CAPA Report 2000-2001

October 17, 2001

CAPA Members: Catherine Soehner (Chair), Sue Chesley (Vice-Chair), Frank Gravier, Wei Wei.

A. Summary of Activities

Recruitments and Appointments:

CAPA nominated members for ad hoc Selection Committees, reviewed draft position descriptions and participated in initial meetings for the following recruitments:

McHenry Reference Librarian

CAPA responded to hiring supervisor recommendations for the following appointments:

Assistant Head of Access Services

McHenry Reference Librarian (three appointments)

Substitute Reference Librarian Pool (three appointments)

Emeritus Review:

CAPA reviewed one Librarian application for Emeritus status.

Performance Reviews:

CAPA reviewed 11 Librarian packets.

B. Previous Recommendations

There were no formal recommendations from CAPA at the end of last year that would have required action from CAPA during the 2000-2001 review period.

C. CAPA Interviews

There were several areas on which LAUC members commented.

1. Recruitment

Several members commented on the need for better consistency when administration evaluates the level of a candidate's past experience as it translates to a particular rank and step in the Librarian series. It was noted that decisions made at the time of appointment regarding rank and step have an impact on retention.

Several members commented on the fact that communication regarding new appointments was not
done in a timely fashion. Frequently, rumors preceded announcements by several months.

2. Review Process

Many LAUC members expressed a need for more guidance regarding the review process. Issues included the procedure and policy regarding letters, inclusion of cumulative information in the biobib, the need for more biobib samples in the Library office, the need for more clarity regarding the criteria for advancement, promotion and acceleration.

3. Retention

Several members were uncertain about who should be handling retention issues. Since administration makes the initial offer to a candidate at the time of appointment, why are they not able to provide a counter offer when a Librarian has a job offer from another institution?

Other members thought CAPA and the review process were an appropriate venue for handling retention issues but recommended that a clear and fair process be created to handle such issues.

There was also the suggestion that an ad hoc committee be formed to discuss the issue and present a possible plan to the LAUC membership.

D. Comments from CAPA

The work over this past year was unusual because there were a large number of appointments made and the librarian series was changed significantly. In the midst of all this hard work, one step was unintentionally executed out of order during an appointment process. Human error is inevitable under such conditions and future members of CAPA should maintain good communication with the AUL-HR and do their part to ensure that the appointment process is followed.

Another unusual situation occurred when a member of the librarian series who was not normally eligible for a review during this review cycle requested an accelerated review. While this is perfectly acceptable according to APM 360-80d, it was unusual in that the request to be reviewed was preceded by an unsolicited job offer. Since similar situations are very likely to occur again and possibly outside of the review cycle, we must prepare ourselves for this eventuality. CAPA agrees with the recommendation from the LAUC membership to create an ad hoc committee to review the process for retention. This ad hoc committee should have as one of its members the AUL-HR.

A majority of the review packets were well organized and complete. However, CAPA would like to remind everyone that a clear and concise packet, which describes accomplishments that support the criteria for advancement, promotion or acceleration allows CAPA to more easily determine how the candidate has met the criteria. Additionally, candidates should review their documentation for typographical and grammatical errors prior to submission. Criteria set forth in PAPA/LS are purposefully flexible so as to allow for differences in librarian positions and workload. It is essential that each candidate be in regular communication with their supervisor to make sure that their supervisor is interpreting the criteria in the same way as the candidate. CAPA also suggests enlisting the assistance of the review initiator to edit documentation for grammatical and typographical errors.

E. Recommendations
CAPA submits the following recommendations:

1. CAPA recommends the creation of an ad hoc committee to discuss retention and recommend a clear and fair process for the review of librarians where retention is an issue. The charge and membership for this committee should be directed by the LAUC Executive Board. CAPA recommends that one of the members on this ad hoc committee be the AUL-HR.

2. CAPA recommends the discussion of the review process at the next CAPA Workshop. Topics should include a description of the overall process, the procedure and policy regarding letters and response to letters received, inclusion of cumulative information in the biobib and an attempt to clarify the criteria for advancement, promotion and acceleration.

3. CAPA recommends that additional samples of biobibs be placed in the Library office.

Send comments to Christy Caldwell at caldwell@cats.ucsc.edu
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