

**REVIEW OF PROGRAM DIRECTORS
(Part-Time Faculty Administrators, reference APM 241)**

September 19, 2017

Summary of contents:

- I. Review of Directors of Undergraduate Programs and Minors
- II. ALTERNATE Review Process (with Ad Hoc Review Committee) for Directors of Undergraduate Programs and Minors
- III. Review of Directors of Graduate Programs
- IV. ALTERNATE Review Process (with Ad Hoc Review Committee) for Directors of Graduate Programs
- V. Review of Directors of Programs with both Graduate and Undergraduate Curricula
- VI. ALTERNATE Review Process (with Ad Hoc Review Committee) for Directors of Programs with both Graduate and Undergraduate Curricula

I. Review of Directors of Undergraduate Programs and Minors

The Executive Vice Chancellor-Academic Affairs (EVCAA) has authority to reappoint Program Directors for a period up to five years, and is responsible for ensuring that performance reviews of Program Directors are conducted no later than the fifth year of service and at five-year intervals thereafter. The Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Education (DUE) will maintain records of undergraduate Program Director service periods and review dates, will carry out the review in collaboration with the relevant Dean(s) and/or College Provost, and will present the findings and recommendations concerning reappointment to the EVCAA.

The purpose of the review of a Director of an Undergraduate Program or Minor is to evaluate his or her performance as an administrator and academic leader within the area of the Director's responsibility. The review should address the following:

- Has the Director provided effective leadership of the program or minor, thereby contributing to excellence in undergraduate education?
- Has the Director interacted fairly and responsibly with program faculty, staff, students, and members of the administration?

Description of the Review Process

1. The DUE, or where applicable, the Dean(s) or College Provost, will advise the Director in writing that he or she is due for review, and will ask the incumbent to provide the following documentation:

- (a) A self-appraisal, or statement of his or her personal accomplishments as Program Director within the period of review, including:
 - i. A summary of the progress and quality of the program for which the Program Director has responsibility
 - ii. Future plans for development of the program
 - (b) An updated *curriculum vitae*
 - (c) Any other documents the Director wishes to submit (e.g., program documents, curriculum descriptions, program reviews, etc.)
2. The DUE, or where applicable, the Dean(s) or College Provost, will solicit confidential assessments of the Program Director's effectiveness and accomplishments (*see attached sample solicitation letter*). Suggested contacts include:
 - (a) the Program Executive Committee or Advisory Committee
 - (b) Program *affiliated faculty*
 - (c) faculty outside the Program who teach in the Program
 - (d) current or former Provosts of Colleges closely associated with the Program
 - (e) current or former Teaching Assistants and Lecturers
 - (f) Program staff members
 3. A list of those solicited and a sample of the solicitation letter used should be included in the file.
 - (a) The individual letters received should be held in confidence and not shown to the Program Director.
 - (b) However, if the Program Director requests access to his or her administrative review file the DUE or Dean or Provost should provide an oral summary of the confidential material in the file at the conclusion of the review.
 4. Following their evaluations of the review file, the DUE and the Dean and/or Provost should discuss the results and reach agreement on a recommendation concerning the Director's continuation.
 5. The DUE (and/or the Dean/Provost) should discuss their preliminary recommendation with the Director, and offer an opportunity to provide an additional statement and/or additional materials for consideration, if appropriate.

6. A favorable review serves as a recommendation for reappointment of the Director to a new term, not to exceed five years. The Office of the DUE will prepare a reappointment letter for the EVCAA's signature; copies will be sent to:
 - (a) Dean of Undergraduate Education
 - (b) relevant Dean(s)
 - (c) relevant College Provost
 - (d) Assistant/Associate VCs for (1) Academic Personnel, and (2) Resource Administration
 - (e) Assistant Dean Undergraduate Education
 - (f) Chair of the Director's home department
 - (g) MSO of the Director's home department
7. If the review is not favorable, the candidate will be given a written memorandum informing him or her of the final action.

II. ALTERNATE Review Process (with Ad Hoc Review Committee) for Directors of Undergraduate Programs and Minors

The following alternative review process, which includes participation of an ad hoc review committee appointed by the EVCAA, will be followed at the request of any of the following: (1) the DUE, (2) the relevant Dean(s), or (3) the Director to be reviewed.

