[Subject line] Committee for Professional Governance Report

TO: LAUC President
FR: CPG
RE: 2019-2020 Mid-Year Report

Committee Charge:

General Charge

For 2019-2020, the Committee is charged with fulfilling its standing charge, Article VIII, sec. 1.f.1.:

a. Advise the President and the Executive Board on issues that affect librarians, peer review, and other professional governance issues.
b. Serve as a review body for Divisions who may request evaluation of local peer review procedures.
c. Serve as a Bylaws review committee for proposed changes to the LAUC Bylaws. Be available to review the Divisions' Bylaws for consistency with the LAUC Bylaws and to consult with Divisions on request.
d. Address other subjects at the request of the President, and consider and develop recommendations on matters of librarian professional governance.

Specific Charges for 2019-2020

- Coordinate with LAUC divisions to gain an understanding of the variations in the Librarian appointment processes across campuses. In light of long appointment timelines, the LAUC-LA division has begun a local effort to review and assess their appointment process. Given similar reports at various divisions and related concerns for the effect these long timelines have on the libraries' abilities to appoint strong candidates, a more systematic review across divisions is due. Also make note of LAUC divisional participation in the librarian appointment process, noting variations across divisions. Upon reviewing campus practices, make recommendations for next steps to the LAUC Executive Board.

- Review the survey of local practice for Review Process, conducted by Adele Barsh at UC San Diego during the 2018-19 LAUC year. Consider whether any LAUC action logically follows from the survey findings, and recommend any next steps to the LAUC Executive Board.

- Review the CPG website with an eye to improving how the committee communicates its work to the LAUC membership. Consider improvements to displaying committee member terms, posting the chair rotation schedule, and other helpful improvements. Work with LAUC Exec and the Webmasters to make improvements.

Summary of Action Items:
- Set up regular monthly Zoom meetings for the first Monday of the month.
- Reviewed specific charges for the year focusing on the first two charges.
- Discussed, drafted, and distributed a set of questions to be sent to the CAPA Chair and Library Human Resources representative of each campus to help CPG understand the variations in the Librarian appointment processes across campuses.
- Reviewed survey of local practice for the Librarian series Review process and drafted a set of recommendations for potential future LAUC action.

[body of report] Mid-Year Report:

In response to the first charge:

For 2019-2020, the Committee on Professional Governance has been charged to:

"Coordinate with LAUC divisions to gain an understanding of the variations in the Librarian appointment processes across campuses. .... Also make note of LAUC divisional participation in the librarian appointment process, noting variations across divisions. Upon reviewing campus practices, make recommendations for next steps to the LAUC Executive Board."

CPG will look at the timeline from when a position is posted until an offer is made. Although it is a concern, delays in recruitment caused by administrative approval of a job posting or other delays while the position is not yet open for candidate applications, is not within LAUC's purview. There are many reasons for a long recruitment process, not all of which are obvious, and they can vary from campus to campus and whether or not the position is in an affiliated library. Any administrative delays, even before a posting is made public, can shift the recruitment calendar, which might run into holidays, planned vacations/leaves. Other issues include: a hiring supervisor that is new to the position and is unfamiliar with procedures or policies; affiliated libraries that have their own department HR offices and the number of offices that need to approve a decision; multiple recruitments happening at the same time; and small HR departments. It was noted that it can be frustrating when someone withdraws their application from the final short-list of viable candidates after all the work has taken place.

As a first step, each CPG division chair provided a list of individuals on their respective campuses who are involved in the recruitment process. These include: CAPA Chair, Human Resources representative, Chairs of Search Committees from previous two years, other stakeholders (e.g., Management Council, ORU Directors, etc.) that may take an active role in the recruitment process at each campus.

A list of questions has been distributed through email. At the end of this report is a copy of that letter.

CPG is in the midst of compiling the answers, some of which are still incoming, and will consider further actions and recommendations in the coming weeks.

