

**LAUC-B Executive Committee Comments Regarding:
LAUC-B Working Group Report on Academic Reviews, September 4, 2018**

The LAUC-B Working Group Report on Academic Reviews was discussed at the September 12, 2018 and October 10, 2018 LAUC-B Executive Committee (ExComm) meetings in closed sessions.

ExComm met with the report's authors, Jesse Silva, James Eason, and Virginia Shih, as well as with the current and past chairs of LAUC-B's Nominating and Elections Committee (N&E), Christina Tarr and Manuel Erviti.

After thorough consideration, ExComm decided that continuing Berkeley Division's current method of member selection for its Committee on Academic Promotion and Advancement (CAPA) is the most appropriate course of action at this time.

By current practice, in late summer or early fall the incumbent CAPA committee selects members to fill its ranks and passes on its recommendations to ExComm for formal appointment.

ExComm considers such selection of CAPA members more appropriate than open election because of Berkeley Division's large size and expansive scope. CAPA membership must be carefully balanced between different academic disciplines and specialties to ensure that librarians under review during any given review period receive a full and fair evaluation.

In response to LAUC-B members expressed wish for more transparency regarding appointment to CAPA, N&E has instituted an online form for anyone wishing to serve on any LAUC-B committee, including CAPA. The form clearly states that, "[y]our name will be forwarded to CAPA. CAPA selects their own members in a separate process and according to their own requirements. CAPA appointments are made on a separate schedule."

As a reminder, CAPA will send out a call for volunteers to the LAUC-B membership in early fall. CAPA will also maintain a list of volunteers from year to year.

LAUC-B Working Group Report on Academic Reviews

September 4, 2018

Submitted by:
Jesse Silva (chair)
James Eason
Virginia Shih

Executive Summary

A small working group was charged by the LAUC-B Executive Committee to perform an environmental scan of how University of California campus libraries and Berkeley peer institution libraries select the members for their local librarian peer review committees and publicize the requirements for serving on the peer review committee. The working group found that while local procedures vary across the ten UC campuses, UCB is the only campus that employs an appointment-only process to select members of its peer review committee; 7 of the 10 campuses elect all or some portion of their committees. At the two smallest campuses, everyone serves on the committee. The working group recommends incorporating an election component into the selection of our peer review committee members to bring Berkeley more in-line with the rest of the UC system, and we include some possibilities for how this may be done.

Background

The Executive Committee of the Librarians Association of the University of California, Berkeley (LAUC-B) charged a small working group (WG) to perform an environmental scan of how University of California campus libraries and Berkeley peer institution libraries select the members for their local librarian peer review committees (Appendix A). The committee was also charged with investigating how these requirements and procedures were publicized amongst the local LAUC members.

Process

The WG first met in June, 2018 and devised a set of ten questions to ask each of the local chairs of the peer review committees (Appendix B). Chairs were contacted via email and responded to the questions either in writing or via a scheduled phone interview. Several of the people we contacted expressed an interest in the WG's findings.

The WG initially planned to interview non-UC libraries from the Berkeley Standard Peer Comparison List. Further investigation revealed that these universities do not classify librarians in such a way that we could compare our processes and procedures with them: librarians are classified as faculty, or incorporate a different academic model where peer review is not used in librarian evaluations, or librarians are classified as non-academic employees.

Findings and Discussion

Peer review of librarians is an integral component of the librarian performance review process within UC. Selecting the librarians for the committee doing the reviews is a very important task. The members should be fair-minded and have a wide view of the Library and its collective work. Under current UC rules and procedures, each campus has autonomy for setting up their local processes and procedures for librarian peer review. The WG found that these processes and procedures vary greatly across the ten campuses. Some campuses have substantial

documentation about their internal processes, while others have very little documentation. Since the name of each campus's peer review committee also varies (CAPA, CAP, LRC, etc), this report uses PRC to refer to the local peer review committee.

The number of librarians on campus is a major determiner of how members are chosen to serve on the PRC. Except for the smaller campuses (UCM and UCSF) and UCB, all campuses incorporate some kind of election component in the selection process of the PRC members. UCLA and UCD elect their chair. UCR, UCI, UCSB, UCSD, and UCSC elect their PRC members. At the smaller campuses, everyone serves on their PRC with procedures in place to ensure confidentiality and automatic recusals when certain members are under review (such as a review initiator is automatically recused from peer reviewing a librarian they supervise). The smaller campuses may also rely on outside reviewers when needs such as deeper knowledge of a librarian's academic specialty arise. Several campuses employ a mix of appointments and elections to determine who serves on the committee. For instance, while UCSD elects all its PRC members, their local LAUC Executive Committee appoints the new chair based on the recommendation of the outgoing chair. UCD appoints all the PRC members except the chair-elect and chair, and they elect a chair-elect each year. UCB is the only larger campus that appoints all of its PRC members.

The use of ad hoc committees to provide an additional layer of review of a candidate's dossier also varies both in how they are called and when they are used. Most campuses will call an ad hoc for career status or promotion review cases. UCD does not use ad hoc committees, while UCR and UCLA use ad hocs for such tasks as when the Review Initiator (RI) and a candidate disagree on the number of salary points that should be awarded. Smaller UC's solicited help from other UCs for ad hocs. UCSD will call an ad hoc if the PRC disagrees with the RI. At UCI, only the University Librarian (UL) can call an ad hoc and the PRC does not know its make-up or outcome. UCB uses ad hocs only in career status or promotion cases, and the ad hocs are nominated by CAPA and approved by the UL.

