

Departmental Review Procedures

This document focuses on the internal department procedures that implement the department review specified in the APM and CAPM. General procedures are included in the APM and CAPM. Departments are advised to adopt more specific procedures for the items in **green** below. Please forward a copy of any written departmental review procedures to your dean and Academic Personnel.

Key Acronyms/Symbols:

APM = Academic Personnel Manual (University of California)—APM

CAPM= Campus Academic Personnel Manual (UC Santa Cruz campus)—CAPM

The CALL= Eligibility List for Senate Academic Personnel Actions—CALL Letter and Calendar

Bold Type= Best Practice (Identified by Campus Departmental Procedures Workgroup)

*The duties of the department chair may be delegated to a committee or other faculty member

Responsible	Task	Resources
Chair*	Review status and determine who to review Annually review status and performance of each faculty member in the spring quarter. Check the CALL. Are reviews warranted for faculty not on the CALL, including those at indefinite steps? Discuss research plans, teaching, and service with every assistant professor annually. Refer to Incompetent Performance section of APM for cases of unsatisfactory performance	APM 220-80-b CALL Letter and Calendar APM 075 Termination for Incompetent Performance
Chair or department manager	Notify faculty being reviewed Faculty being reviewed should be notified in spring quarter of the action, informed about the review process, deadlines to submit materials, and made aware of APM 210, CAPM 410.220, CAPM 200.160 and other appropriate sections.	Checklist to Assure Fairness APM 220-80-c APM 210 review criteria CAPM 410.220 CAPM 200.160
Department option	Deadline for candidate to submit materials. Department chair determine whether department will adopt campus deadline for materials (first day of fall quarter) to be submitted by all candidates or set earlier deadline.	Campus Deadlines CAPM 400.220
Chair and Candidate	Chair should be helpful in responding to the candidate's questions and in advising on what to submit for review by deadline. As criteria for evaluation varies among disciplines, candidates may request guidance from department colleagues about the review criteria as they are used in the department.	Checklist to Assure Fairness APM 220-80-c APM 210 review criteria
Chair and candidate	Candidate submits list of possible reviewers in spring quarter Soliciting confidential letters Letters are required for appointment to a tenured position; promotion to tenure; mid-career appraisal; promotion to professor; merit to Professor Step VI and merit to Professor Above-Scale. Candidate submits a list of suggested reviewers as well as those who the candidate feels may not be objective (both internal and external) in the review. A reviewer named as possibly not objective is not necessarily barred from participating in the review; however, the department should have good reason to include the input of a reviewer named as possibly not objective.	Link to sample solicitation letters CAPM 401.220
Department Option	Determine how to choose reviewers. Some departments may solicit input from all department faculty and some may have reviewer names recommended by committees or some leave this to the chair. Department must include a reasonable number nominated by the candidate. If department faculty have input into the selection of internal and external reviewers, the department chairperson should request the list of suggested reviewers from the candidate in time to discuss them with the department faculty before the last department meeting in spring quarter .	APM 220-80-c CAPM 401.220
Chair or department manager	Securing reviewers Chair should call or email prospective reviewers in the spring and summer to secure their commitment to submit a review letter when solicited in fall quarter (some departments may solicit these letters in the summer).	
Chair and Candidate	Submission of materials Candidate submits materials (bibliography, publications or website of publications, self-statement, etc.) for review file by established campus (first day of fall quarter) or department deadline. Chair is responsible for ensuring that faculty submit a complete set of required materials no later than the deadline. In justifiable circumstances, the chair, upon request by the faculty member, may request up to a 30-day extension to this deadline. The dean has authority to approve these extensions.	Checklist to Assure Fairness Campus Deadlines Campus Deadline Policy CAPM 400.220.2 Link to sample optional

