

**Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Advancement  
Annual Report 2012-13**

Submitted by Harold Colson, Chair  
September 10, 2013

**Members**

Harold Colson (2<sup>nd</sup> year), Lia Friedman (2<sup>nd</sup> year), Adele Barsh (1<sup>st</sup> year), Susan Shepherd (1<sup>st</sup> year)

**Overview**

For this cycle, CAPA handled 20 academic review files and three appointment files.

The two CAPA members who had rotated off the committee together with Tammy Dearie conducted one Self-Review writing workshop and one workshop for Review Initiators in November 2012.

**Academic Review Files: Summary of Recommended Actions by Reviewing Body**

<b>Action</b>	<b>Department Head Recommendation</b>	<b>CAPA</b>	<b>Ad Hoc</b>	<b>UL Decision</b>
No change	2	2	0	2
Granting of Career Status only	0	0	0	0
Merit increase	8	9	1	8
Merit increase with granting of Career Status	0	0	0	0
Merit increase with granting of Distinguished Status	1	1	1	1
Accelerated Advancement (skip a step)	5	4	4	4
Accelerated Review (ahead of cycle)	1	1	1	1
Promotion	2	3	3	3
Promotion with granting of Career Status	0	0	0	0
Accelerated Promotion (extra step)	1	0	0	0
<b>Total files reviewed</b>	20	20	10	19*

\* One file completed CAPA review but received no UL Decision owing to the candidate's departure.

**Appointment Files**

CAPA reviewed the recruitment files for two program director positions and one line librarian position.

**Proposed Changes to the ARPM**

The apportionment of nearly all Librarians into multiple program assignments began in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of calendar year 2013, after the conclusion of this review cycle. Looking ahead to the next cycle and beyond, CAPA recommends that the ARPM be revised to reflect the new environment by clarifying requirements and standards for file letters under the existing “Coordinator” and “Multiple Reporting Lines” provisions of the manual.

### **Observations and Issues**

1. This year’s cycle ended about one month later than last year’s did, in large part because just over half of the files were received in LHR 31-60 calendar days after the official submission deadline, and the last two files were received in early May. (During the two prior cycles the largest sets of files were received in LHR 1-30 calendar days late.)
2. A very small number of review files were missing a required major statement when received by LHR and CAPA.
3. In keeping with recent experience, plenty of Ad Hoc committees were formed this term, and CAPA thanks all members for their prompt and valuable contributions to the review process. Ad Hocs formed to review acceleration files are reminded to consult the terminology and standards of ARPM Appendix VII, Guidelines for Accelerated Advancements, and to craft their reports accordingly.
4. The Library’s recent organizational reconceptualizations, branch closures, and downsized personnel complements were recurrent themes during this cycle, as many files revealed candidates taking on new or additional reporting lines and job responsibilities that bridge and bear the workforce and workload imprints of both the legacy institution and its emerging yet incomplete successor. CAPA sought to assess and balance expectations of performance across all review criteria in light of this challenging environmental context, which will persist for consideration in the documentary record of the upcoming cycle and beyond.
5. Owing to the recent departures of three senior librarians with CAPA experience, two remaining senior librarians were called to serve on Ad Hoc committees twice this cycle. Such “double tapping” is unusual (although not unprecedented), but was warranted given the nature of files in the mix this year and the pool of eligible committee members. CAPA extends a special commendation to these colleagues.
6. CAPA compiled a special tally this year on the prevalence of confidential letters across review actions. The initial census (see below) reveals encouragingly low usage of confidential letters in simple merit increase actions, with 5 of the 8 files containing no confidential letters.
7. There were ten “routine” files (those not requiring Ad Hoc committee action) this cycle, and nine of them arrived with self-reviews conforming to the five-page length guideline. (Files involving promotion, acceleration, and advancement to the distinguished step were often longer than five pages, as allowed by the ARPM.)

### **Academic Review Files Statistical Summary**

**Date of file receipt by LHR**

By February 15, 2013 deadline	2
1-30 (calendar) days late	4
31-60 days late	11
More than 60 days late	3

**Files by Rank at the time of submission**

Rank	Number of Files
Associate Librarian	11
Librarian	9

**Files by Rank and Department Head Recommended Action**

Rank at time file submitted	DH Recommended Action	Number of Files
Associate Librarian	Merit increase	3
	Accelerated Advancement	4
	Accelerated Review	1
	Promotion	2
	Accelerated Promotion	1
Librarian	No change	2
	Merit increase	5
	Accelerated Advancement	1
	Merit increase with granting of Distinguished Status	1

**Committee Actions and UL Decisions**

Action	Ad Hoc	CAPA	UL
Agree with DH Recommendation	8 of 10	18 of 20	17 of 19
Disagree with DH Recommendation	2 of 10	2 of 20	2 of 19
Agree with Ad Hoc Recommendation	n/a	10 of 10	10 of 10
Agree with CAPA Recommendation	n/a	n/a	19 of 19

**Special Addendum on Letters Received by Rank and Action**

<b>Rank at time file submitted</b>	<b>DH Recommended Action</b>	<b>Number of Files</b>	<b>Average Confidential* Letters per File</b>	<b>Total Confidential Letters &amp; Average by Rank</b>
Associate Librarian	Merit increase	3	0.0	
	Accelerated Advancement	4	4	
	Accelerated Review	1	6	
	Promotion	2	2.5	
	Accelerated Promotion	1	3	
Librarian	No change	2	0.0	
	Merit increase	5	1.6	
	Accelerated Advancement	1	0.0	
	Distinguished Status	1	4	
				12 / 1.33

\* The 20 files under review also included seven non-confidential letters from former department heads, coordinators, and department heads responsible for 2<sup>nd</sup> reporting lines. Three letters were in Associate Librarian files and four letters were in Librarian files.