

## LAUC-SD MEMBERSHIP MEETING

Minutes November 23, 1993

Price Center Davis/Riverside Room 2:30 p.m.

Present: L. Abrams, L. Barnhart, P. Brueggeman, K. Cargille, L. Claassen, R. Coates, K. Creely, S. Galloway, C. Graham, R. Gustafson, J. Hanson, C. Haynes, C. Hightower, M. Horres, C. Jahns, E. Kanter, R. Lindemann, K. Lindvall-Larson, K. Lo, G. Lowell, P. Mirsky, A. Prussing (Chair), B. Renford, R. Ringler, J. Sih, B. Slater, S. Starr, D. Talbot, E. Valdez, R. Wang, T. Weintraub, B. Westbrook.

### **CAPA Vacancy**

A. Prussing announced that K. Cargille has been elected to fill the vacant term, which expires with the 1993/94 year.

### **CAPA 1992/93 Summary Report**

Susan Starr gave a summary report of the committee:

Continuing CAPA members this year were Susan Starr and Doug Stewart. New members were Beverly Renford and Sharon Anderson.

A total of 29 librarians were reviewed this year, 7 at the level of Assistant Librarian, 12 at the level of Associate, and 10 at the level of Librarian. There were 10 promotions, 12 merit increases and 7 cases in which there was no change in step. 8 individuals received Career Status. There were 7 cases in which the University Librarian's decision differed from the action recommended by the review initiator, and 7 in which CAPA's recommendation differed from the action recommended by the review initiator. These figures do not include temporary appointments. A total of 15 Ad Hoc Committees were required this year, probably an all-time high.

CAPA has prepared a list of issues arising from this year's process, and these will be discussed by the membership today.

### **CAPA Issues from Review Cycle 1992/93**

B. Renford summarized areas of discussion that have been ongoing among 1992/93 CAPA, 1993/94 CAPA and University Librarian G. Lowell; Lowell was introduced and was asked to offer his views on the review/promotion process. He arrived at UCSD near the end of the cycle with little notion of the process. Important elements in learning about the process have been his involvement over the spring and summer and his meetings with outgoing and incoming CAPA members. A summary of his expectations and observations follows:

- He is looking for staff who take pride and joy in their work and who strive for a high level of professional contribution.
- Choices in where to put energy should lie with the individual, whose responsibility it is to explain/justify/defend those choices; activities should relate to the job.
- Goals/objectives are important because the process of setting and attempting to meet them has high value in establishing strategies, setting priorities, adjusting to short-term pressures, and defining long-term direction.
- The review process must be streamlined. Currently, an inordinate amount of time is invested in the process, and we should look for ways to eliminate unnecessary steps and documentation without compromising the efficacy of the process.

Lowell invited questions and comments from those assembled.

Q. How does the decline in support (i.e., travel funds) for professional activities affect the promotion/review process?

A. The balance between wants and resources is delicate. We need to be equitable among a varying group of librarians, weighing and considering expectations against differing levels of professional development. Enough options abound for librarians at all levels to contribute and to grow regardless of financial support. The greater difficulty lies in how peer committees assess specific activities. While travel is important, we must weight the value of travel relative to limited funding, and valuing travel highly if funding doesn't support it may not be appropriate. Evaluating portfolios must take the limitations of downsizing into account. Library administrators seem more ready to make this adjustment than LAUC reviewers may be.

B. Renford then led a discussion of issues outlined in her memorandum "Issues from review cycle 1992/93" (November 22, 1993) [see attached]:

Issue 1: Should a member of CAPA continue to be disqualified from serving on CAPA if they have contributed documentation to the file within the past two years?

Discussion: Major conflict occurs when the department head is also a CAPA member. Simply contributing a letter, as chair of a committee, for example, or by serving as a reviewer in a previous year, ought not to disqualify a CAPA member from deliberating over a current file.

Recommendation: A CAPA member should remove himself or herself from deliberating over a file when his or her file is being reviewed, when he or she has been responsible for compiling the department head's review, or when he or she questions his or her ability to make an objective judgment in a particular case. Other contributions to the file are not cause for removal.

Issue 2: Should unsolicited letters be put in the file? How can these be distinguished from those solicited by the review initiators?

Discussion: Unsolicited letters must be included within the initial bundle of documents that are submitted to CAPA for review; letters cannot be included once the file is submitted to CAPA. Although unsolicited letters are not patently identifiable as such, there is sufficient documentation in the file about solicited letters to deduce which ones are unsolicited. Streamlining would argue against including unsolicited letters. A broader question concerns the role and value of ALL letters within the file, and this question becomes more acute now that redacting discourages candor.

Recommendation: Keep status quo, but give further consideration before next year of disallowing unsolicited letters.

Issue 3: Is the current level of direction given to Ad Hoc Committees adequate? Are we certain that they will receive the backfiles if they decide to consider promotion?