	<p>Alternative formats (CD, electronic versions or websites) of publications are encouraged.</p> <p>A self-statement (refer to the Candidate's Optional Statement in the Checklist to Assure Fairness) is highly recommended in order to guide and expedite the department's review. This document should explain the work and accomplishments during the review period and address problem areas, if any.</p> <p>Descriptions and explanations of teaching as well as service outside the department, campus or university are encouraged. Sample tests, syllabi, reading lists may be included as evidence of teaching.</p> <p>Complete Checklist to Assure Fairness items 1-5.</p>	statement Link to advice on identifying contributions to joint work.
Chair	<p>Decide what to send to outside reviewers</p> <p>It is important for the candidate to understand what is being sent out to reviewers and that faculty within the department are treated substantially the same in similar situations. For tenure review, send all the publications that the candidate submits. For other actions, the candidate and/or department may decide to send reviewers a sub-set of publications/creative work from the review period.</p> <p>Reviewers should be given the candidate's biobibliography, self-statement, publications/creative work, etc.</p>	
Department manager	<p>Send solicitation letter and candidate's review materials to reviewers</p> <p>Send the solicitation letter no later than September 30th in order to receive a response in time to meet the deadline for submission of review files to the division.</p> <p>Departments should send electronic versions (CD, web site) of publications/creative work to reviewers if possible. Give all letter writers a deadline to respond, usually 30 days after receipt of the materials. Contact letter writers who have not responded as the deadline approaches to check on the status of the letter and give a final extended deadline if necessary. Responses to solicited letters may be received via postal services, fax or email.</p>	Link to sample solicitation letter
Chair	<p>Adding letters to the review file</p> <p>The number of letters needed is determined by what is required to make the case; it could be as few as three, as many as six. The most effective letters are analytical and from leading experts in the discipline. It may not be necessary to hold the file waiting for letters not received if the letters in hand provide a thorough assessment of the candidate.</p> <p>"No response" should be indicated on the list of letter writers for those who do not submit a letter. All letters received, including declining and unsolicited letters, must be included in the file. (See section below, "redacting confidential materials" for instructions on declining letters.)</p> <p>The department may receive unsolicited letters from faculty, students or other interested parties. All unsolicited material (unless received by the University with the understanding that the identify of the author will be held in confidence to the extent permissible by law) is non-confidential. Chairs may check with the letter writer to ascertain whether the letter was intended to be confidential or not.</p> <p>An unsolicited letter should be clearly marked 'unsolicited-confidential' or 'unsolicited-non-confidential,' as appropriate, before adding it to the review file.</p>	APM 160-20-c(4) and CAPM 200.160
Chair or department manager	<p>See appropriate document inventory for list of documents to include in review file.</p>	Document inventories
Chair or department manager	<p>Candidate inspection of non-confidential material</p> <p>Notify candidate that non-confidential materials in the review file may be inspected. This is candidate's chance to be sure that all of the appropriate materials have been included. Complete</p> <p>Checklist to Assure Fairness item 6.</p>	APM 160-20-c(4) and CAPM 200.160 Checklist to Assure Fairness
Chair or department manager	<p>Redacting Confidential material for candidate</p> <p>The chairperson gives the candidate a redacted copy (as defined in APM 160-20-c(4) and 200.160) of the confidential academic review letters that will be included in the review file. Assign each reviewer an alpha identifier and delete letterhead and signature block.</p> <p>Declining letters are not provided to the candidate, but should be attached to the list of letter writers when the file is sent forward. This protects the identity of the letter writer who may be identified by the reasons they are unable to provide a letter.</p> <p>Refer to section 200.160 for further information concerning confidential documents.</p> <p>Complete Checklist to Assure Fairness item 7.</p>	APM 160-20-c(4) and CAPM 200.160 Checklist to Assure Fairness
Candidate	<p>Candidate optional response</p> <p>Candidate may include a written response to the material in the review file within 10 working days. The chair may grant an extension to the deadline in cases of illness or exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Complete Checklist to Assure Fairness items 8-9.</p>	Checklist to Assure Fairness
Department Option	<p>Determining faculty eligible to access the review file and vote</p> <p>Refer to academic senate bylaw 55 and departmental voting procedures (should be on file in Academic Personnel).</p> <p>Department faculty should be given a time frame in which to review the file prior to the department meeting when the file will be discussed. Suggested time frame: allow one week for review before department meeting.</p>	Bylaw 55