Steps 1. through 3. – same as above review process

4. The DUE will develop a list of potential ad hoc Review Committee members in consultation with the relevant Dean(s) or College Provost of the Program Director under review. The Director under review should be invited to suggest names of individuals to serve on an ad hoc Review Committee and to identify individuals that they do not want to serve on the committee.
5. The Review Committee should include broad campus representation, comprising four to five members, including one or two administrators as well as faculty members.
6. Review Committee composition guidelines:
 - (a) one faculty member from the Program's current or recent Executive or Advisory Committee (or equivalent body)
 - (b) faculty members familiar with/supportive of interdisciplinary programs should be considered
 - (c) faculty members from the Director's home department will generally be excluded
 - (d) current members of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) will be excluded.

7. After the ad hoc Review Committee membership has been confirmed, a list of members will be sent to the Dean and/or Provost, the Director under review and to the Academic Personnel Office via a copy of the charge letter.
8. An e-mail list serve may be set up (by the Office of the DUE) which can be used by the ad hoc Review Committee to communicate with each other and to receive responses to requests for comments.
9. The DUE will attend the first meeting of the ad hoc Review Committee to discuss the charge, outline the review process, and respond to questions.
10. At the first meeting, the Review Committee should be provided with copies of the following:
 - (a) charge letter to the Review Committee
 - (b) self-assessment or self-appraisal, CV, and any other materials submitted by the Director
 - (c) list of student enrollments in the Program covering a 5-year period (number of majors and/or minors)
 - (d) list of courses offered by the Program over a 5-year period, with enrollments
 - (e) List of Program degrees awarded and/or Minors completed over a 5-year period
 - (f) list of Program TAs, including department affiliation and email address
 - (g) CAPE evaluations from a sampling of instructors covering a 5-year period (or summary of internal evaluations, if CAPE is not utilized)
 - (h) Course Load and Student Direction form for the Director, covering the recent 3-year period
11. The Review Committee will solicit comments from suggested contacts via e-mail, personal or committee interview, and/or hard copy letters, and obtain any other evaluation materials available. Suggested contacts include:
 - (a) the Program Executive Committee or Advisory Committee
 - (b) Program *affiliated faculty*
 - (c) faculty outside the Program who teach in the program
 - (d) current or former Provosts of Colleges closely associated with the Program
 - (e) current or former Teaching Assistants and Lecturers

(f) Program staff members

12. As part of the review, the committee should meet with the incumbent under review. While the timing of this meeting is up to the committee, it is preferable to wait until feedback has been received from others.
13. The Review Committee will write a draft report, transmit it to the DUE and the Dean(s), and then meet with the DUE and the Dean(s) to discuss it. (While the Review Committee Chair may elect to represent the Review Committee without requesting members' attendance, it is often advisable to include committee members.)
14. A final report from the Review Committee should be submitted to the DUE and the Dean(s).
15. A meeting should be scheduled with the DUE, the Dean(s), and the Program Director under review to discuss the recommendations of the Review Committee report. A copy of the report will be provided to the incumbent under review prior to this meeting.
16. Upon completion of the review, the DUE (and the Dean or Provost, if appropriate) should meet with the EVCAA to discuss the Review Committee report and reach agreement concerning the incumbent's continuation as Program Director and/or any expectations of corrective actions to be taken. The committee's report should be provided to the EVCAA prior to this meeting (*transmittal memo and written summary of recommendations are not required*).
17. A favorable review serves as a recommendation for reappointment of the Director to a new term, not to exceed five years. The Office of the DUE will prepare a reappointment letter for the EVCAA's signature; copies will be sent to:
 - (a) Dean of Undergraduate Education
 - (b) Dean(s)
 - (c) College Provost
 - (d) Assistant/Associate VCs for Academic Personnel and Resource Administration
 - (e) Assistant Dean Undergraduate Education
 - (f) Chair of the Director's home department
 - (g) MSO of the Director's home department
18. If the review is not favorable, the candidate will be given a written memorandum informing him or her of the final action.
19. After the report is discussed with the incumbent and the EVCAA, comments and correspondence related to the review should be destroyed. The only review documents that should be retained are the official correspondence with the committee, the list of individuals contacted for comments, and the final report. The committee members should be reminded to destroy all of their correspondence and materials related to the review.