Qualifications of librarians for PRC membership is another area where there was no absolute standard. All librarians are peer reviewed by other librarians except UCD. UCD's review process includes an additional, larger campus committee that includes non-librarians. This committee reviews all non-faculty academic employees from across the campus, including librarians. Like Berkeley, most campuses allow only librarians with career status to serve on their PRC. UCSB allows librarians with potential career status to serve on their PRC. Berkeley's qualifications to serve on CAPA include having career status, having gone through at least one review cycle, having served on an ad hoc committee, and being in the associate- or full-librarian rank.

How the other Libraries publicize their PRC requirements and procedures also varies by campus. For the smaller campuses (UCM and UCSF), this is not a problem since everyone serves on the PRC. UCSD and UCLA recommend all librarians read the documentation prior to the start of the review period, though it is unclear if everyone does this. The campuses with elections all issue a call for candidates with the requirements spelled out.

Recommendations

The Academic Reviews Working Group recommends the following:

Since UCB is the outlier in not electing any of our CAPA members, we recommend LAUC-B ExComm investigate incorporating an election component into the CAPA appointment process. We have identified several approaches to consider:

- 1) Elect the CAPA chair as a two-year position, serving as chair-elect the first year. A prerequisite to run for chair could be previous CAPA experience, and CAPA would work with the Nominating and Elections committee to provide a list of qualified individuals. The remaining five members would continue to be appointed to three-year terms, as is current practice. This change may necessitate a bylaws change.
- 2) Elect the CAPA chair from the existing committee of appointed CAPA members. Since there are two to three people coming into their third year, such a change would create a slate of 2-3 candidates each year for chair. While this would not entirely democratize the Chair selection process, it would ensure an experienced CAPA chair without putting a burden on the Nominating and Elections committee, or the need to find candidates with prior CAPA terms and a willingness to serve. This would probably not require a bylaws change.
- 3) Elect one CAPA member each year to a three year term, who will become chair for their third year. The current CAPA appointment process would fill the other vacancies for the other three year term position(s). CAPA could work with the Nominating and Elections Committee to provide a list of qualified individuals for the election slate. Members would be elected in the Spring and begin their term when the new CAPA begins in late Fall. A disadvantage to this is the potential difficulty candidates may have in committing to a major responsibility three years in the future, and the possibility of changes in circumstances that may prevent them from serving three years in the future (change in job, retirement, etc). This may also necessitate a bylaws change.
- 4) Elect at least one CAPA member each year to a three year term. Unlike option 3, this person would not automatically become chair and the current chair selection process will remain in place. The current CAPA appointment process would fill the remaining vacancies for the other three year term position(s). CAPA could work with the Nominating and Elections Committee to provide a list of qualified individuals for the election slate. The member would be elected in the Spring and begin their term when the new CAPA term begins in late Fall. A disadvantage to this is the difficulty in finding potential candidates who would be willing to run. This may also necessitate a bylaws change.

Regardless of what form these potential changes may take, our WG also recommends that CAPA and the Nominating and Elections committee work together to publicize any new

procedures and requirements to the LAUC-B membership. CAPA should also devote a small amount of time to the requirements for serving on CAPA and ad hoc committees at both the annual peer review workshop and the LAUC-B Assemblies.

Finally, we recommend sharing this report with the PRC chairs who provided us the information and with the LAUC-B membership. Several of the chairs we interviewed expressed an interest in the project and asked that we share our findings with them.

Appendix A: Working Group Charge

Charge for Academic Review Committee Appointment Process Working Group

Among the UC campuses, local practice varies as to how members are appointed to the body responsible for academic peer review of librarians. LAUC-B's Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Advancement (CAPA) suggests new members through an internal nomination process. Potential new members are selected based on a set of criteria, including having career status and having served on a CAPA Ad Hoc committee. CAPA's list of nominees is forwarded to the LAUC-B Executive Committee for discussion and official appointment. LAUC-B members have raised questions about the transparency of Berkeley's process and how to better encourage participation in CAPA membership. Other academic review appointment processes exist at other campuses.

The LAUC-B Executive Committee charges a working group to perform an environmental scan on the procedures used by librarian peer review committees across the UC system including Berkeley to appoint members, and how those procedures are publicized to local LAUC members. The group may also investigate Berkeley's peer institutions where librarians hold a comparable non-faculty academic status. This group will consist of three members: the current CAPA chair, a current Executive Committee member, and a current member of the Nominating and Elections Committee.

This working group will begin in June 2018 and report on its findings with recommendations to the Executive Committee by September 2018.

Appendix B: Peer Review Committee Chairs Questionnaire

- 1) What is the name of your peer review committee?
- 2) How many people are on the committee and how long do they serve?
- 3) Who, or what governing body, has authority for establishing review procedures?
- 4) *For non-UC libraries only:* What classification model does your institution use for academic librarians? (Non-senate academic appointment, tenure-track faculty status? non-tenure-track faculty status? Or other models?)
- 5) How are members of your institution's peer review committee selected? Volunteer, appointed, voted in? (if appointed, ask 5a)
- 5a) If appointed, how does the appointment process work; who or what governing body has the authority to make the appointments?
- 6) What is the committee composition in terms of members' job titles and/or rank? (All librarians? Faculty? Other library administrators or staff?)
- 7) Since librarians have a diverse array of expertise and specialities (cataloging, public services, instruction, archivist, etc), how do you balance the breadth of librarian experience/expertise as well as standards for transparency on the review committee?
- 8) Do you use ad hocs or other types of subcommittees in peer review? (if no, skip to question 9)
- 8a) What is purpose of the ad hoc/subcommittee? How are they appointed? What are the qualifications to be a member of an ad hoc?
- 9) What are the qualifications to be a member of the peer review committee? Experience, years of service at the institution, and status/rank? Is the MLS/MLIS required to be a member?
- 10) How are the qualifications to be a member of the peer review committee publicized at your institution?