CAPA Workshop Minutes
December 2, 1999  8:30 - 10:00 a.m.
McHenry Library, room 325

Attending: Blackmer-Reyes, Chesley, Dyson, Gomez, Gravier, Hubble, Marie, McGirr, Millsap, Mokrzycki, Murphy, Jaffe, Jahns, Ritch, Soehner, Wei, White
Guest:  Nancy Degnan

Chesley called the meeting to order with a few welcoming remarks. Jaffe began the CAPA Workshop, introducing the current CAPA members, and thanking Dyson, McGirr and Degnan for their participation, and gave an overview of the agenda, and turned the first part over to Dyson.

Dyson was asked to comment on the following three areas:

1. Changes to the Librarian series:

The comment period from the campuses ended on November 30th and no substantial comments were made. One more UC committee needs to review and approve the proposal.

The most complex part of this change will be the transition of members from the former Librarian series to the new one. The draft transition plan is not being widely distributed at this time, but Dyson has a copy and would be happy to answer questions regarding individual cases.

This is a change in the library scale, not an equity increase for librarians. In other words, no one will suddenly get a check for $6,000 as a result of this change which is why there is a need for a transition plan. If everyone who was a librarian IV now were simply to be a Librarian IV on the new scale at a vastly higher salary there would be no need for a transition plan. The only way this plan was even looked at by the University was because it was a change in scale. In other words, when people move to the new scale there may be a slight increase of a couple hundred dollars and any additional money someone gets as a result of the new sale is earned money through the review process. In some cases and in some ranks, a grandfather condition may apply where someone transitioning to a new step on the new scale may be reviewed one year earlier. The reason for that condition is to allow people the opportunity to be eligible for the higher salary in the same kind of way they would have been on the former scale. Once this new scale is in place, each librarian’s individual case will be reviewed by Dyson and McGirr to see what actions will be required as a result of the transition plan.

The new librarian scale is an excellent plan and provides several advantages desired by University Librarians to remain competitive. It starts with higher salaries, it reduces the number of reviews and therefore the amount of paperwork, it extends the length of the series, it raises the top end of the salary in a way that makes us competitive.

McGirr:  The plan was designed so that no one will lose money over the life of their career.

Question: Can you provide an example of what might happen to a person who is currently at Librarian I and who would be up for review with the new scale in place?

Librarian I is one of two ranks and steps that wind up with a special title. If at their next review they were granted a merit increase, their salary on the new scale would be equivalent to a new scale Associate Librarian VI. However, they would use the title Librarian B. They would not have to go through an extensive
review for promotion since they would have already done that in the former scale. And the new salary would be equivalent to Librarian II in the former scale. The next review after that they would be eligible for Librarian I on the new scale and would continue their future reviews as normal.

The only concern expressed by some people is that as people are reviewed and are awarded a merit increase they will actually move down in step on the new scale because the salary on the new scale is so much higher. In all cases the rank does not change and since the money is the same or higher the change in step becomes purely cosmetic. In fact, in most cases moving down a step to get to the new scale helps rather than hinders. For instance, a Librarian IV would be eligible for a new scale Librarian III and could put off facing the barrier step for several more years and perhaps be even more prepared to make a successful review through the new barrier step. The main advantage of being on a lower step on a scale that goes much higher is that it allows individuals to advance even more before facing the barrier step.

Question: How will the change affect the current review period?

One of the next steps is a meeting between UC and the union which can happen any time both parties agree to meet. The union could indicate that they want to negotiate the new scale with the overall package in July. If that happens, the scale would not be implemented during this review period. There is hope for a meeting in January or February.

There are only four steps which would be treated differently under the transition plan and these represent such a small subset of the total. Those at Librarian V should do a normal review as if there could be merit increase. Those at Librarian IV should present a packet aimed at old Librarian V, if that's the way things are going, or a packet aimed at a normal merit increase, just in case the new scale goes into place in the meantime.

2. Candidate / Review Initiator Negotiations

When CAPA discusses issues that candidates or review initiators had during the review process they often find that 75-90% of the issues are rooted in incomplete communication between the parties involved. Both the candidate and the review initiator are responsible for maintaining communication during the review process and throughout the year or years preceding the review process. Some questions have come up regarding the possibility of a recommendation for acceleration. That looks like a signal to work very closely with each the review initiator, asking "What can I do that will help make this an acceleration packet?" The final decision about the recommendation belongs to the review initiator. The University Librarian is not involved in any way. McGirr reviews each packet in its draft form to make sure that each packet is fair, persuasive and comprehensive. There are two parts to any review. The formal part is a backward looking evaluation of past performance which can't be changed. The informal portion looks more at current and future activities and is the most important part of this process.