III. Review of Directors of Graduate Programs

The Executive Vice Chancellor-Academic Affairs (EVCAA) has authority to reappoint Directors of Graduate Programs for a period up to five years, and is responsible for ensuring that performance reviews of Program Directors are conducted no later than the fifth year of service and at five-year intervals thereafter. The Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) will maintain records of Graduate Program Director service periods and review dates, and the Dean of Graduate Studies (DGS) will carry out the review in collaboration with the relevant Academic Dean(s), and will present the findings and recommendations concerning reappointment to the EVCAA.

The purpose of the review of a Director of a Graduate Program is to evaluate his or her performance as an administrator and academic leader within the area of the Director's responsibility. The review should address the following:

- Has the Director provided effective leadership of the program, thereby contributing to excellence in graduate education?
- Has the Director interacted fairly and responsibly with program faculty, staff, students, and members of the administration?

Description of the Review Process

1. The Dean of Graduate Studies, or where applicable, the Academic Dean(s), will advise the Director in writing that he or she is due for review and ask the incumbent to provide the following documentation:
 - (a) A self-appraisal, or statement of his or her personal accomplishments as Program Director within the period of review, including:
 - i. A summary of the progress and quality of the program for which the Program Director has responsibility
 - ii. Future plans for development of the program
 - (b) An updated *curriculum vitae*
 - (c) Any other documents the Director wishes to submit (e.g., program documents, curriculum descriptions, program reviews, etc.)
2. The Dean of Graduate Studies, or where applicable, the Academic Dean(s), should solicit confidential assessments of the Program Director's effectiveness and accomplishments (*see attached sample solicitation letter*). Suggested contacts include:
 - (a) the Program Executive Committee or Advisory Committee
 - (b) Program *affiliated faculty*

- (c) faculty outside the Program who teach or supervise students in the Program
 - (d) current or former Teaching Assistants and Lecturers
 - (e) Program staff members
3. A list of those solicited and a sample of the solicitation letter used should be included in the file.
 - (a) The individual letters received should be held in confidence and not shown to the Program Director.
 - (b) However, if the Program Director requests access to his or her administrative review file, the Dean of Graduate Studies should provide an oral summary of the confidential material in the file at the conclusion of the review.
 4. Following their evaluations of the review file, the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Academic Dean(s) should discuss the results and reach agreement on the recommendation concerning the Director's continuation.
 5. The Dean of Graduate Studies and the Academic Dean(s) should discuss the preliminary recommendation with the Director, and offer an opportunity to provide an additional statement and/or additional materials for consideration, if appropriate.
 6. A favorable review serves as a recommendation for reappointment of the Director to a new term, not to exceed five years. The Office of the Graduate Studies will prepare a reappointment letter for the EVCAA's signature; copies will be sent to:
 - (a) Dean of Graduate Studies
 - (b) Relevant Academic Dean(s)
 - (c) Associate VC for Academic Affairs/Dean of Undergraduate Education
 - (d) Assistant VCs for Academic Personnel and Resource Administration
 - (e) Assistant Dean Undergraduate Education
 - (f) Chair of the Director's home department
 - (g) Director, Graduate Academic Affairs
 - (h) MSO of the Director's home department
 7. If the review is not favorable, the candidate will be given a written memorandum informing him or her of the final action.

IV. **ALTERNATE Review Process (with Ad Hoc Review Committee) for Directors of Graduate Programs**

The following alternative review process, which includes participation of an ad hoc review committee appointed by the EVCAA, will be followed at the request of any of the following: (1) the Dean of Graduate Studies, (2) the Academic Dean(s), or (3) the Director to be reviewed.