Discussion: More initial direction would save time for Ad Hoc Committee members, who currently must guess or speculate why the Ad Hoc was formed or must request backfiles that they might have had on hand from the beginning.

Recommendation: CAPA will provide guidance by establishing context for Ad Hoc Committees.

Issue 4: Should illness, maternity leave, etc., be mentioned in review files. Should such absence be taken into review when evaluating performance?

Discussion: Outside knowledge naturally comes into play, and when such factors are not mentioned in the file, how can we accommodate those two sets of information? Prolonged absence can prompt the option of deferral. Reviewing a file solely on its merit is fairer than taking health issues into account. Communication between reviewee and supervisor/review initiator is the key in determining whether to proceed or to defer.

Recommendation: The reviewee should discuss and determine with his or her principal reviewer which option to pursue: defer; submit a file that articulates mitigating conditions; submit a file silent on these matters.

Issue 5: Now that all letters are redacted, are there any constructive ways for supervisees to participate in review of supervisors?

Discussion: If redacted letters aren't candid, are there other ways of getting valuative information? If a file relies heavily on such letters, there is a bigger supervision question/problem to deal with.

Recommendations: none.

Issue 6: How can we change the calendar to reduce anxiety over the review process?

Discussion: Decision letters should all be sent out at the same time to reduce anxiety produced by reviewees' learning that other colleagues' files have been decided. J. Hanson distributed a draft calendar for the coming cycle. Adherence to dates would contribute to making the calendar more meaningful. Delayed letters often sabotage attempted adherence to deadlines, and getting requests for letters early improves chances for timely response. A strongly written file makes letters less important, so a strongly written file is desirable.

Recommendation: Librarians must make adherence to the schedule a priority. Decision letters should be sent out all at once if at all possible, and adherence to all dates on the schedule will make this more likely.

Issue 7: What is the time frame for Ad Hoc Committees to meet to consider peer review files? Should there be a definite minimum time frame, e.g. within one week of being appointed to an Ad Hoc Committee) for the committee to meet, and should those who cannot make that time frame decline to serve?

Discussion: Ad Hocs sometimes make the process cumbersome, especially where there is no disagreement about a file but forming an Ad Hoc Committee is required. But there is insufficient time during this cycle to consider how to reduce the circumstance for which Ad Hocs might be mandated. As to time frame, those who serve on Ad Hocs should accept this as a priority responsibility and make time available to discharge their deliberations on time.

Recommendation: CAPA should set dates and times for the completion of Ad Hoc tasks, and Ad Hoc Committees should make every effort to complete their charges on time. Jackie Hanson will work with CAPA early in the process to identify which files might need to have Ad Hoc's, and she will begin to organize the committees ahead of schedule. The Ad Hoc scheduling from a central location might also be tried this year.

Issue 8: Should there be a timetable for sending out UL's letters? Should they all go out at once?

Discussion: Pertinent points were made during discussion of Issue 6.

Recommendation: Letters will go out at one time.

Issue 9: In cases other than normal merit increases, e.g. career status, promotion, acceleration, should the department head specifically address the APM criteria for the action recommended?

Discussion: Promotion files received during 1992/93 did not appear appreciably different from advancement files, but they should have done. Both reviewee and reviewer should meet in advance to be sure that a promotion file looks different from a

review file. Department heads especially need to be sensitive to this distinction and should insure the construction of the file appropriate to the action being considered. Few department heads are present to hear this discussion, however.

Recommendation: Articulate these points of discussion to department heads through these minutes.

Issue 10: What are the advantages/disadvantages of "lateral promotion" - change in rank but no change in pay, e.g. Associate Librarian VI to Librarian I?

Discussion: J. Hanson reported that only Berkeley has done this, once, but their authority for doing so is unclear. This would mainly apply at the Associate Librarian/Librarian juncture, and it would provide a more reasonable possibility for promotion than such a large transition as from Associate Librarian VII to Librarian III, for example. Could a single campus initiate this option? It might require UCSD or UC sanction.

Recommendation: The membership expressed sufficient interest at least to explore the possibility of such an option.

Announcements

Fall Assembly is next week, and E. Kanter will attend in place of A. Prussing.

A second call for Statewide research proposals will be broadcast in the next few days.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Richard Lindemann, Secretary

Date: November 22, 1993  
To: LAUC-SD Membership  
From: Beverly Renford, Chair of CAPA 1993/94  
Re: Issues from review cycle 1992/93

Issue 1: Should a member of CAPA continue to be disqualified from serving on CAPA if they have contributed documentation to the file within the past two years?

Background: The procedures require that members of CAPA disqualify themselves from service if they have provided documentation to a review file other than as a member of CAPA within the last two years. This limitation was probably designed to insure an impartial CAPA. However, the effect is that members of CAPA are routinely disqualified from files, so that the makeup of CAPA is not consistent from one file to the next. At the same time, continuing members of CAPA routinely review the same file twice during their two year term. Is the limitation on service desirable?

