

**Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Advancement
Annual Report 2015-2016**

Submitted by Dominique Turnbow, Chair
Drafted 7/28/16; Submitted 9/9/16

Members

Cristela Garcia-Spitz (2nd year), Dave Schmitt (1st year), Aislinn Sotelo (1st year), Dominique Turnbow (2nd year)

Academic Review Files Statistical Summary

CAPA handled 24 academic review files.¹

Academic Review Files: Summary of Recommended Actions and Points by Reviewing Body

	Program Director Recommendation	Ad Hoc Recommendation²	CAPA Recommendation	UL Decision
No Action + no salary points		1		
No Action + additional salary points recommended			1	1
Granting Career Status only				
Career Status + Merit Increase			2	2
Career Status + Merit increase + 1 additional salary point recommended	3	3	2	2
Career Status + Merit increase + 2 additional salary points recommended	1	1		
Merit increase	8	1	9	8
Merit increase + 1 additional salary point recommended	8	4	7	9
Merit increase + 2 additional salary points recommended	2		1	
Merit increase + 3 additional salary points recommended				
Promotion	1	1	1	1
Promotion + 1 additional salary points recommended				
Promotion + 2 additional salary points recommended				
Promotion + 3 additional salary points				
Total files reviewed	23	11	23	23

¹ One file was for a temporary position that was not renewed. 23 files went to Library Administration for review.

² Ad hocs were called when required by the ARPM. Five of the 11 ad hocs were for required actions.

Appointment Files

CAPA reviewed four recruitment files for the following positions:

- Arts and Humanities Collection Coordinator/Visual Arts Librarian
- Special Collections Cataloging & Metadata Librarian
- Media Curation Librarian
- Digital Archivist

Additional CAPA Activities

This year, CAPA focused on process.

- When requesting ad hocs, we used the [ad hoc letter template](#) created by former CAPA members, Annelise Sklar and Teri Vogel. This template was added to the email sent by Library Human Resources when assigning an ad hoc.
- We kept copious notes about our timeline, Chair responsibilities, the way we formed ad hoc committees and the specific sections of the ARPM and APM we consulted while reviewing files. This year's outgoing members (Dominique Turnbow and Cristela Garcia-Spitz) will use these notes to create documentation to facilitate the work of future CAPAs.
- We captured our observations while reviewing files that we will use to update this year's training materials. Outgoing CAPA members (Dominique Turnbow and Cristela Garcia-Spitz) will update the CAPA LISN site to make it easier for librarians new to the process to find and use academic review documents.

Observations

There were two things that were much improved this year compared to last year. First, 20 out of 24 files (83%) were submitted within 30 days past the deadline. This is compared to 75% last year and 61% in 2013-2014. It is possible that the reminder emails sent by the CAPA Chair to LAUC-SD and messages posted to the weekly update in LISN facilitated this improvement. Second, the ad hoc reports were very insightful, without doubt due to the new template. CAPA was able to easily understand the ad hoc recommendation and appropriate and adequate evidence was used to support it.

Dates of File Submissions

Date	# of files
By February 22, 2016 (original deadline)	7
1-30 calendar days late (by March 23, 2016)	13
31-60 calendar days late (by April 22, 2016)	4
More than 60 calendar days late	0

This was the first year librarians used the new campus Academic Biography form. CAPA did not note significant issues with how librarians were using it.

CAPA Recommendations

Academic Biography

CAPA observed that a number of librarians did not take full advantage of the academic biography form. Since there is no expectation to include a comprehensive list of all activities in the self-review/narrative during the period under review, CAPA relies on this form to get a full picture of one's work. CAPA recommends that librarians fill out the entire academic biography, paying special attention to the career history section and include all publications.

Ad Hoc Timeline

Due to the large number of files and recommendations for extra points, CAPA called 11 ad hocs this year compared to five last year. Every librarian eligible served on an ad hoc this year and one person served twice. Our data in the table below shows that most ad hoc reports were completed within three weeks of being called, which is acceptable if the ad hocs are called early in the process (March). If ad hocs are called later (April), CAPA recommends reports to be completed as soon as possible, but no longer than two weeks. CAPA acknowledges that this can be difficult given busy schedules, which is why it is imperative that people respond quickly by accepting the appointment to an ad hoc (or not). Once the appointment is accepted, the ad hoc should meet as soon as possible. If the ad hoc is unable to meet within one week of being assigned a file, then the ad hoc members should let LHR know so that an alternate member may be assigned.

Summary of Ad Hoc Duration

Length	# of files
0 – 10 days	1
11 – 20 days	5
21 – 30 days	3
31 – 40 days	1
41 – 50 days	0
51 – 60 days	1

ARPM Revisions

Ad Hoc Committees

CAPA would like to revisit last year's CAPA recommendation to revise the language of the ARPM to require ad hocs only in cases of career status, promotion and when CAPA disagrees with recommended action put forward by the Program Director or AUL. CAPA recommends removing the language in the ARPM IV.D.2.a.1 (p. 17) that requires CAPA to call an ad hoc when CAPA disagrees with the point recommendation (even in cases where CAPA agrees with the recommended action). As a result of the high number of extra point files and the current language of the ARPM, CAPA called 11 ad hocs this year with the majority being called in late March and April after CAPA had initially reviewed the file in order to determine if an ad hoc was required. With the average length of an ad hoc being three weeks, this delayed CAPA in getting the files to the University Librarian for review. While the ad hoc reports were insightful this year, they did not always sway CAPA's decision in another direction. CAPA has the benefit of looking at the files across ranks, making it easier than an ad hoc to determine point recommendations. Commenting on points can be difficult for ad hocs when they are not seeing comparable files.

