

REVISED: February 2015

**ORU DIRECTORS
ORU MANAGEMENT SERVICE OFFICERS**

SUBJECT: Review and Voting Guidelines for Academic Research Personnel in ORUs

- 1. Voting Requirement** - Any and all proposed file actions (new appointments, merits, promotions, accelerations, appraisals, career reviews, change in series appointments, no changes, etc.) of non-visiting Academic Personnel in ORUs shall be reviewed and voted on by a minimum of three academic members consisting of either the ORU's Executive Committee (EC), or an otherwise designated Ad Hoc Committee, made up of UCSD appointees with adequate expertise to objectively evaluate the candidates' progress and achievements. The majority of the Ad Hoc committee's (e.g. two out of three) should have a formal association with the ORU.
- 2. Eligibility to Vote** - Is restricted to EC or Ad Hoc members who are academics of the Associate or Full rank, and should be of at least the same rank or higher than the candidate; these UCSD appointees may be either professors or non-Senate academics. To facilitate the Academic Personnel (AP) process, one member of the review committee may be designated as lead on AP matters, or a subcommittee of the EC may be charged with the activity, depending on the size and membership of the EC. In order to maintain as much objectivity and equity as possible, the Director and/or a candidate's mentor, collaborators, or co-authors may not be a voting member of the EC or Ad Hoc Committee for that candidate.
- 3. Votes Documented** - The votes will be reflected on the final summary form. Additionally, confirmation of the committee's assembly as well as the recorded votes will be noted in the Director's letter. The Director's letter will include a breakdown of committee members by series/rank (i.e. – two full Professors and four full Research Scientists met to review the proposed file of...), votes, and reason/s for any abstentions, recused or negative votes.
- 4. Committee Reports** –These reports are optional and at the Director's discretion for inclusion as a file component but may be included at any time that the Unit determines it to be helpful for documentation purposes. Please note that Units are strongly encouraged to include Committee Reports for all CAP and PSSRP file actions, particularly Career Reviews, 4th-Year Appraisals and 6th-Year Readiness Assessments. If these reports are included in the file, they should be signed by all members on the committee and reason/s for any abstentions, recused or negative votes should be clearly explained. If a Committee Report is not included with the file, then the Director's letter content must meet the rigors of the review components and documentation requirements.
- 5. Mentor Letters** – For all actions for the Project Scientist series (all ranks) as well as the Assistant Research Scientist level, files will include mentor letters. If the Director is also the candidate's mentor, the Associate Director will write the department letter (or the chair of the Executive Committee if there is no associate director).
- 6. For the Academic Coordinator Series** - a mentor/supervisor letter is not required, but may be included at the discretion of the Director. Additionally, the review committee will consist of at least 3 UCSD appointees with adequate expertise to objectively evaluate the candidates' progress and achievements. These reports are optional and at the Director's discretion for inclusion as a file component but may be

included at any time that the Unit determines it to be helpful for documentation purposes. Please note that Units are strongly encouraged to include Committee Reports for all AARP file actions, i.e., New Appointment, Promotions, Accelerations, etc. If these reports are included in the file, they should be signed by all members on the committee and reason/s for any abstentions, recused or negative votes should be clearly explained. In order to maintain as much objectivity and equity as possible, the Director/Supervisor may not be a voting member of the EC or an Ad Hoc Committee for that candidate.

Reviews:

1. **Spring:** The ORU AP Analyst submits a preliminary list of proposed file candidates and the next normal actions for the coming review cycle to the ORU MSO. The MSO then, in consultation with the Director, prepares a completed list of approved proposed academic file reviews/actions that are due in the coming academic year and submits it simultaneously back to the Director and the ORU AP Analyst for file initiation (soliciting the candidates and starting assembly of the academic files).
2. **Summer:** The ORU AP Analyst submits any initially completed files back to the MSO needing preliminary committee review/recommendations. Review committees perform an initial review of pending files and may recommend to the Director the need for an alternate action and/or additional external letters. The Director informs the MSO (who informs the ORU AP Analyst) of any file action updates/changes.
3. **Fall:** The ORU AP Analyst submits finalized files back to the MSO for final committee review. Unit review committees review and finalize the academic files, with votes, and submit their final recommendations to the Director. The Director then writes the final decision letter on what action the ORU will propose and submits a signed letter and Summary form to the MSO who then forwards all back to the ORU AP Analyst. The ORU AP Analyst reviews the file documents for accuracy and completeness and then forwards the completed file to ORA-AP Dean's Office for campus routing and reviews.

New appointments:

1. This is a year-round process. The sponsoring PI proposes the new appointment to the Director. The Director forwards the request to the Unit review committee for initial review.
2. After receiving the request, the committee recommends a proposed series, tier and step, as well as a list of external reviewers to the Director and the MSO. The MSO informs the ORU AP Analyst of the pending appointment and provides initial documents according to the ORU AP Website guidelines and published timelines. The ORU AP Analyst then proceeds to contact the candidate to initiate and assemble the proposed file.
3. Once the required external letters are received, the ORU AP Analyst submits the initial file to the MSO for committee review and recommendation to the Director. The Director then writes the final decision letter on what action the ORU will propose and submits a signed letter and Summary form to the MSO who then forwards all back to the ORU AP Analyst. The ORU AP Analyst reviews the file documents for accuracy and completeness and then forwards it to ORA-AP Dean's Office for campus routing and review.