CAPA Report 1998-99
CAPA Members: Cynthia Jahns, Chair; Lee Jaffe, Vice-Chair; Elisabeth Remak-Honnef; Jacquelyn Marie.

A. Summary of Activities

CAPA nominated members for the following Ad Hoc Selection Committees:
Media Development Librarian
Serials Cataloger

CAPA participated in the following recruitments and appointments:
Substitute Librarian (Science Library)
Temporary Science Reference Librarian
Serials Cataloger
Media Development Librarian

CAPA participated in 15 reviews. CAPA and the deciding officer concurred with the review initiator in all cases.

CAPA commented on the use of a continuous recruitment process for substitute Reference Librarians.

The notebook of sample reviews (kept in the Administrative Office) was weeded and more recent sample reviews were included.

B. Previous recommendations

Previous recommendations have been implemented.

C. CAPA Interviews

These comments were received:
⚠️ The review process is time-consuming and onerous, especially when the perception is that advancement from step to step is almost automatic.
⚠️ It's important for review initiators to meet with reviewees often enough during the review period that there are no surprises in the review.
⚠️ Perhaps there should be documentation for review initiators that would guide them through the process.
⚠️ The librarian review calendar's schedule for letters to outside referees allows very short response times. The slow pace of campus mail systems at both ends of the process should be taken into account, as well as the fact that many librarians are at ALA around the time the letters go out. Comments were received from outside referees who worried that their lateness would reflect badly on the candidate and who were upset about having so little time to respond.
⚠️ Several librarians asked for clarification about how acceleration recommendations and decisions are made.

D. Comments from CAPA

Many packets received this year were excellent. Some of these were added to the notebook of sample reviews kept in the Library Office.

CAPA continues to urge that packets be made as concise as possible.
⚠️ Extraneous email detracts from the more substantive material, and is particularly frustrating when the sender's relationship to the reviewee is unclear.
⚠️ Candidates should include the URLs for web pages to which they refer.
⚠️ We urge review initiators to edit files more severely, and urge reviewees to be more responsive to these suggestions.
⚠️ Only outside activities that employ one's professional expertise as a librarian should be included in the packet. APM 210-4.e.3.c states:
  (c) University and Public Service -- Recognition should be given to those who participate effectively and imaginatively in library-wide and University service (including serving on campus or University-wide administrative or academic committees), and in professional librarian services to the community, state, and nation.
The amount of documentation and degree of detail in a review packet should reflect the action being taken. When no action will be taken, as in a Librarian V review, the packet should be particularly concise.

E. Recommendations

1. CAPA recommends that the AUL-HR provide the LAUC-SC membership with the names of those librarians selected as members of the Ad Hoc Selection Committee during the recruitment process. PAPA/LS specifically states that the membership of this committee is not confidential. The names of the committee members could be sent out at the same time as the final job description.

2. CAPA recommends that the LAUC-SC membership review the "UCSC Librarian Review Chronology" at http://bob.ucsc.edu/library/internal/personnel/papa/libchron.htm

CAPA recommends that the LAUC-SC membership vote to approve the chronology.

3. CAPA recommends that the review initiators, CAPA, the University Librarian, and the AUL-Human Resources meet to discuss issues surrounding the review process. We believe this would be especially helpful for new review initiators.