Steps 1. through 3. – same as above review process

4. The Dean of Graduate Studies will develop a list of potential ad hoc Review Committee members in consultation with the relevant Academic Dean(s) of the Program Director under review. The Director under review should be invited to suggest names of individuals to serve on an ad hoc Review Committee and to identify individuals that they do not want to serve on the committee. The list should include a broad campus representation.
5. The Review Committee should comprise four to five members, including one or two administrators as well as faculty members.
6. Review Committee composition guidelines:
 - (a) one faculty member from the Program's current or recent Executive Committee (or equivalent body)
 - (b) faculty members familiar with/supportive of interdisciplinary programs should be considered
 - (c) faculty members from the Director's home department will generally be excluded
 - (d) current members of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) will be excluded.
7. After the ad hoc Review Committee membership has been confirmed, a list of members will be sent to the Academic Dean(s), the Director under review, and to the Academic Personnel Office via a copy of the charge letter.
8. An e-mail list serve may be set up which can be used by the ad hoc Review Committee to communicate with each other and to receive responses to requests for comments.
9. The Dean of Graduate Studies will attend the first meeting of the ad hoc Review Committee to discuss the charge, outline the review process and respond to questions.
10. At the first meeting, the Review Committee should be provided with copies of the following:
 - (a) charge letter to the Review Committee
 - (b) self-assessment or self-appraisal, CV, and any other materials submitted by the Director
 - (c) list of student enrollments in the Program covering a 5-year period

- (d) list of courses offered by the Program over a 5-year period, with enrollments
 - (e) List of Program degrees awarded over a 5-year period
 - (f) list of Program TAs, including department affiliation and email address
11. The Review Committee will solicit comments from suggested contacts via e-mail, personal or committee interview, and/or hard copy letters, and obtain any other evaluation materials available. Suggested contacts include:
- (a) the Program Executive Committee or Advisory Committee
 - (b) Program *affiliated faculty*
 - (c) faculty outside the Program who teach or supervise students in the program
 - (d) current or former Teaching Assistants and Lecturers
 - (e) Program staff members
12. As part of the review, the committee should meet with the incumbent under review. While the timing of this meeting is up to the committee, it is preferable to wait until feedback has been received from others.
13. The Review Committee will write a draft report, transmit it to the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Academic Dean(s), and then meet with the DGS and the Academic Dean(s) to discuss it. (While the Review Committee Chair may elect to represent the Review Committee without requesting members' attendance, it is often advisable to include committee members.)
14. A final report from the Review Committee should be submitted to the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Academic Dean(s).
15. A meeting should be scheduled with the Dean of Graduate Studies and/or the Academic Dean(s), and the Program Director under review to discuss the recommendations of the Review Committee report. A copy of the report will be provided to the incumbent under review prior to this meeting.
16. Upon completion of the review, the Dean of Graduate Studies (and the Academic Dean(s), if appropriate) should meet with the EVCAA to discuss the Review Committee report and reach agreement concerning the incumbent's continuation as Program Director and/or any expectations of corrective actions to be taken. The committee's report should be provided to the EVCAA prior to this meeting (*transmittal memo and written summary of recommendations are not required*).

17. A favorable review serves as a recommendation for reappointment of the Director to a new term, not to exceed five years. The Office of the Graduate Studies will prepare a reappointment letter for the EVCAA's signature; copies will be sent to:

- (a) Dean of Graduate Studies
- (b) Relevant Academic Dean(s)
- (c) Associate VC-Undergraduate Education
- (d) the Assistant VCs for Academic Personnel and Resource Administration
- (e) Director, Graduate Academic Affairs
- (f) Chair of the Director's home department
- (g) MSO of the Director's home department

18. After the report is discussed with the incumbent and the EVCAA, comments and correspondence related to the review should be destroyed. The only review documents that should be retained are the official correspondence with the committee, the list of individuals contacted for comments, and the final report. The committee members should be reminded to destroy all of their correspondence and materials related to the review.

V. Review of Directors of Programs with both Graduate and Undergraduate Curricula

The Executive Vice Chancellor-Academic Affairs (EVCAA) has authority to reappoint Directors of Programs with both Graduate and Undergraduate Curricula for a period up to five years, and is responsible for ensuring that performance reviews of Program Directors are conducted no later than the fifth year of service and at five-year intervals thereafter. The Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) and the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Education (DUE) will maintain records of Program Director service periods and review dates, and the Dean of Graduate Studies (DGS) and the DUE will jointly carry out the review in collaboration with the relevant Academic Dean(s), and will present the findings and recommendations concerning reappointment to the EVCAA.

The purpose of the review of a Program Director is to evaluate his or her performance as an administrator and academic leader within the area of the Director's responsibility. The review should address the following:

- Has the Director provided effective leadership of the program, thereby contributing to excellence in graduate education?
- Has the Director interacted fairly and responsibly with program faculty, staff, students, and members of the administration?

