

Guidelines for the Review of Organized Research Units

Purpose and Responsibility of the Review Committees

The quality of organized research units (ORUs) of the University of California is assessed at five-year intervals through objective and thorough appraisal of the program and directorship of the unit. Responsibility for this appraisal falls largely upon the members of the ad hoc review committees nominated by the Davis Division of the Academic Senate and appointed by the Vice Chancellor--Research, who serves as the designated representative of the Chancellor. It is the duty of these committees to ascertain the extent to which each unit has succeeded in achieving its goals and the general goals of the University with regard to its original purpose, present functioning, future plans, and continuing development to meet the needs of the field. Implied in the committee's responsibility is recognition and encouragement of achievement and/or recommendation for change or disestablishment.

Committee Effectiveness

- A. The membership, deliberations, and recommendations of the review committee are normally confidential; when the director is reviewed they **MUST** be confidential. The chairperson of the review committee should remind members of the committee, and others whom it is essential for the committee to consult, of the confidential nature of the assignment. Committee requests for additional information should go through the Vice Chancellor--Research who will then forward the information to the committee. However, if a committee finds that review of the program is best accomplished without confidentiality, the chairperson may petition the Vice Chancellor--Research for an open committee. The report of the committee remains confidential in either case.
- B. The whole system of review by committee depends for its effectiveness upon the committee's prompt attention to its assignment and its conduct of the review with all possible dispatch, consistent with judicious and thorough consideration of the case.
- C. The chairperson of the review committee has the responsibility of making sure that each member of the committee has read and understands these instructions.

Procedures

- A. The quinquennial review of ORUs originates with the Vice Chancellor--Research. Reports are requested from the director of the unit, the advisory committee to the unit for its report and comments on the report of the director, the dean to whom the director reports, those department chairpersons whose departments are closely associated with the ORU, and the Vice Chancellor--Research for his or her comments on the unit's contribution to undergraduate and graduate education. In the case of the review of the director, the report from the dean to whom the director reports should include a summary of the views of the principal research staff of the ORU and the director's immediate staff regarding the administrative capabilities of the director. The committee also receives annual reports and budgetary information for the period of time. The committee may request additional information as necessary through the Office of Research during the course of the review.
- B. In review of the program of the ORU, the ad hoc committee report is sent to the Davis Division of the Academic Senate for its review and comments and then to the Council of Deans & Vice Chancellors, which recommends to the Chancellor continuance or disestablishment of the unit. Final approval rests with the Chancellor except that after 15 years of existence, approval for continuation must be obtained from the President of the University.

- C. In the review of the director of the unit, copies of the report are sent to the Chancellor, the Vice Provost--Faculty Relations who consults with the Committee on Academic Personnel, and the dean to whom the director reports. After consultation, the Chancellor will take action to reappoint or not to reappoint the director.
- D. Wherever possible, the review of the program and of the director will be undertaken simultaneously. A summary of each review is given to the dean to whom the unit reports and through him or her to the director of the unit.

Scope and Criteria for Review of the Program

- A. **Scope of Reviews.** The ad hoc review committee shall judge the unit according to the criteria set forth in paragraph 1 of these guidelines with respect to its purpose, program, and success, considering its record of performance in (a) research, (b) teaching, (c) impact on the campus, and (d) public service. In evaluating the unit's effectiveness in these areas, the review committee shall exercise reasonable flexibility, recognizing that each unit presents problems and issues unique to the unit under review.
- B. **Criteria of Reviews.** The criteria set forth below are intended to serve as a guide in judging the unit, not to set boundaries to the elements of performance that may be considered.

Research

1. Quality of research accomplished and in progress.
2. Accomplishment of objectives as stated in the research mission of the ORU, evaluation of changes in direction of research and their impact, impact of research accomplished on the campus and community.
3. Benefit to research programs or departments of instruction and research, including faculty and student personnel engaged in research within the ORU.
4. Quality of professional staff as evidenced by such things as awards, honors, presentations at national and international scholarly conferences.
5. Comparison with other similar units at other campuses and/or institutions.
6. Publications issued by the ORU, including reports and reprints in its own covers as well as material published in refereed journals--both by faculty and by students. Publications in progress and in the developmental stages should be included, as well as doctoral dissertations by graduate students.
7. Interdisciplinary nature of the unit's research efforts, if appropriate.

Teaching

1. Administrative support to graduate education, pre- and postdoctoral.
2. Degree to which graduate and postdoctoral students participate through assistantships, fellowships, or traineeships or otherwise are involved in ORU work, including paid employment and graduate student research.
3. Sponsorship of internships with or without credit for graduate and undergraduate research.
4. Direct or indirect contributions of ORU to graduate and undergraduate teaching programs of academic departments.
5. Staffing of unit, including number of full-time academic staff with fractional appointments in

academic departments, faculty with part-time appointments in the ORU, and degree to which each category participates in teaching programs of academic departments. This would include participation in regular courses and seminars of academic departments, supervision of independent research and group study, etc.

6. Student and faculty participation from other campuses in regard to all of the above points.

Impact on Campus

1. Evidence that existence of the ORU was a factor in attracting faculty or students to the campus.
2. Effect of the program of the unit on campus programs, including statements as to why the goals and objectives could not be accomplished within the existing departmental structure.
3. Assessment of the uses of all resources available to the unit and evaluation of the unit's internal and external sources of support in relation to its mission.
4. Advantages and disadvantages to the campus that might reasonably be expected to occur in the future if the unit is continued.
5. Possible effect on the campus from disestablishment of the unit.

Public Service

1. Contributions in the form of lectures, tours, visiting groups, conferences, etc., within the community, state, and nation, as well as services to the campus community.
2. Interaction with other similar units or research in other places. Other services to the community, state, and nation, such as distribution of research information, recognition by non-University groups or governmental agencies.
3. Other evidence of the direct, tangible impact of the activities of the ORU on the public at large.

The Report of the Review of the Program

- A. The report of the review committee forms the basis for further review. It should contain the following information:
 1. A brief, concise statement detailing the history, mission, scope of the ORU and its relationship with departments of instruction and research on the campus.
 2. An appraisal of all significant evidence, favorable and unfavorable, adequately documented by specific reference to the attached supporting material. (See Procedures, paragraph A, for a list of supporting documents available to the ad hoc committee.)
 3. Specific and analytical evaluation of the ORU with respect to teaching, research, impact on campus, and public service.
 4. An evaluation of the resources of the unit. The committee should consider and make specific recommendations on the following range of alternatives to the status quo: a change in State funding; a change in other resources (FTE, space, etc.); a change in the mission of the unit; a merger of the unit with one or more other units; discontinuance of the unit.
 5. A summary of the recommendations of the ad hoc committee according to its charge.
- B. The review committee has the responsibility of making an unequivocal recommendation. No

member should subscribe to the report if it does not represent his or her judgment. If the committee cannot come to a unanimous decision, the division of the committee and their reasons therefor should be communicated either in the body of the report or in separate concurring or dissenting statements by individual members, submitted with the main report and with the cognizance of the other committee members.

The Report of the Review of the Director

Whenever the program and the director are being reviewed simultaneously, two separate reports must be made, each complete in itself. Since knowledge of the evaluation of the program is important to the review of the director, the report on the program may be incorporated by reference in the report on the director.

The committee should assess the success or failure of the director in guiding the unit according to the same criteria used in the review of the program itself. This review is in no way connected with merit and promotion review as a member of the faculty.

University policy requires that directorships be changed periodically, with 10 years being the maximum term of continuous tenure in all but extraordinary circumstances. Strong justification for continuance beyond 10 years of service as director must be provided in the report.