CAPA Workshop

December 4, 2003

Present: Bob White, Karen Mokrzycki, Paul Machlis, Kate McGirr, Christine Bunting, Ann Hubble, Lucia Orlando, Debbie Murphy, Sheila O'Hare, Margaret Gordon, Cheryl Gomez, Beth Remak, Deborah Turner, Cynthia Jahns, Lai-Ying Hsiung

CAPA Chair Christine Bunting welcomed the Acting University Librarian and the LAUC/SC members to the annual CAPA workshop. She introduced the three other members of CAPA: Ann Hubble, Cheryl Gomez, and Catherine Soehner (vice-chair).

1. Comments from Bob White, Acting University Librarian

White prefaced his comments by stating that "the review process is one of the most important processes that a librarian goes through and participates in." He indicated that he takes the review process very seriously and sees it as one of the most important things he will do in his role as Acting University Librarian. White described his dual role as both a review initiator and as the deciding officer. He believes that the general criteria for advancement and promotion are well understood and that the process at UCSC has worked reasonably well in the past. As a result, White stated that he has no intention of charting any new territory in terms of major changes or new policy directions. My job is to see us through this process and make it a smooth one. White looks forward to working with CAPA and he will take very seriously the recommendations from CAPA. This year is very unique in that there will be both an interim University Librarian and an interim Executive Vice Chancellor. White announced that he would meet with EVC Chemers and Kate McGirr to discuss the librarian review process. CAPA will also make arrangements to meet with the interim EVC.

2. Comments from Christine Bunting, CAPA Chair

Bunting distributed a handout titled, CAPA Workshop December 4, 2003, which highlighted several important topics: the Review Calendar, meeting minutes from previous CAPA workshops and helpful documentation for the review process.

The review calendar is provided to each candidate when they receive their paperwork from their review initiators. The calendar was provided again on Bunting's handout. Additional copies of these handouts can be obtained from Bunting or Soehner. Bunting reminded everyone that since there would be no major changes to the review process this year that looking at the minutes from previous CAPA workshops could be extremely useful. Minutes from previous CAPA workshops (1997-2002) are available on the LAUC/SC Web page: http://internal.library.ucsc.edu/comm/lauc/capa/index.html

All review documentation for both represented and non-represented librarians can be found on the Web: http://library.ucsc.edu/internal/personnel/papa/papa.htm. Bunting's handout listed some of the key areas of this documentation.

As stated in the CAPA report, the packets last year were considered very well prepared and were written appropriately to the recommended action. We hope this will continue in the coming year. Please remember that the deciding officer and CAPA depend upon the packet exclusively for their recommendation or final decision and will deal only with what is presented in the documentation. As a
result, it is very important that it is clear how your contributions meet the stated criteria.

Help is available to review candidates as they prepare their documentation. First, the review initiator is available to provide assistance in completing the package. Kate McGirr is also available for both candidates and review initiators. Previous members of CAPA make good mentors. If there are other members of LAUC interested in becoming mentors, please contact Christine Bunting. A binder with examples of biobibs and self-evaluations is available in the library office.

Bunting reminded everyone that both the candidate and the review initiator are responsible for maintaining communication throughout the review process and throughout the review period. Communication between the review initiator and the candidate is essential for a smooth process. Almost all problems associated with the review process have been attributed to poor communication.

3. Questions and Answers

**Question:** Several of us reported to Lan Dyson during the majority of this past review period. How do we go about getting his input?

**Answer:** Kate McGirr responded that Dyson would provide an open letter as part of the review packet for those candidates who reported directly to him. However, each review candidate will need to get his or her biobib and self-evaluation to Dyson ahead of time and it is strongly recommended that each candidate arrange a meeting with him.

**Question:** Will merit increases be funded?

**Answer:** After reviewing recent documentation and speaking with Barbara Brogan, McGirr assumes that academic employees will have their merits funded for the 2003-04 fiscal year. The rationale for funding them was because librarians, like most academics, are reviewed on two-three year review cycles. As a result, UC considered it unfair not to fund these merit increases. Once McGirr has this information confirmed, she will send an e-mail to the librarians reflector.

**Question:** Is it ever the case that decisions regarding reviews are not based on intrinsic values but rather extrinsic or monetary concerns?

**Answer:** McGirr responded that decisions are not based on money, but are based on the merits of the packet. The money which supports merit increases comes from UCOP, so there is no incentive to base librarian decisions on money since the library will not be responsible for funding the results of those decisions.

Since there were no more questions, Bunting closed the meeting and thanked CAPA for their work last year.

Minutes by Soehner