By revising the language of the ARPM to require ad hocs only in cases where CAPA disagrees with the recommended action, the review process will be fair and timely. It is important to note that this revision would not take away the rights of the reviewee, Program Director/AUL, or CAPA to request an ad hoc if they want one.

This recommendation was discussed but not voted on at the July 28, 2016 membership meeting. It was determined that the October 2016 LAUC-SD membership meeting would be used for further discussion and a vote. CAPA will prepare specific language for the ARPM to share at the meeting.

Committee Reports

Additionally, CAPA would like to revise the Ad Hoc Committee Report (Appendix VIII) and CAPA Committee Report (Appendix IX) to include separation between agreement/disagreement with recommended *action* and *points* on the first page. We would like both reports to reflect cases where the committee agreed with an action, but disagreed on points. Currently, it is not possible to distinguish between these.

This recommendation was approved by quorum of the LAUC-SD membership at the July 28, 2016 meeting. CAPA Chair with work with Library Human Resources to revise the forms.

Confidential Letters

There were 27 confidential letters requested this year. Fifteen of 24 people requested at least one confidential letter even though there were only five files that included actions where one would typically require them (e.g. career status and promotion). CAPA encourages librarians to request confidential letters if desired; however, a file that has a standard action (i.e. merit) with a recommendation of extra points doesn't always require confidential letters. Confidential letters are most useful to CAPA in cases when the Program Director or AUL may not fully be able to address the details of work in the file.

Confidential Letters Requested by Recommended Action

Program Director Recommended Action	Number of files	Average # letters/file
No action ³	1	0
Career Status + Merit increase + 2 additional salary points	1	2
Career Status + Merit increase + 1 additional salary point	3	2.3
Merit increase	8	0.6
Merit increase + 1 additional salary point	8	.75
Merit increase + 2 additional salary points	2	2
Promotion	1	3

Point Recommendations

The largest issue that CAPA has this year is with regard to point recommendations. 60 percent of files (14 out of 23) included recommendations for extra points. Requesting extra points comes with the extra responsibility of the Program Director or the AUL to highlight the impact of the librarian's work and provide more insight than what is already in the file.

³ File was for a temporary librarian position that was not renewed.

Horizon Issues

- We anticipate that there will be many librarians going up for review for the first time in 2016-2017. We will need to be sure that resources and training are adequate. As mentioned previously, we will work to make academic review information easier to find on LISN. Additionally, we will encourage more librarians to take advantage of the guidance their LAUC-SD buddy can provide.
- Both *APM-360, Librarian Series* and *APM-210-4, Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on the Appointment, Merit Increase, Promotion, Career Status Actions for Members of the Librarian Series* continue to undergo systemwide revisions. The 2016-2017 CAPA should be aware of any changes that impact our local practice.

Statistical Summary

File by Rank at the time of submission

	# of files
Assistant Librarian	2
Associate Librarian	14
Librarian	8

Files by Rank and Department Head Recommended Action

Rank at time file was submitted	Program Director/AUL Recommended Action	# of files
Assistant Librarian	Merit Increase	1
	Merit increase + 2 additional salary points	1
Associate Librarian	No Action	1 ⁴
	Career Status + Merit increase + 1 additional salary point	1
	Career Status + Merit increase + 2 additional salary points	2
	Merit increase	1
	Merit increase + 1 additional salary points	4
	Merit increase + 2 additional salary points	4
	Promotion	1
Librarian	Career Status + Merit increase + 1 additional salary point	1
	Merit increase	3
	Merit increase + 1 additional salary point	4
Total Files Reviewed		24

⁴ File was for a temporary librarian position that was not renewed. File was not reviewed by University Librarian.

Committee Actions and University Librarian Decisions (action *and* points)

Action	Ad Hoc	CAPA	UL
Agree with Program Director recommendation	7 of 11	14 of 23	13 of 23
Disagree with Program Director recommendation	4 of 11	9 of 23	10 of 23
Agree with Ad Hoc recommendation		5 of 11	4 of 11
Agree with CAPA recommendation			22 of 23

Summary of Decisions by Recommended Action

Action	Recommendation			
	Program Director	Ad Hoc	CAPA	University Librarian
No action	1 ⁵	1	2 ⁵	1
Career Status + Merit increase	4	4	4	4
Merit increase	18	5	17	17
Promotion	1	1	1	1

Confidential Letters Requested by Recommended Action

Program Director Recommended Action	Number of files	Average # letters/file
No action ⁵	1	0
Career Status + Merit increase + 2 additional salary points	1	2
Career Status + Merit increase + 1 additional salary point	3	2.3
Merit increase	8	0.6
Merit increase + 1 additional salary point	8	.75
Merit increase + 2 additional salary points	2	2
Promotion	1	3

⁵ One file was for a temporary librarian position that was not renewed.