3. Perception that advancement from step to step is almost automatic

The word "almost" is very important in this statement. Over the last several years, two people did not reach career status which would indicate that advancement is not automatic. At the same time we have to recognize that we go through a rigorous process, we go through a national search, we have high standards, we, on more than one occasion, have decided that we did not feel that the candidates that we had were of a standard that was going to make it at UCSC and have gone out and re-recruited. So, we tend to wind up with a group of librarians that are the best in the country. The standards of performance that
are both expected and achieved from colleagues here is exceedingly high. That high standard has been maintained over the last 6-7 years as we have brought in a whole new group of professionals to replace those people we lost due to early retirement and other reasons. If that is all true and we are hiring excellent people, and with those people the judgment was that it was a good match and they were performing at that high level then it is true that most people do earn their merit increases. However, it is not automatic. The review process is rigorous and it will continue to be rigorous. In more recent years letters from colleagues are more balanced due to the use of redaction.

Question: What about the increasing demand in our primary duties -- Criteria I -- and the consequences to our ability to participate in the other three Criteria necessary for promotion?

This is not so much of a problem here because we have come up with a good plan for how we relate the senior support staff (LA V) to librarians. In areas where librarians feel the most time pressure to perform in Criterion I, we have backed up our librarians with LA V's who can get rewarded for spending more time on the desk or more time doing cataloging. It seems that this isn't a pattern that is common among the other UC campuses. My hope is it allows the traditional balance between Criterion I and the other three criteria to be maintained during times when budgetary pressures would have tended to push us away from being able to participate in Criteria II-IV activities at the level we traditionally have.

Where people have not obtained career status they tended to have a lot of activity in Criteria II-IV and to fall down in their abilities in Criterion I. The focus of a librarian's job and the part they have to have down cold is Criterion I, quality of service within the library, and we try to provide the resources that enable them to do Criteria II-IV activities. While it's never a perfect world, it's the ability to balance these Criteria that distinguishes us as professionals. The balance we have tried to achieve on this campus as far as librarians are concerned is that you are expected to be good at what you do in your Criterion I activities and to show leadership -- and increasing leadership as your career goes on -- in at least one of the other Criteria.

Human Resources Update

McGirr provided an update regarding how other campuses are dealing with using email for letters of reference for the review process. Two campuses solicit and accept letters over e-mail: however, the library office does the soliciting and accepting of these letters. Two other campuses solicit letters via paper but will accept electronic versions of letters as long as they are backed up with a paper copy. All other campuses use paper only. A letter via fax is ok with a backup of a hard copy. McGirr recommended that UCSC remain the same this year as in past years, keeping both the solicitation and acceptance of letters in paper form only. This policy can be reviewed on a case by case basis if there are exceptional problems.

Nancy Degnan was asked if she had any comments from the Academic Human Resources point of view. She indicated that since the campus has to fund the increase in salary when the new scale becomes effective, a gradual transition plan will make this much easier for the campus.

Nancy also noted that electronic letters accepted in faculty reviews seem less careful and analytical so that remaining paper based would most likely serve us well.

CAPA Presentation:

Jaffe provided a handout titled "Source Documents For Librarian Reviews" (<a href=http://library.ucsc.edu/lauc/capa/99handout.pdf>http://library.ucsc.edu/lauc/capa/99handout.pdf</a>)
After briefly reviewing the documents the listed, Jaffe provided suggestions for creating packets for the review process.

The one thing to be stressed most of all is that CAPA has only the packet to work with. As hard as it may seem, we do try to address only what is documented. That it means it is important to assemble your dossier with that in mind. Make sure it is complete and clear how the contributions relate to criteria. Not only is it critical to document points, but it can also be useful to leave out unimportant material that might obscure the important items. In other words, when assembling your packet try to look at it from CAPA's perspective and make sure that it is complete and stands on its own.

It is a good idea to get help, a second pair of eyes, to look at the packet for you. Your review initiator is one source. Kate McGirr is available as a mentor for both candidates and review initiators. However, CAPA is not available to consult about your review. Recent past members of CAPA are often a good resources. Cynthia Jahns and Beth Remak were on CAPA last year. You can also consult sample Biography Supplements (“BioBibliographies”) available in the library office.

Dyson: Not only does CAPA look at the packet but the EVC looks at the packet and the UL looks at the packet and in both cases they may really not have any additional information and therefore they depend on the packet exclusively.

Question: Does CAPA look at web pages?

CAPA would like to have the URLs for any of the Web pages you cite in your documentation so that we can look them if we need to. WWW authoring is no different than anything else. The focus needs to be on the quality of the contribution and how you document it depends upon how critical the piece is to the overall packet and how you can best demonstrate of the quality of work completed during the review period.

Member Comment: Five years ago, if someone said they did something in HTML that was a big deal. Now we’re not so impressed. We want to see the actual work done.

Question: Does CAPA like to have copies of articles?

CAPA often likes to have a copy of an article but there are no hard-and-fast rules. These are judgment calls you need to make about what’s going to make sense when we look at the packet. Check with your review initiator about the number and type of supporting documents you include in your packet. It’s difficult to give blanket guidance across the board regarding the inclusion of publications and other materials. It’s up to you to put together a packet that best describes you and your work.