In response to the second charge:

For 2019-2020, the Committee on Professional Governance has been charged to:

"Review the survey of local practice for Review Process, conducted by Adele Barsh at UC San Diego during the 2018-19 LAUC year, consider whether any LAUC action logically follows from the survey findings, and recommend any next steps to the LAUC Executive Board."

At our February 3, 2020 meeting, CPG discussed this survey and agreed to the following:

The composition of peer review committees varies amongst campuses. The reasons for this appear to be the size of LAUC division membership and considerations of library structures on each campus. Requiring a particular number of committee members or requiring a representative demographic (e.g. librarians reporting to their UL or librarians from affiliated units) is not practical for smaller divisions or campuses without multiple reporting structures. Therefore, LAUC CPG does not make recommendations to change the divisions' current committee structures.

The summary of practices demonstrates that schedules for local review and updates vary widely. The Committee on Professional Governance makes the following recommendations:

1. Each division should schedule annual reviews of their peer review documentation to insure all campuses are reviewing their peers based upon the same criteria, operating on best practices, and aligning with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), Academic Personnel Manual (APM), and other required documentation. Ideally, this should be done after each peer review cycle so that improvements can be made in time for the next peer review period.

While working through this charge, it came to our attention that some information is outdated on UCOP's website. Therefore, CPG makes the following recommendation:

1. Confirm and update membership lists for each LAUC division on an annual basis and report to UCOP so division membership at https://lauc.ucop.edu/ is current.

The summary of practices demonstrates that schedules for local review and updates vary widely. The Committee on Professional Governance makes the following recommendations:

1. Each division should schedule annual reviews of their peer review documentation to insure all campuses are reviewing their peers based upon the same criteria, operating on best practices, and aligning with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), Academic Personnel Manual (APM), and other required documentation. Ideally, this should be done after each peer review cycle so that improvements can be made in time for the next peer review period.

2. While working through this charge, it came to our attention that some information is outdated on UCOP's website. Therefore, CPG recommends the membership lists for each LAUC division should be confirmed and updated on an annual basis and then reported to UCOP so division membership at https://lauc.ucop.edu/ is current.

Respectfully submitted,

Names of Committee Members:
Dean Rowan (UCB)
Matt Conner (UCD)
Shu Liu (UCI)
Patrick Lavey (UCLA)
Jim Dooley (UCM)
Cherry Williams (UCR)
Marlayna Christensen (UCSD)
Sara McClung (UCSF)
Sarah Lindsay (UCSC)
Chuck Huber (UCSB)
Nina Schneider, Chair (UCLA)

Letter to campus representatives re. recruitment practices:

Dear :

The Committee on Professional Governance (CPG) of the Librarians Association of the University of California (LAUC) has been charged with exploring the recruitment process for candidates within the Librarian series. As you are aware, the time between a posted position's closing date and an offer to the chosen candidate can be quite lengthy, sometimes resulting in failed searches due to a candidate's receiving offers from other institutions with a faster recruitment timeline. LAUC CPG is gathering data to see if a pattern emerges.

We have six questions that we hope you can answer by **March 31 [note: some deadlines have been extended from the original deadline of February 7]**

1. Over the past 2 years (2018-2019), how many recruitments were conducted for a position in the Librarian series?

2. Over the past 2 years, what was the median timeline for recruitment on your campus between the application's closing date until an offer?

3. How many of these recruitments resulted in failed searches?

4. How many of these failed searches were due to the desired candidate/s withdrawing their application?

5. Which campus groups are usually involved in the interview day/s? (e.g. Search Committee, University Librarian, Human Resources personnel, Department staff, etc.)

6. In your experience, is there an obvious bottleneck (within the purview of LAUC), which make speedy recruitments impossible? For instance, is the delay in common scheduling on the interview day, CAPA review, or in reference checks?

Your answers will be kept confidential within LAUC and I will remove any identifying information. If there is a need for specific examples or follow-up, I will contact you before proceeding.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Please don't hesitate to contact me with questions or concerns.

Sincerely,
[Division chair of CPG] and Nina Schneider, CPG Chair, LAUC