
A. Summary of Activities

CAPA reviewed the following changes to the APM and CAPPM:
APM 360 revised to allow payment of administrative stipends CAPPM 324.000 revised guidelines for review of the University Librarian

CAPA nominated members for the following committees:
Ad Hoc Committee, University Librarian Review Ad Hoc Selection Committee, Head of Access Services

CAPA participated in the following recruitments and appointments:
Substitute Librarian
Head of Access Services

CAPA acted on one request for deferral of review and one request for emeritus librarian status.

CAPA participated in eleven reviews. Of the eleven reviews, CAPA and the deciding officer concurred with the review initiator in eight cases. Of the three cases in which CAPA’s recommendation differed from the review initiator’s, the decision followed the review initiator’s recommendation. There were four regular advancements, three regular promotions, one accelerated promotion and one advancement to Librarian V. Two reviews resulted in no change in status.

CAPA solicited and received comments from the members regarding the recruitments, appointments and review process. It also met with the University Librarian.

B. Previous Recommendations

All previous recommendations have been implemented and are included in the current (1/98) version of PAPA/LS.

C. CAPA Interviews

Some questions were raised as a result of reassignments and/or changes in primary supervisor. As a general point of information, CAPA reminds the membership that the committee’s role in appointments is clearly defined but that it has no such role in library restructuring or reassignments (PAPA/LS 2.1; APM-360.20.e).

One member requested clarification regarding procedures for evaluation and documentation during review periods involving more than one primary supervisor. Current practice at Santa Cruz agrees with procedures at other campuses; the review initiator requests an open letter from the former primary supervisor at the time of the formal review. Since the possibility of requesting a formal letter of evaluation at the time of reassignment was raised and discussed by CAPA, the committee explored possible ramifications and parallel practices within academic titles. Concerned members may wish to review APM-160.20 and APM-360.35 for information regarding the maintenance of, access to, and opportunity to request amendment of academic personnel records. CAPA was unable to find evidence of use of "letters to the file" or similar documentation as part of the academic review process. CAPA acknowledges that there may be some benefit to creating documentation of performance at the time that a reporting relationship is changed. However, the practice would seem to create more problems than it would solve. Questions raised included: where would such an evaluation be held, at what point is it made available to the candidate, would a response be possible, and if so, when? Individuals may wish to request, or provide an informal letter at the time of the transfer, thus ensuring that the supervisor
is able to refer to something other than memory when a formal letter is requested.

One review initiator expressed concern regarding the lack of communication between CAPA and the initiator in cases where CAPA does not concur with the review initiator's recommendation. Both the APM-210.4.D.2 and PAPA/LS 3.4.3.g address assessment of the documentation in terms of adequacy for the purpose of making a recommendation. In the APM the review committee is directed to solicit further evidence, through the AUL, HR or Director of Academic Human Resources (for those reporting to the UL); "if, in the committee's judgment, the evidence in incomplete or inadequate to enable if to reach a clear recommendation." PAPA/LS states "if during subsequent committee review of a recommendation the academic review record is found to be incomplete or inadequate, the committee(s)... may ask the review initiator for additional documentation and/or clarification of existing documentation." At no time is CAPA directed to request further elaboration when it considers the evidence to be sufficient to support an action other than recommended by the review initiator, nor is there any role suggested for CAPA as a negotiator with the review initiator.

D. Comments from CAPA

In previous years CAPA and the membership have moved to revise procedures so as to streamline the process and minimize the burdens imposed by performance review process. Care and selectivity in drawing together the review documentation should not become incompatible with streamlining. Some of the packets forwarded during this review cycle failed to focus on substantive activities and contributions. Indiscriminate inclusion of mail of the "thanks for doing this" variety may eclipse more important achievements or it may appropriately be interpreted by the committee as an attempt to cloak the absence of meaningful action. Documentation should be clean and coherent. CAPA deplores the sloppiness, carelessness, and egregious errors contained in some of the packets. CAPA applauds efforts to minimize the time expended on the review process but documentation submitted for review should exhibit the same care we hope is expended in preparing library handouts, reports, and instructional materials.

E. Recommendation

Last year the membership voted to adopt the CAPA recommendation which altered PAPA/LS 3.4.3.b from:
Solicits confidential letters from qualified persons, including a reasonable number from those whose names have been provided by the candidate, when:
to:
Solicits confidential letters from qualified persons, including a reasonable number from those whose names have been provided by the candidate, in the following cases. However, even in the cases below, letters will not be solicited if the packet contains written consent from the review initiator, the candidate, and CAPA to non-solicitation of letters.

The circumstances under which letters were to be solicited had already been circumscribed to include only those involving extraordinary action or major steps in the librarian series. Letters and their solicitation are the primary conduit of peer evaluation and direction. Letters were mandated when:
a. The candidate is eligible for promotion; or career status; or advancement from Librarian III to Librarian IV; or advancement from Librarian IV to Librarian V.
b. The candidate requests an accelerated advancement. c. The candidate requests consideration for accelerated advancement or the review initiator finds that the dossier merits a recommendation of no action, or when the previous review resulted in no action. d. CAPA finds that the dossier merits a recommendation of no action or accelerated advancement.
A candidate at Associate Librarian VII or Librarian IV whose previous review resulted in no action could request that no letters be solicited. No letters were solicited for a candidate at Librarian V. Critical steps such as conferral of career status and promotion through the librarian ranks warrant the commentary provided by letters. CAPA recommends reversal of the current language to ensure solicitation of letters for key events in a librarian’s career.