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A. Summary of Activities

CAPA members hosted the annual CAPA workshop in December 2004 at which Acting University Librarian Robert White addressed the LAUC/SC membership and commented upon the upcoming review period and his expectations for the process.

CAPA members met with Interim Provost Dave Kliger to provide background information on the librarian review process, the criteria for appointment, promotion, and advancement, and to discuss the role of Deciding Officers within that process.

Recruitments and Appointments:

CAPA responded to the hiring supervisor’s recommendations for the Science & Engineering Librarian recruitment.

Performance Reviews:

CAPA reviewed 11 Librarian packets. One of those packets was a very late submission from the previous review period (2003-04).

Three files were recommended for advancement and promotion.

One file was recommended for no advancement.

One file was recommended for accelerated advancement.

Six files were recommended for one step advancements.

In all cases the recommendations of CAPA agreed with the Deciding Officers.
CAPA solicited and received comments, suggestions and criticisms of the appointment and review processes. CAPA met with the Acting University Librarian for a general closure discussion of the review process.

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 2004-05 review period.

C. Comments from CAPA

CAPA was impressed by the number of packets received in a timely manner during this review cycle. Although one packet was received very late in the process (August), CAPA was able to review this packet and make a recommendation to the Acting University Librarian before September 1, 2005. Therefore, it was not necessary to carry over any files.

A majority of the review packets was well organized and complete. However, CAPA would like to suggest 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. Criteria set forth in PAPAREP/LS and PAPA/LS are intentionally flexible so as to allow for differences in librarian positions and workload. It is essential that candidates and review initiators communicate throughout the review period to make sure they have a clear understanding of expectations and are interpreting the criteria in the same way.

D. CAPA Interviews and Recommendations

1. No Advancement

There was a request for a change in the timing and content of reviews after a candidate receives a “No Advancement” decision.

The LAUC membership gathered on October 13, 2005 to discuss current definitions and procedures regarding reviews following a No Advancement decision. Generally, the group agreed that a change to the procedure regarding the timing and content of reviews after a candidate receives a “No Advancement” decision should be revised to look more like the UC Irvine model with some adjustments:

1. A written assessment of the candidate’s performance should be completed each year until the candidate successfully completes a positive review and is advanced.

   • The candidate is responsible for providing a bio-bibliography and self evaluation taking into
account activities and accomplishments back to the last positive review.

- The review initiator is responsible for providing a written evaluation that determines if the candidate should or should not go up for review.

2. If the candidate and review initiator do not agree that the candidate is ready for a positive review, the candidate has the right to submit their review anyway.

[See Recommendation 1]

2. Accelerated reviews outside of the normal review period.

As a result of the LAUC membership meeting on October 13, it was noted that if a candidate requested an accelerated review outside of the normal review period and received “No Change” as the final decision, they must wait the full length of time of another review cycle before coming up for a regular review. If they choose to request a review prior to their regular review cycle, it would be considered another request for an accelerated review. There was general consensus of the membership that the candidate should be allowed to come up for review at their regularly scheduled time prior to the No Change decision and include material since the last positive action.

For example, Jane Librarian is on a three year review cycle from February 1, 2004 through January 31, 2007. Jane decided to go up for an accelerated review in January 2006 taking into account just two years of her three year cycle. At the end of this review, Jane received a decision of No Change. Our current procedure is that her review cycle begins again and she can be reviewed for a merit increase in January 2009. If she elects to go up for review earlier than January 2009, it would be considered an accelerated review. If this procedure was changed, Jane could come up for a regular merit review in January 2007 and include material back to February 1, 2004.

[See Recommendation 1]


At the October 13 meeting, there was discussion regarding a yearly discussion of goals between the review initiator and candidates.

4. Biography Supplement

Confusion was expressed around the inclusion of cumulative information in the biography supplement. Does every review have to include cumulative information from the beginning of the librarian’s career?

Appendix XV, the Academic Review Record Contents Form, lists a “Cumulative Bio-bibliography” as
one of the items to be included in a review packet. PAPA/LS, Appendix II also makes mention of a cumulative bio-bibliography.

For non-represented librarians, PAPA/LS, Appendix II, Position Paper 1 states:

7. A review for promotion or appointment to the rank of Librarian should give full consideration to the total career of the candidate. This is interpreted to be the spirit of [APM] Section 360-10c, which states: “Promotion shall be justified by demonstrated superior professional skills and achievement, and, in addition, demonstrated professional growth and accomplishment and/or the assumption of increased responsibility. The assumption of administrative responsibility is not a necessary condition for promotion.”

8. Advancement from Step IV to Step V of the Librarian rank should be predicated upon a career history of outstanding service, capped by significant achievement in the period since attaining Step IV.

For represented librarians, the MOU has language identical to that found in the APM Section 360-10c in Appendix E, Section IV, B, 3:

Promotion shall be justified by demonstrated superior professional skills and achievement and, in addition, demonstrated professional growth and accomplishment and/or the assumption of increased responsibility. The assumption of administrative responsibility is not a necessary condition for promotion.

There are advantages and disadvantages to a cumulative bio-bibliography. The advantage of a cumulative document includes the ability to produce a written record of a librarian’s career during significant reviews, such as promotion and the higher levels of the Librarian rank and allows a librarian to keep track of significant achievements throughout their career.

A disadvantage of a cumulative bio-bibliography includes the fact that for most librarians, the cumulative version of their bio-bibliography becomes an extremely long document making it difficult for CAPA to read and determine which parts to include in their assessment and recommendation.

[See Recommendation 2]

5. CAPA Letters

Concern was expressed by the absence of mention in a CAPA recommendation letter of what the candidate considered to be her/his main work outside the Library. Careful crafting of recommendations to the new UL will be especially important in the coming year as they will serve as an educational tool for the new UL about our criteria, expectations, customs, etc.
6. Recognition of advancement, acceleration, and promotion

A member commented on the desire to publicly acknowledge librarian achievements. We have the Honored Faculty/Honored Books event for the science faculty, yet we do not recognize or acknowledge the similar achievements of our librarians.

7. Survey of Interest

(This applies to LAUC as a whole): revive the old interest survey or start a new process whereby members can be assured of expressing their interest in serving on LAUC/SC and CAPA.

8. Communication

There used to be more LAUC meetings throughout the year allowing the membership to gather to discuss important issues. Year-round discussions and involvement in LAUC would help keep important issues from becoming accidentally forgotten and the continuity between a discussion and the subsequent action could be better established.

9. PAPAREP/LS and PAPA/LS

These documents (PAPAREP/LS and PAPA/LS) are out of date and should be updated to follow the University Library Web page policies (http://internal.library.ucsc.edu/comm/libwww/policy.html) to include a date updated, a contact name and an e-mail address, and the .html file extension. There are many broken links to be fixed and the AUL-HR title has changed, which should be reflected in the documents.

[See Recommendation 3]

E. Recommendations

1. CAPA recommends that Library Administration and CAPA work together to recommend changes to local policies and procedures regarding the timing and content of reviews following both “No Advancement” and “No Change” actions.

2. CAPA recommends that Library Administration and CAPA 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 first recommendation be presented to LAUC by the end of February 2006 and that this report include wording for PAPREP/LS and PAPA/LS. CAPA further recommends that a report on the other two recommendations above be presented to the LAUC membership by Spring 2006.