A. Summary of Activities

CAPA participated in ten reviews. Of the ten reviews, CAPA and the deciding officer concurred with the review initiator in seven cases. In each of the three cases in which CAPA's recommendation differed from the review initiator's, the deciding officer's decision followed CAPA's recommendation. There were three regular advancements, one advancement with career status, four accelerated advancements, one accelerated advancement with career status, and one accelerated promotion.

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

B. Previous Recommendations

CAPA acted on two previous recommendations: First was a thorough discussion of the review process at the December 2001 CAPA Workshop. As recommended, topics included a description of the overall process, the procedure and policy regarding letters and response to letters received, inclusion of cumulative information in the biography supplement and an attempt to clarify the criteria for advancement, promotion and acceleration.

CAPA also placed additional samples of bio-bibliographies in the file in the Library office.

C. CAPA Interviews

-- A review initiator commented on a review which received a review-initiator recommendation of advancement and a CAPA recommendation of accelerated advancement as follows: "I ... feel that the quality of the review packet was affected. The librarian, who was recommended for acceleration by CAPA and for a streamlined review by me, would, I think, have submitted a different packet if his/her goal had been acceleration."

PAPA/LS and PAPAREP/LS 3.4.3.5 stipulate that the review initiator solicits confidential letters when CAPA finds that the dossier merits a recommendation of no action or accelerated advancement. PAPA/LS and PAPAREP/LS 3.5.1.c describe how requests from CAPA for additional information are to be handled, including the opportunity for both the review initiator and the candidate to respond to the new information. While CAPA can only agree that a candidate and review initiator aiming for acceleration will present the performance with the criteria of acceleration in mind (whereas if aiming for normal advancement, they will not normally address acceleration criteria), CAPA is not convinced that a change in procedures is advisable, such as sending the packet back for a fresh start with a view towards acceleration. CAPA finds the current procedures adequate; the candidate and review initiator
are assumed to have presented the performance as positively as possible; if CAPA disagrees with the recommendation in any way, CAPA submits its own recommendation (having followed any required procedures for additional information) and then the deciding officer considers the entire packet, including both recommendations.

-- A member commented on a colleague's review about which the member expected confidential letters to be requested not only from himself/herself but also from certain other persons in the unit. The review initiator’s decision not to request letters from these colleagues was interpreted as an attempt to present a one-sided packet rather than one which accurately represented the performance. The member commented that this lack of opportunity to comment on a colleague’s performance has a negative effect on morale.

Review initiators are given complete latitude as to who is originally approached for confidential letters. If CAPA finds areas of the performance not adequately addressed by the letters solicited, it may request additional letters, and it may indicate what topics need to be addressed or even what class of letter-writers are to be asked (faculty, internal colleagues, colleagues on an outside project, etc.) However, for reasons of confidentiality, CAPA cannot specify the names of individuals that, in CAPA's opinion, would be appropriate for comment. CAPA acknowledges therefore that it has limited power to ensure that the packet is a full representation of the performance, and both CAPA and the deciding officer must sometimes evaluate files that do not appear to present all views of the performance. This is a flaw of the system, but not one which CAPA feels fixable by a change to PAPA/LS. Review initiators however, as supervisors of a group of colleagues, may find value in this comment at it relates to morale and relations in their units.

-- A review initiator commented on a case in which CAPA recommended career status for a librarian (and the review initiator did not). "Despite the fact that the librarian was eligible for career status, [the candidate] and I had agreed that, despite an excellent performance...I would feel more comfortable evaluating the potential of [the] long-term contributions to the library, with a little more time [under the review-initiator's supervision]...The matter, however, was taken out of my hands by CAPA. As a review initiator and supervisor...I have now lost the prerogative to adequately evaluate performance before recommending that career status be granted...This lost prerogative weighs heavily on me."

