

Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Advancement

Annual Report, 2023-2024

Sibyl Schaefer, Chair

Date: July 30, 2024

Appointment Files

Reviewed files

For the 2023-2024 academic review period, CAPA reviewed five appointment files:

- Music and Media Librarian
- Electronic Resources and Licensing Librarian
- Social Sciences Librarian
- Arts & Humanities Collection Strategist, Music Librarian (first offer)
- Arts & Humanities Collection Strategist, Music Librarian (second offer)

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 update the charge.

Academic Review (AR) Training

We greatly appreciate Liz Miraglia, Jin Moon, Rachel Almodovar, and Estefania Campillo for providing AR training in November 2023, via Zoom. CAPA anticipates holding the 2024 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 flexible work arrangements, CAPA members were split between working onsite and remotely, thus CAPA met via Zoom for the entire review period.

- CAPA reviewed 19 AR files during the standard review calendar.
- Candidate rank at the time of submission:
 - Assistant = 0
 - Associate = 5
 - Librarian = 14
- Two Ad Hoc committees were appointed for two recommended Promotion files (one with Career Status)
- Two of the nineteen (10%) files included recommendations for additional salary points: one file for one additional point and one file for two additional points. This is a significant decrease in the overall number of files recommended for extra points from last year, in which 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.
- CAPA recommended one file for an additional salary point over the PD recommendation for standard merit.
- Six files had a “no action” recommendation because the candidate was at the top of the salary scale.
- One file had a “no action” recommendation to address performance issues. This file was incomplete and CAPA declined to review it, as discussed below.

Actions

With the exception of one incomplete file, there was full consensus 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 two files with recommendations for additional salary points, CAPA agreed with the PD that additional points should be awarded.
 - For one of the files CAPA disagreed with PD regarding the number of additional points. In this instance, the UL agreed with the PD.
- CAPA recommended an additional salary point for one file in which the PD recommended a standard merit increase.

- Six out of 19 files (31%) were awarded additional points, compared with seven out of 16 (43%) files in 2022-2023 and six out of 16 files (37%) in 2021-2022.
 - Seven files were “No Action” files and thus not eligible for extra points. Thus, of the files eligible for extra points, six out of 12 (50%) were awarded points.
- Five files were awarded an additional salary point and one file was awarded two additional points.
- There was less consensus between the PD, CAPA and the UL regarding the number of extra points. Only one of the files awarded extra points was in full agreement between the three bodies.

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	3
	Merit Increase + 1 Additional Point	0
	Merit Increase + 2 Additional Points	0
	Promotion	2
Librarian	No Action	7
	Merit increase	5
	Merit Increase + 1 Additional Point	1
	Merit Increase + 2 Additional Points	1
Total Files		19

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

	PD Recommendation	Ad Hoc Recommendation	CAPA Recommendation	UL/EVC Decision
No Action + No Salary Points	7	N/A	6	6
Merit Increase only	8	N/A	7	4

Merit Increase + 1 additional salary point	1	N/A	3	5
Merit Increase + 2 additional salary points	1	N/A	0	1
Career Status+Promotion	1	1	1	1
Promotion	1	1	1	1
Total Files	19	2	18*	18*

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.)

*One file was not reviewed due to incompleteness.

Action	Ad Hoc Committee	CAPA	UL/EVC Decision
Agree with PD Recommendation	2/2	16/18	13/18
Disagree with PD Recommendation		2/18	4/18
Agree with CAPA Recommendation			13/18
Disagree with CAPA Recommendation			4/18
Agree with Ad Hoc Committee		2/2	2/2
Disagree with Ad Hoc Committee		0/2	0/2

Compared with last year, there was less consensus between PDs, CAPA, and the UL for recommended points, with the PDs and CAPA agreeing on all but two of the reviewed files. In three files that were not recommended for an extra point by the PD or by CAPA, an extra point was granted by the UL. There was full consensus between the PD, CAPA and the UL for the two ad hoc committees that were called this year.

Recommendation: We continue to encourage the UL to attend this fall's PD/RI training sessions (as he has done every fall) to "communicate expectations, stimulate discussion and promote common understanding and consensus." ([ARPM](#) 10. B. 1.)