	<p>In developing the departmental voting policy consider: whether to extend voting rights per bylaw 55 voting method: secret ballot, email, phone whether to receive votes after meeting and if so, how long after</p> <p>Faculty on leave Departments should develop a procedure to handle faculty who are on leave during the review. Departments may consider having faculty on leave automatically waive their right to vote since they are neither present for the discussion nor usually available to read the review file. The prior spring or at the time the leave is approved is a good time to discuss with faculty their participation in personnel actions while on leave.</p>	
Department Option	<p>Department meeting</p> <p>Departments may choose to have a sub-committee, a particular faculty member, or the chair analyze the review file and present the material. Some chairs come to the dept meeting with a draft department letter to help frame the discussion.</p>	APM 220-80-e
Department Option	<p>Department augmentation</p> <p>In the case of small departments or programs, the Divisional Dean or the unit may propose that one or more tenured faculty from other departments be temporarily appointed to join the department for participation in personnel matters. An augmentation proposal must be reviewed by the dean, CAP and approved by the CP/EVC. Appointments through augmentation carry Bylaw 55 voting rights.</p>	Bylaw 55 CAPM 414.220 See Senate Bylaw 13.4.3 , 13.4.4 , and 13.4.5
Chair	<p>Draft Department Letter</p> <p>Evaluate (rather than summarize) the evidence in the review file in accordance to the criteria (APM 210) for the particular action.</p> <p>Include the exact vote(s) of the eligible department faculty. If there are negative votes and nothing negative came up in the department discussion, say so.</p> <p>All references to confidential letter writers must be by alpha code.</p>	<p>Suggestions for department letters of evaluation may be reviewed in CAPM appendix 4</p> <p>APM 220-80-e</p> <p>APM 210</p>
Chair or Department Manager	<p>Faculty Review of the department letter</p> <p>The department letter is available for review, before the review file is forwarded, by all members of the department eligible to vote on the review file. Set a deadline (suggest one week from notice that letter is available) for the review of the department letter and any suggested changes.</p> <p>Eligible department faculty can suggest revisions to the department letter.</p>	APM 220-80-e
Department faculty	<p>Minority letter</p> <p>Academic Personnel policy, 220-80-e, states that the department's letter "shall report the nature and extent of consultation on the matter within the department and present any significant evidence and difference of opinion." On rare occasions, a minority letter may be employed when it is necessary to express a disagreement or a differing point of view. When an eligible department faculty member believes that the department does not adequately represent her/his views, he/she may submit a minority letter directly to the department chair for attachment or inclusion in the department letter. In the same way that specific views of individual faculty members are not identified in the department letter nor are faculty required to reveal their votes, an attached minority opinion need not bear a signature. However, the chair must know the author of the minority letter in order to verify eligibility to vote on the action. The chair may incorporate the minority language or attach the minority letter to the departmental letter.</p> <p>If a minority letter is added or incorporated, the faculty must be notified and given an opportunity to review the newly revised letter. Set a deadline for the review of this revised letter (suggest one week from notice).</p>	APM 220-80-e
Department chair only	<p>Department chair letter</p> <p>The chairperson of the department may submit a separate independent evaluation, which may differ from the department. The chairperson may not introduce new evidence but bases the evaluation on the review file.</p> <p>During the review, the letter is not shared with the candidate or the rest of the department. This letter will be available to the candidate in redacted form after the final decision has been issued if the candidate requests access to the review file.</p>	APM 220-80-e
Chair or department manager	<p>Candidate given copy of department letter</p> <p>The candidate is provided with a copy of the department evaluation and recommendation. Check to be sure alpha codes replaced each confidential reviewer name.</p> <p>Complete Checklist to Assure Fairness item 10.</p>	APM 220-80-e Checklist to Assure Fairness
Candidate	<p>Candidate optional response</p> <p>The department chair informs the candidate that he/she may submit a written response to the department letter within ten days from the receipt of the letter. A deadline is set for the candidate's response and recorded on the Checklist to Assure Fairness. The candidate's comment may be sent to the department or directly to dean. If the candidate chooses to send a comment directly to the dean, it is confidential from the department. The candidate's comment, if any, will be included in the review file</p> <p>Departments are not encouraged or required to respond to the candidate's response.</p> <p>Complete Checklist to Assure Fairness items 11-12.</p>	APM 220-80-e Checklist to Assure Fairness
Chair or department	<p>Forward the file to the dean</p>	APM 220-80-f

manager	Questions concerning the status of the review file may be directed to the divisional academic personnel coordinator	
Chair or department manager	<p>Additional Information after file has left department</p> <p>Additional information will be requested if needed. Departments should consult with their division about the appropriateness of forwarding additional materials that have not been requested. Any additional material forwarded after the file has left the department is accompanied by a completed Checklist for Additional Information.</p> <p>If a promotion is tentatively not approved, the preliminary assessment process will provide an occasion for any late letters or other information to be added to the review file.</p>	<p>Checklist for Additional Information</p> <p>APM 220-80-h</p>
Candidate/Chair	<p>Preliminary assessment</p> <p>If the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor's preliminary assessment of the file (appointment, reappointment, appraisal, non-reappointment or promotion) is contrary to that of the department, the dean or CAP, the CP/EVC will notify the dean and CAP indicating the reasons and request any further information that may support a different decision.</p> <p>A checklist to assure fairness for additional information must accompany any material submitted.</p>	<p>Checklist to Assure Fairness</p> <p>APM 220-80-j</p>
Candidate/Chair	<p>Preliminary assessment of an Assistant Professor</p> <p>If preliminary assessment occurs for promotion or reappointment of Assistant Professors, the candidate is notified in writing of the tentative decision by the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor. The CP/EVC provides the candidate, department chair, and dean the documents added to the review file subsequent to the department review.</p> <p>The candidate has ten days to respond to or comment upon the material provided. The candidate has the option of sending his/her response to the department or directly to the dean. A response sent directly to the dean will be kept confidential from the department.</p>	<p>Checklist to Assure Fairness</p> <p>APM 220-84-b</p> <p>CAPM 404.220</p> <p>APM 160-20-c</p> <p>CAPM 200.160</p>
Chair	The department has twenty days to comment on, or respond to the material provided in the preliminary assessment. The chair gives a copy of the department's response to the candidate.	
Candidate	<p>The candidate has five days to respond to the department's response to the preliminary assessment. The candidate has the option of sending his/her response to the department or directly to the dean. A response sent directly to the dean will be kept confidential from the department.</p> <p>The information shall be forwarded to the dean, accompanied by a completed Checklist to Assure Fairness: Response to Preliminary Assessment for an Assistant Professor. The dean shall add his/her comment and forward the material to the Academic Personnel Office.</p>	<p>Checklist to Assure Fairness: Response to Preliminary Assessment for an Assistant Professor</p>

APO; fall 2006