CAPA is unable to find evidence in the APM, PAPA/LS, or PAPAREP/LS that review initiators have the exclusive role of recommending career status. Thus, CAPA has on this occasion (and on other occasions in the past) included career status among the actions which it is expected to consider. Both the self-evaluation and the review-initiator recommendation are appropriate places for career plans and candidate-supervisor agreements or understandings to be expressed, and such information may provide CAPA with useful information related to its charge. However, that charge is only to weigh performance against criteria and to recommend accordingly, even if its recommendation disagrees with such understandings and agreements. Whether LAUC/SC could amend PAPA/LS and PAPA/REPLS to give review initiators the prerogative to recommend career status, or whether such a procedure would require change to the APM is unclear. However, CAPA cannot recommend that such a change be considered. The strength of our review process is that it is neither wholly administrative nor wholly peer-based. It is CAPA's experience that providing deciding officers with both the administrative (review-initiator) and peer-review (CAPA) assessments of the evidence generally contributes to fairness and consistency in the process. To make the recommendation for career status the prerogative of review initiators would tilt the review process towards administrative review and, in CAPA's view, would not benefit the membership or the library as a whole.
-- A member expressed concern over instructions in PAPA/LS and PAPAREP/LS for the candidate's inclusion of cumulative information in the biography supplement. Appendix VII.4 states "Parts I.C-D and II-V are cumulative. Make sure that you highlight activities completed during the current review period, and that you describe as well as list them." The librarian noted that inclusion of activities from past review periods in non-promotional reviews is explicitly disallowed in procedures followed by at least one other UC campus. The APM, section 210-4-b says "...it is the duty of these committees to assess an individual's performance during a given review period to determine if a merit, promotion, or career status action should be recommended." The librarian felt that a cumulative record is a good management tool for review initiators, but it should not be included in documentation for CAPA, because the committee's task is to make a recommendation based only on work done during the review period. CAPA was split on this issue and felt that it should come to the membership for discussion before making any recommendations for changes to review procedures.

-- A review initiator commented on a normal merit review (without confidential letters) in which CAPA asked for additional information because it found the written evidence inadequate. In the request, CAPA quoted PAPA/LS 3.5.1.c ("[CAPA] shall...solicit additional information if, in the Committee's judgment, the written evidence is incomplete or inadequate to enable it to reach a clear recommendation.") Because more frequently, requests for additional information invoke PAPA/LS 3.4.3.b ("The review initiator solicits confidential letters from qualified persons...[when] CAPA finds that the dossier merits a recommendation of no action or accelerated advancement"), the request was misinterpreted as a request for confidential letters. CAPA regrets the misunderstanding and, with hindsight, sees how it could have been even more explicit in its request. CAPA does not propose any changes to PAPA/LS or PAPAREP/LS but encourages future CAPAs to be as clear as possible in such communications and encourages the AUL/HR to bring any questions about CAPA's intentions to CAPA for clarification.

-- A review initiator commented on the pressure experienced in trying to meet a request from CAPA for more information and at the same time follow the review calendar. While encouraging review initiators to respond in a timely manner, CAPA is aware that asking for additional information will take time. CAPA would like to remind candidates and review initiators that the priority is to ensure that the packet contains sufficient evidence to make a fair and clear recommendation. There is no penalty for taking the additional time needed to ensure that this is so. For example, any salary increases that might result from the ensuing process are retroactive to July 1st. CAPA also encourages, as it has in years past, meeting the initial submission deadline at the start of the process as the best insurance against running into time pressures later.

D. Additional comments from CAPA

CAPA notes the high number of accelerations recommended this year. Though we may speculate on the reasons, we do not see a trend and do not have any recommendations for changes to the review process based on this observation.

CAPA confirms that the self-evaluation is optional. Even when a self-evaluation is submitted, CAPA and the deciding officer need evidence of the performance, such as examples of work, minutes, unsolicited letters, etc. One value of the self-evaluation, especially for work in criteria 2-4, is in explaining or evaluating activities that may not be familiar to the other parties in the review process.
E. Recommendations

CAPA has no recommendations at this time.
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