Reference Letters

During this review cycle, four review files (21%) included requests for confidential reference letters. While the majority of these candidates were up for career status, promotion, and/or additional points, there was one candidate up for standard merit that requested letters. 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 strongly recommends that candidates going up for career status, promotion, and/or extra points include reference letters.

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	7	0	0	0	0
Career Status + Promotion	1	1	2	2	2
Promotion	1	1	1	1	1
Merit Increase	8	1	1	1	.12
Merit Increase +1 Additional Salary Point	1	0	0	0	0
Merit Increase +2 Additional Salary Points	1	1	2	2	2

2024 Academic Review Observations and Recommendations

Timeliness of the AR Process and Deadlines

Seven of the 19 files (36%) were submitted to Library Employee Services (LES) by the February 20 deadline compared with four of sixteen files (25%) submitted by the February 17 deadline last year. Seventeen files (89%) were received within 30 days after the deadline this review cycle, compared with eleven files (69%) last year. LES received some files before February 20, giving CAPA an opportunity (about 1.5 business days) to begin reviewing files early.

Files submitted to LHR	Number of Files
------------------------	-----------------

By February 20 (Original Deadline)	7 (first file received by CAPA February 15)
1-30 Calendar Days Late (By March 21)	10
More than 30 Calendar Days Late	2

Compared with last year, there was a lower percentage of files submitted after the deadline and a decrease in the number of files submitted more than 30 days after the initial deadline. Several years ago the deadline for candidates to submit their self-reviews was extended 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.

CAPA completed its work by the April 22 deadline. CAPA also received and completed two appointment files during the Academic Review period. Like previous years, 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.

Recommendations:

- CAPA recommends keeping the same timeline next year, even though there were several late files.
- The academic review documents should be kept electronic.

CAPA met 19 times over Zoom between Feb 20 and April 5. Occasionally, CAPA members relied on the Quince Room while Zooming with those working offsite. 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 21, also the date for LES to forward the completed files to the Academic Personnel Office. This year, the UL letters were delivered to the PDs on June 21, 2024 and the candidates on the same day. CAPA received copies of the UL letters on June 24.

Ad Hoc Committees

Two Ad Hoc committees were required this year. Drawing on recommendations from last year, in order to avoid delays CAPA agreed on the constitution of each committee and nominated two alternates well in advance of the due date for files. One Ad Hoc committee was delayed in returning their report, taking over a month to deliver it. While this did not impact CAPAs ability to meet our deadline, it should be noted that files which require Ad Hoc review are usually promotion files, and thus are at the Assistant or Associate rank. Given that the majority of librarians employed at the UC San Diego Library are at the Librarian Rank, there are relatively few Assistant and Associate files to compare and evaluate. This means that delays in promotion files can cause delays in evaluating other files as well.

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 and providing the report within a two week timeframe.

Impact of COVID-19 on Academic Reviews

This year, no librarians chose to use Criteria III to outline impacts from COVID. While some librarians did mention innovation and flexibility resulting from COVID limitations, overall, the reviews largely reflect a post-pandemic work environment. Thus, CAPA does not feel it is necessary to continue to highlight COVID impacts beyond utilizing Criteria III as needed.

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.

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.”

Recommendation:

- Review the importance of highlighting bullets during the fall AR training.
- Outline the potential impacts of failing to distinguish I.A-D into a single narrative during the fall AR training.
- In recognition that librarians who recently went up for review may be unlikely to attend the subsequent fall training, these issues should also be briefly discussed during a LAUC-SD meeting.

Inclusion of Future Goal Statements

[Appendix X of the ARPM](#) states that “Goals statements are not a formal part of the review process for UC San Diego Librarians, and they are not included in review files.” In addition, [ARPM Section E.1](#), states that “The review file shall consider activities and documentation that relate to the period under review only.” This year there were several files that included statements concerning future goals. A few of these files included these statements in their Self-Review, an area which is very limited in space. Because CAPA cannot review goal statements, especially those that do not relate to the period under review, it is concerning to see such statements take up valuable real estate and reduce the amount of space candidates have to highlight their achievements.

