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A. Summary of Activities
CAPA members hosted the annual CAPA workshop in December 2005 where University Librarian Virginia Steel addressed the LAUC/SC membership and commented upon the upcoming review period and her expectations for the process.

Prior to the CAPA workshop, CAPA members met with UL Steel to discuss her vision of the role of CAPA in the peer review process.

Recruitments and Appointments:
CAPA reviewed job announcements for the following positions:
Substitute librarian pool
Temporary Access Services Librarian
Cataloging/Metadata Librarian
CAPA also recommended a slate of names for an ad-hoc committee for this last position.

Performance Reviews:
CAPA reviewed seven Librarian packets. One of those packets was a very late submission.
Five files were recommended for one step advancement.
One file was recommended for acceleration.
One file was recommended for advancement and promotion.

In all cases, CAPA and the Deciding Officers were in agreement.

CAPA solicited and received comments, suggestions and criticisms of the appointment and review processes.

CAPA met with the University Librarian for a general closure discussion of the review process.

B. Previous Recommendations
The 2005 CAPA report contained the following recommendations:

1. CAPA recommends that Library Administration and a member of LAUC work together to recommend changes to local policies and procedures regarding:
   A. The timing and content of reviews following both No Advancement and No Change actions.
   B. An annual required review or annual plan process for all librarians.

2. CAPA recommends that Library Administration and a member of LAUC (preferably the same member mentioned in Recommendation 1) clarify the requirement for a cumulative bio-bibliography as part of the review process at UCSC and determine the advisability of a cumulative bib-bibliography for every review.
3. CAPA recommends the PAPAREP/LS and PAPA/LS be updated to follow the University Library Web page policies (http://internal.library.ucsc.edu/comm/libwww/policy.html).

4. CAPA recommends that a report on the three recommendations above be presented to the LAUC membership by Spring 2006.

2006 update on the 2005 recommendations:
1. Parts A and 1B are still under review by Library Administration
2. A cumulative Bio-bibliography is required for every review.
3. Library Administration is still working on the PAPAREP/LS and PAPA/LS updates.
4. CAPA chair gave a progress report to the LAUC Executive Board in Spring 2006.

C. Comments from CAPA

CAPA was impressed by the number of packets that were turned in promptly during this review cycle: CAPA made a concerted effort to minimize the turnaround time between receiving and returning packets to Library Administration. CAPA was surprised to receive several packets very late in the academic year, even though some had been turned in punctually by the candidates in January. Most of the review packets were well organized and complete. CAPA would like to reiterate comments from previous years stating the importance of clear communication between the candidates and review initiators throughout the review period to make sure that there is a clear understanding of expectations and that criteria are being interpreted in the same way.

D. CAPA Interviews and Recommendations

Comments received this year by CAPA shared one theme: dismay at the length of time it took to receive a final response. Members complained about disheartening delays and an absence of concern for how the delays would be perceived by the staff involved in the process (both reviewees and reviewers), why did this process drag on so long, delays in receiving responses to submitted packets were excessive, I felt that my work was not valued. CAPA agrees with the membership that staff morale drops and the review process is devalued in the face of extensive delays.

In CAPA’s closure meeting with the University Librarian, she provided the following response to the draft CAPA report, addressing primarily the end of year CAPA interviews:

This year, delays occurred at all points in the review process. Some of the delays could be attributed to a combination of unusual circumstances, some of which were unavoidable, but others seem to indicate a lack of adherence to the Review Calendar. Additionally, the University Librarian, in her capacity as Deciding Officer, provided extensive letters which addressed not only past but future performance issues. Such letters inevitably took more time to compose than boiler plate responses. One question that should be addressed at the membership meeting is whether librarians see the value of receiving such personal and extensive responses, or would they prefer a prompt but perfunctory yes or no response to their files.

Additionally, CAPA and the University Librarian agreed that it would be a good idea to discuss what kinds of procedures could be implemented to better insure that deadlines are met by all parties involved in the review process, and also, how to best notify those involved in cases of unavoidable delays.