

**COMMITTEE ON ADVANCEMENT AND PROMOTION (CAP)**  
**ANNUAL REPORT 2013-14**  
**AUGUST 15, 2014**

**Members, 2013-14**

Linda Broderick, Senior Member-at-Large  
Elaine McCracken, Vice Chair / Chair Elect  
Eunice Schroeder, Chair  
Socrates Silva, Junior Member-at-Large

**1. Librarian review outcomes, 2013-14 review cycle**

- Standard merit increase: 6
- Standard merit increase with career status: 1
- Greater than standard merit increase: 1
- Standard promotion: 1
- No action with salary increase due to exceptional circumstances: 1
- No action, non-prejudicial, with salary increase due to exceptional circumstances: 1

All reviews were completed by the extended, mutually agreed-on deadline of June 20. Each candidate received his/her letter from the UL stating the personnel action and reasons for the final decision. Each letter from the UL was accompanied by an addendum from the AUL-ODE outlining exactly what the new salary would be effective July 1, 2014. Also, each candidate received a redacted copy of the review committee report, and a redacted copy of the ad hoc committee report, if any.

**2. Reflections on the review process**

This was a busy and intense year for CAP. It was the first year in which the new procedures for CAP selection and membership, approved by the membership in 2013-14, were implemented. Based on these procedures, Eunice and Linda served the second of their two-year terms. In addition, for the first time in the history of the committee (as far as we know), CAP itself reviewed all files, rather than having the files assigned by Admin to several ad hoc committees, as was done in the past. The new procedure ensures transparency and upholds the integrity and autonomy of the peer review process, which is essential to LAUC professional governance and its contribution to maintaining the quality of the library's programs and services. To mitigate CAP's workload, and taking advantage of the provision approved last year that three members constitute a quorum of the committee, we assigned three of the four members to each review file. Another advantage of the official quorum lies in the revised review procedures, which require that each candidate receive a redacted copy of the review committee report, the redaction consisting of removal of the committee members' names; this measure upholds the integrity of the peer review process in that the report issues from CAP as a whole rather than from three specific librarians.

Despite the slight workload mitigation achieved by assigning three members per file, the committee found that completion of the review process by the agreed-on deadline required a substantial amount of time. We ask that the CAP workload be taken into consideration in the future, where possible and appropriate, when assignments are made for committee work, instruction, and other responsibilities.

**3. Revision of local review procedures**

Following the completion of the annual review cycle, CAP collaborated with the AUL-ODE on a revision of the local review procedures in order to bring them into alignment with the new MOU. To date, the revision has been endorsed by the Executive Committee and has been sent out to the membership for their review. At a special membership meeting scheduled for Aug. 29, CAP and AUL-ODE will discuss the changes made to the document and answer questions, and the membership will be asked to vote on an endorsement. One issue not addressed in the revision is review criteria. The AUL-ODE has asked that LAUC-SB take up this issue next year, perhaps assigning it to a task force as part of a process that would include participation by the full membership. The expected outcome would be to include in the local procedures language addressing criteria at different ranks and for different review recommendations, e.g. positive and greater-than-positive.

**4. Calendar for review cycle 2014-15**

CAP's proposed review calendar for the 2014-15 cycle was approved by the Executive Committee and by Admin, and distributed to the membership. Since the restriction that the review process be completed in six months no longer applies in the new MOU, the 2014-15 calendar allows more time (8 weeks) for candidates, review initiators, CAP, and the UL to complete their respective portions of the process. Also, the new MOU and local procedures allow for extension of deadlines upon mutual agreement of the affected parties. The extended timetable and new flexibility regarding deadlines promise to make the entire process more manageable for all parties.

**5. Bylaw revision**

CAP drafted a revision of the LAUC-SB bylaws to incorporate the new procedures for committee membership and the peer review process that were approved by the membership in 2013/14, as well as provisions for filling committee vacancies. The revision was approved by the membership on Aug. 1.

**6. CAP/WOM brown bag on the review process**

CAP collaborated with WOM to schedule the annual brown bag on the review process, which will take place on Wed., Aug 27, 12-1 pm. The program will feature comments by Denise on her expectations for the narrative summary.

*--submitted by Eunice Schroeder, Chair, CAP 2012-2014*