Recommendation:

- Review how to properly incorporate mentions of applicable (ie., within the current review period) goals during the fall AR training and also during the LAUC-SD meeting in which other files issues are discussed.

Candidate file presented without Checklist A

One file lacked both a Self-Review and the Checklist A which serves as both a Certification Statement and Documentation Checklist. As cited below, the APM, ARPM, and Union MOU all include language delineating the importance of the Checklist signed by the candidate certifying that the prescribed procedures have been followed. This checklist is the only documentation specifically named and required by the guiding policies. Without this certification by the candidate, CAPA considered this file incomplete and declined to review it.

[APM:](#)

360 - 80 Procedures, section h: “Upon completion of the procedures described in APM - 360-80-d and -e, a statement shall be signed by the candidate certifying that the prescribed procedures have been followed. A documentation checklist listing the contents of the review record shall also be signed by the candidate. The certification statement and the documentation checklist shall be included in the review record.”

[ARPM:](#)

IV. C: “Checklist A (ARPM Appendix II) shall be initialed and dated by the Candidate and the Program Director as a way to certify that the necessary steps of the review process have been fulfilled.”

[Union MOU, Article 5:](#)

“Upon completion of the procedures described above, a Certification Statement shall be signed by the candidate certifying that the prescribed procedures have been followed. A Documentation Checklist listing the contents of the academic review file shall also be signed by the candidate. The Certification Statement and the Documentation Checklist shall be included in the academic review file.”

Recommendation:

- Failure to procure a signed Checklist A appears to be a rare occurrence and likely does not warrant the amount of effort needed to expand the wording in the APM, ARPM, and Union MOU to include provisions for what happens if a file does not include a Certification Statement/Checklist.
- Future CAPA training should clarify the purpose and importance of the Checklist, including that certification simply means that the process was followed correctly and does not indicate agreement with all of the provided documents in the file.

Academic Review Procedures Manual Recommendations

Last year CAPA recommended three minor revisions to the ARPM to address process questions/issues that arose during the review cycle. After discussions with LAUC and the UL, we are carrying forward one recommendation.

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 and provided recommended language for the change. After further discussion with LAUC and the UL, the following language appears to be acceptable to all.

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 when possible a secondary evaluation should be provided by the Candidate's previous Program Director (or Review Initiator).

Recommended CAPA Committee Report Form Changes

The CAPA Committee Report form (last revised 11/2016) used to file CAPA Annual Review Reports is cumbersome, difficult to read, and not optimized for an electronic delivery environment. These issues resulted in CAPA spending extra time discussing misunderstandings related to the form and correcting errors when submitting reports.

Recommendation:

- The incoming (2024-2025) CAPA committee will review the form in the fall of 2024 and make suggestions for edits, including using PDF form fields to make it more easily editable.

Call for Taskforce to Work on Abbreviated Review Format

This year six of the 19 files (31%) were “No Action” reviews due to librarians already being at the top of the salary scale. For each of these files, CAPA members individually review the file materials, meet to discuss the file, lead on drafting or suggest draft revisions, and review the final report draft. This work takes approximately 2.5 hours of each CAPA member’s time, thus each file takes approximately 10 hours (2.5 hours times four members) of CAPA’s time for a total of 60 hours (10 hours times 6 files) this review cycle. These files also require time of the candidate, the PD or RI, SLT and the UL to review.

The [Union MOU, Article 5 Section B](#) includes language which allows for abbreviated reviews for those at the top of the rank in their series (emphasis added):

The performance of each appointee shall be reviewed periodically and the review shall include participation by a review committee. A standard review is one that takes place every two (2) years at the Assistant and Associate rank and every three (3) years at the Librarian rank. **Service at the top of the Associate Librarian or Librarian rank may be of indefinite duration, therefore, an abbreviated review may be conducted every two (2) years for Associate or three (3) years for Librarian.**“

Recommendation:

- CAPA recommends that the incoming (2024 - 2025) LAUC-Executive committee form a special taskforce to outline an abbreviated review process for represented librarians and draft any needed language to update the ARPM.