

## CAPA annual report 2015-2016:

Daniel Goldstein, chair

Michael Colby, vice chair/chair-elect

Axel Borg, member

Melissa Browne, member

Deanna Johnson, member

### Appointments:

CAPA reviewed and supported the appointments of seven new librarians.

### Recommendation for Appointments:

- APM 210-4-d-1 states, in part: *“In the case of an appointment, opinions from colleagues in other institutions where the candidate has served and from other qualified persons having firsthand knowledge of the candidate’s attainments are to be included, if feasible.”*

Accordingly, Appointment files sent to CAPA for review should, in future, include information derived from references, whether letters or interview notes. This was not done in academic year 2015-2016.

### Reviews:

Over the past few years, CAPA’s process has evolved in response to its experience working with the new point system and revised review documents. Before any recommendations are determined, CAPA evaluates multiple packets, focusing initially on statements of responsibility and engages in extensive discussion to which members bring their knowledge of this library and the profession to develop a shared understanding of the duties, opportunities, challenges and workload of librarians. It also reviews, discusses and debates the governing documents of the review process in order to develop a shared sense of how to apply them to specific files. The committee’s recommendations thus emerge from an analysis of individual review files that is firmly grounded in its knowledge of the library, the profession and the review policies. In short, the committee exercises academic judgement and, insofar as the diverse nature of librarians’ duties and careers, permit, seeks to ensure that the recommendations are consistent with each other.

In studying the review documentation, CAPA realized that the requirement that Promotion and Career Status reviews be full-career reviews had been inadvertently left out of the revisions. LAUC-D is addressing this oversight.

Review Actions: In 2015-2016, CAPA reviewed a total of 14 files, resulting in the following recommendations:

Promotions 2

Standard Merit: 4

Off-cycle Standard Merit: 1

Greater than Standard: 7

Different recommendation than that of the Review Initiator: 5

Recommendations for Reviews:

- As CAPA's decision-making process is more nuanced than it has had to be under the old system, consider providing CAPA with additional weeks in the Review Calendar.
- Candidate's files should be well organized and the items therein be clearly explained (comprehensible to a non-librarian), dated (demonstrably falling within the review period) and placed in appropriate categories (criteria a-d). No-one has a better understanding of the challenges and successes reflected in a candidate's accomplishments than the candidate him/herself so candidates need to take great care in prioritizing and explaining the material in their file in order to present as compelling a case as possible in support of the desired action.
- While the candidate plays an essential role in creating the file, both the APM (360-80-g) and MOU (5.H) assign to the Review Initiator the responsibility to ensure that the file is complete.
- Candidates' statements and documents and Review Initiators' letters must articulate a clear basis and explicit rationale for the recommendation.
- Given the many stages of the review process, candidates' statements, recommendations and responses thereto should be placed in chronological sequence when loaded into the MIV so that evaluators can readily follow the exchange of views.
- In addition to the usual start of review cycle meeting with librarians, the CAPA chair and vice-chair, and Library HR should meet with Review Initiators to go over their expectations for Review Initiators' letters.
- In the event that CAPA is not in agreement with the Review Initiator's recommendation and/or candidate's request, its letters should explicitly address those points of disagreement. It is not sufficient to make only the positive case in support of its recommendation.
- CAPA recommendations should include a reminder that the University Librarian and subsequent reviewers (if any) may request clarification or additional explanation from CAPA.