

APO Updates
October 2011

Department letters recommendations:

Add standards to letters that describe a normal merit, acceleration and promotion within the ORU. Each ORU is different, so it is helpful if this is explained in the department letter, instead of having to ask later.

Add the ORU's consultation process for voting and adhoc processes. Since each ORU has its own process in place and they vary from each ORU, please explain what your process is.

Please do not include collaborators on your adhoc committees, and if you do then please explain it in the department letter.

Discuss candidate's diversity and its impact to the campus

CAP requests for additional info:

Please include new evidence and explain it in your response. Do not argue the previous position made in the department letter.

Independence of referees:

Please select referees that are independent of the academic, and on occasion when there is collaboration, explain why they were chosen. Referees need to be impartial.

Teaching evaluations:

If the academic has a joint appointment and you do discuss the teaching component, please identify any weaknesses that show up in the teaching evals. This should be done by the department that the appointment is held in, but if you decide to include any references to teaching in your department letter, then it should be addressed.

Collaborative work:

Explain candidate's scholarly contribution to collaborative research. Not just what percentage of effort but his/her actual contributions.