June 11, 2012

DEANS
DEPARTMENT AND PROGRAM CHAIRS
MRU AND ORU DIRECTORS
ACADEMIC SENATE CHAIR GILLMAN

Re: Issuance of Revised CAPM 408.220 – Mid-Career Appraisal

Dear Colleagues:

I am pleased to issue the campus’s revised policy and procedures involving mid-career appraisal, which is effective with the 2012-13 review year. The key revision is the elimination of solicited external letters of evaluation as part of the mid-career appraisal. Because of the potential for inequity, the revised policy does not allow departments or deans the option to solicit external letters for a mid-career appraisal. The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) supports the proposed revision, shares the concern about potential inequitable treatment, and concurs with my decision not to make solicited letters optional.

The administration and the SEC also agree that providing assessment and guidance at mid-career is essential and that departments themselves have the capacity to do so without relying on external letters. The SEC’s response so clearly articulates this point that I quote the following from their letter of June 7, 2012:

All SEC members agreed that having external assessment is valuable to a faculty member at mid-career, but the majority argued that the personnel review process is not the optimal place for it. Rather, the department should provide both the mentoring necessary to pre-tenure faculty, identifying individual senior faculty members to serve as active mentors and point to the appropriate scholars in the field (or fields), who could be solicited for informal response. This sort of collegial advice given outside of the formal review process is often more pointed and valuable to the candidate than the formal letter.

During the campus review period, some comments were received that expressed concern about having sufficient subject matter expertise in a department or program to conduct a thorough mid-career appraisal. In response to this concern, I remind you of the campus academic personnel policy on Department Augmentation for Bylaw 55 Voting Rights (CAPM 414.220), which includes the following, in relevant part: “[I]f additional subject matter expertise is deemed necessary to conduct a thorough academic personnel review, the department or dean may propose that one or more tenured faculty members from other departments be temporarily appointed to augment the Bylaw 55 voting faculty of the department…. Where the Bylaw 55 augmentation is made pursuant to a need for additional subject matter expertise…the augmentation may be requested for an individual academic personnel review action.”

Campus comments also questioned the potential impact on early tenure cases that may be identified at the mid-career appraisal presuming the elimination of external letters. The clear message here is that if the chair and candidate determine that the candidate’s record appears to warrant tenure at the mid-career appraisal juncture, the department should conduct a tenure review instead of the mid-career appraisal. If the final decision is not promotion, but results in reappointment and merit or salary increase, the candidate has additional time to address the deficiencies identified in the tenure review process.

The revised policy and a revised document inventory are available on the Academic Personnel Office website at: http://apo.ucsc.edu/academic_policies_and_procedures/cappm/408220.htm and http://apo.ucsc.edu/forms_and_data/LR_MidCareerAppr_DocInv.php
I ask that department and program chairs bring this information to the attention of Senate and Adjunct faculty in their unit by forwarding this message and/or by addressing it at a department/program meeting.

Sincerely,

Alison Galloway
Campus Provost and
Executive Vice Chancellor
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