Description of the Review Process

1. The DUE and the Dean of Graduate Studies, or where applicable, the relevant Dean(s), will advise the Director in writing that he or she is due for review, and will ask the incumbent to provide the following documentation:
 - (a) A self-appraisal, or statement of his or her personal accomplishments as Program Director within the period of review, including:
 - i. A summary of the progress and quality of the program for which the Program Director has responsibility
 - ii. Future plans for development of the program
 - (b) An updated *curriculum vitae*
 - (c) Any other documents the Director wishes to submit (e.g., program documents, curriculum descriptions, program reviews, etc.)
2. The DUE and the DGS, or where applicable, the Academic Dean(s), will solicit confidential assessments of the Program Director's effectiveness and accomplishments (*see attached sample solicitation letter*). Suggested contacts include:
 - (a) the Program Executive Committee or Advisory Committee
 - (b) Program *affiliated faculty*
 - (c) faculty outside the Program who teach in the Program
 - (d) current or former Teaching Assistants and Lecturers
 - (e) Program staff members
3. A list of those solicited and a sample of the solicitation letter used should be included in the file.
 - (a) The individual letters received should be held in confidence and not shown to the Program Director.
 - (b) However, if the Program Director requests access to his or her administrative review file, the DUE or DGS or Academic Dean(s) should provide an oral summary of the confidential material in the file at the conclusion of the review.

4. Following their evaluations of the review file, the DUE, the DGS, and where applicable, the relevant Academic Dean(s) should discuss the results and reach agreement on the recommendation concerning the Director's continuation.
5. The DUE, the DGS, and where applicable, the Academic Dean(s), should discuss the preliminary recommendation with the Director, and offer an opportunity to provide an additional statement and/or additional materials for consideration, if appropriate.
6. A favorable review serves as a recommendation for reappointment of the Director to a new term, not to exceed five years. The Office of the DUE or the Office of Graduate Studies will prepare a reappointment letter for the EVCAA's signature; copies will be sent to:
 - (a) Dean of Undergraduate Education
 - (b) Dean of Graduate Studies
 - (c) Academic Dean(s)
 - (d) Assistant/Associate VCs for Academic Personnel and Resource Administration
 - (e) Director, Graduate Academic Affairs
 - (f) Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Education
 - (g) Chair of the Director's home department
 - (h) MSO of the Director's home department)
7. If the review is not favorable, the candidate will be given a written memorandum informing him or her of the final action.

VI. ALTERNATE Review Process (with Ad Hoc Review Committee) for Directors of Programs with both Graduate and Undergraduate Curricula

The following alternative review process, which includes participation of an ad hoc review committee appointed by the EVCAA, will be followed at the request of the any of the following: (1) the DUE, (2) the Dean of Graduate Studies, (3) the Academic Dean(s), or (4) the Director to be reviewed.

Steps 1. through 3. – same as above process

4. The DUE and the Dean of Graduate Studies will develop a list of potential ad hoc Review Committee members in consultation with the relevant Dean(s) of the Program Director under review. The Director under review should be invited to suggest names of individuals to serve on an ad hoc Review Committee and to identify individuals that they do not want to serve on the committee.
5. The Review Committee should include broad campus representation, comprising four to five members, including one or two administrators as well as faculty members.
6. Review Committee composition guidelines:

- (a) one faculty member from the Program's current or recent Executive or Advisory Committee (or equivalent body)
 - (b) faculty members familiar with/supportive of interdisciplinary programs
 - (c) faculty members from the Director's home department will generally be excluded
 - (d) current members of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) will be excluded.
7. After the ad hoc Review Committee membership has been confirmed, a list of members will be sent to the relevant Academic Dean(s), the Director under review, and to the Academic Personnel Office via a copy of the charge letter.
8. An e-mail list serve may be set up which can be used by the ad hoc Review Committee to communicate with each other and to receive responses to requests for comments.
9. The DUE and the Dean of Graduate Studies will attend the first meeting of the ad hoc Review Committee to discuss the charge, outline the review process and respond to questions.
10. At the first meeting, the Review Committee should be provided with copies of the following:
- (a) charge letter to the Review Committee
 - (b) self-assessment or self-appraisal, CV, and any other materials submitted by the Director
 - (c) list of student enrollments in the Program covering a 5-year period (number of majors and/or minors)
 - (d) list of courses offered by the Program over a 5-year period, with enrollments
 - (e) List of Program degrees awarded over a 5-year period
 - (f) list of Program TAs, including department affiliation and email address
11. The Review Committee will solicit comments from suggested contacts via e-mail, personal or committee interview, and/or hard copy letters, and obtain any other evaluation materials available. Suggested contacts include:
- (a) the Program Executive Committee or Advisory Committee
 - (b) Program *affiliated faculty*
 - (c) faculty outside the Program who teach in the program
 - (d) current or former Teaching Assistants and Lecturers