Addendum: In the past, members of CAPA could not serve on an Ad Hoc Committee for a file they had reviewed in the previous two years, because you cannot serve on an Ad Hoc Committee if you have contributed confidential documentation to a file for two years.

Now that the CAPA report is no longer confidential, this restriction presumably no longer applies.

Issue 2: Should unsolicited letters be put in the file? How can these be distinguished from those solicited by the review initiators?

Background: The first question has been cleared up. Apparently, there was a statement omitted from the Academic Review Procedures, Academic Series (November 1989) that addresses this. The following statement will be included in the revision of the procedures that are almost ready for distribution. The statement will read:

Unsolicited letters received during the review period regarding the candidate's performance may be placed in the file by the candidate, the immediate supervisor, the Department Head or a member of Ad Con, but must be included as part of the initial review file. The candidate will see these letters as part of the Department Head's review. The issue of how to distinguish these letters from those solicited by the review initiators still needs to be discussed.

Issue #3: Is the current level of direction given to Ad Hoc Committees adequate? Are we certain that they will receive the backfiles if they decide to consider promotion?

Background: The formation of most Ad Hoc Committees are proscribed, e.g. promotion, career status, advancement to Librarian V or termination. Ad Hoc's will also be formed "in cases where a request for formation of an Ad Hoc Committee has been made by the

Candidate, the Department Head, an AUL, the University Librarian, or CAPA."

When CAPA requests an Ad Hoc to be formed, the Ad Hoc is not provided with any direction. Example: CAPA feels that a person is deserving of promotion, but that was not the department head's recommendation. CAPA requests that an Ad Hoc be formed to review the file for purposes of promotion. The Ad Hoc may guess that CAPA is considering the action of promotion, but nothing in the file provides this background to the Ad Hoc. Does the Ad Hoc need more guidance?

Regarding the backfiles issue: Since the original department head recommendation was not to promote, the backfiles would not have been provided. When the Ad Hoc receives the file, the committee may or may not request the backfiles as part of the deliberations.

Issue #4: Should illness, maternity leave, etc., be mentioned in review files. Should such absence be taken into review when evaluating performance?

Background: Long or frequent periods of absence can affect the substance of a review file, sometimes causing a file to be weaker than it might otherwise be. Although CAPA and/or the Ad Hoc Committee may know about these circumstances from other sources, if they are not mentioned in the file it is not a factor that has been considered in judging the file. Should this be considered in evaluating the file?

Issue 5: Now that all letters are redacted, are there any constructive ways for supervisees to participate in review of supervisors?

Background: In the past supervisees have been asked to contribute to review files of supervisors. Letters from supervisees are now available in redacted form to the supervisor. Will supervisees be willing to write frank assessments? Is there any other way for the supervisee to participate in the review?

Issue 6: How can we change the calendar to reduce anxiety over the review process?

Background: For a number reasons, the review cycle has lengthened. Reasons for delays include the files being turned in late, letters not received in a timely fashion, and some Ad Hoc Committees taking a number of weeks to complete their review. Should we set a more realistic calendar to accommodate the longer cycle or are there some ways of tightening up on aspects of the cycle that would keep things within the current calendar?

Issue 7: What is the time frame for Ad Hoc Committees to meet to consider peer review files? Should there be a definite minimum time frame, e.g. within one week of being appointed to an Ad Hoc Committee) for the committee to meet, and should those who cannot make that time frame decline to serve?

Background: As mentioned earlier, Ad Hoc reviews have taken weeks to complete their reviews. This has really hampered the work of CAPA and made it impossible to meet the calendar deadlines.

Issue 8: Should there be a timetable for sending out UL's letters? Should they all go out at once?

Background: The level of anxiety seems to increase when letters are sent out one or two at a time. It would seem that a set date for the letters to be distributed might ease the tension.

Issue 9: In cases other than normal merit increases, e.g. career status, promotion, acceleration, should the department head specifically address the APM criteria for the action recommended?

Background: When files are treated as routine advancement files, it is difficult for CAPA and/or Ad Hoc to justify the recommendation for promotion, career status, etc. The department head needs to make a case for the action being recommended. What is the best way to make sure this is done?

Issue 10: What are the advantages/disadvantages of "lateral promotion" - change in rank but no change in pay, e.g. Associate Librarian VI to Librarian I?

Background: When a person is at the high end of the Associate Librarian range, promotion must be made to Librarian II or possibly Librarian III. There are some cases where the person has a strong enough file for promotion at the lower end of Librarian, e.g. lateral promotion, but the file isn't strong enough for promotion at the higher levels of the Librarian rank. The lateral promotion may not bring a pay increase, but it does award the person with a change in rank.