA noticed a significant increase in the length in Program Director’s evaluations, particularly when candidates had multiple levels of organizational hierarchy that covered their review (e.g. a direct supervisor, an Assistant Program Director, and their Program Director). The issue was reviewed during the fall training and there were significantly fewer files with Program Director evaluations that exceeded the page limit.

Recommendation:

- Continue to 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).
- Continue to try to 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, 2022-2023 section for recommended wording.

Review File Format

While there is a range of acceptable formats for academic review files, CAPA noted several instances where candidates deviated from the recommendations in their narrative sections, making it more difficult for CAPA to review their files. Specifically, some candidates did not highlight the bullet points that they discussed in their narrative. In addition, there were cases where the narrative did not differentiate between sections I.A and I.B-D. While CAPA recognizes that it can sometimes be difficult to draw hard lines between different types of work, the lack of clear delineation can wind up negatively impacting the candidate. Librarians are expected to fulfill their job descriptions along with contributions to the profession. If these are not clearly spelled out it can be difficult to tell where I.A ends and I. B-D begin and therefore difficult to tell when work crosses over into “exceptional.” Lastly, at least one file used a font that wound up taking up too much space and thereby reducing the items they were able to add to their review in order to adhere to the page limit.

Recommendation:

- Review the importance of highlighting bullets during the fall AR training
- Outline the potential impacts of consolidating I.A-D into a single narrative during the fall AR training
- Review the accepted format and font sizes during the fall AR training

Academic Review Procedures Manual Recommendations, 2022-2023

CAPA is recommending three minor revisions to the ARPM to address process questions/issues that arose during the review cycle. Two are carry overs from the 2021-2022 recommendations. We recommend these revisions are in place by October 2023 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.

Include union work as an explicit example for 1.B

CAPA has fielded several questions this year about where union work should be added to the review packet, including questions from other UC campuses. Currently, union work is included in the matching examples during training but CAPA feels it would be helpful to add it to the ARPM as well given how many librarians are represented