(e) Program staff members

12. As part of the review, the committee should meet with the incumbent under review. While the timing of this meeting is up to the committee, it is preferable to wait until feedback has been received from others.
13. The Review Committee will write a draft report, transmit it to the DUE, the Dean of Graduate Studies, and where applicable, the relevant Academic Dean(s), and then meet with the DUE, the Dean of Graduate Studies, and the Dean(s) to discuss it. (While the Review Committee Chair may elect to represent the Review Committee without requesting members' attendance, it is often advisable to include committee members.)
14. A final report from the Review Committee should be submitted to the Dean(s), the DUE, and the Dean of Graduate Studies.
15. A meeting should be scheduled with the DUE, the Dean of Graduate Studies, the relevant Academic Dean(s), where applicable, and the Program Director under review to discuss the recommendations of the Review Committee report. A copy of the report will be provided to the incumbent under review prior to this meeting.
16. Upon completion of the review, the DUE, the Dean of Graduate Studies, and the relevant Academic Dean(s) (if appropriate) should meet with the EVCAA to discuss the Review Committee report and reach agreement concerning the incumbent's continuation as Program Director and/or any expectations of corrective actions to be taken. The committee's report should be provided to the EVCAA prior to this meeting (*transmittal memo and written summary of recommendations are not required*).
17. A favorable review serves as a recommendation for reappointment of the Director to a new term, not to exceed five years. The Office of the DUE or the Office of Graduate Studies will prepare a reappointment letter for the EVCAA's signature; copies will be sent to:
 - (a) Dean of Undergraduate Education
 - (b) Dean of Graduate Studies
 - (c) Relevant Academic Dean(s)
 - (d) Assistant VCs for Academic Personnel and Resource Administration
 - (e) Director, Graduate Academic Affairs
 - (f) Director, Undergraduate Education & Program Planning
 - (g) Chair of the Director's home department

(h) MSO of the Director's home department

18. If the review is not favorable, the candidate will be given a written memorandum informing him or her of the final action.
19. After the report is discussed with the incumbent and the EVCAA, comments and correspondence related to the review should be destroyed. The only review documents that should be retained are the official correspondence with the committee, the list of individuals contacted for comments, and the final report. The committee members should be reminded to destroy all of their correspondence and materials related to the review.

SAMPLE: Undergraduate Program Director

Suggested Contacts: Program affiliated faculty, Program Executive or Advisory Committee, outside faculty who teach in the program, current/former Provost, current/former TAs/lecturers, program staff

Dear Professor BLANK:

The Division of BLANK is considering Dr. BLANK for reappointment as Director of the BLANK program/minor, effective July 1, 2012.

For such reappointments, UC San Diego requires input from the faculty affiliated with the program/minor. We write to ask if you can assist us by providing a frank assessment of Dr. BLANK's management of the BLANK program/minor, and whether these accomplishments warrant reappointment as Director. Please comment on the Director's management in the following areas:

- Leadership of the program/minor, thereby contributing to excellence in undergraduate education.
- Interaction with program faculty, staff, students, and members of the administration.

In order for your comments to be considered, we ask that you respond via campus mail or email no later than BLANK. My e-mail address is BLANK.

We recognize that writing a detailed assessment represents a significant demand on your time. The University of California regards peer review as essential to maintaining the quality of its faculty directors, and we greatly appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Confidentiality Statement

Although a candidate may request to see the contents of letters of evaluation, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will exclude the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the signature block. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly information about your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.