Hello,

For our July 14th call at 11am, we will primarily be going over the Awards module on your QA site. We thought we would share the following outline/notes (with questions that we’ll need to resolve together). There’s no need to respond with your answer, as we’ll be discussing each item (and coming up with more as we go through this discovery period, I’m sure).

**Nomination Stage**

- Can ANYONE nominate? (or is restricted to only Senate members)
- Can a Senate member self-nominate?
- Are there awards that a non-Senate member is eligible for?
- Do nominees need to be validated by an analyst FIRST, prior to the packets being accessible by others for upload?
  - At UCSB, some awards are routed in this fashion:
    1. Nominator submits nominee name(s)
    2. Senate Analyst validates nominees to verify eligibility
    3. Senate Analyst notifies nominees that they have been nominated, and ask them to upload materials
    4. Senate Analyst reviews inbound packets, and “approves” them so awards committee can review
       - Senate Analyst can also upload documents, if received via email or paper outside of the system
    5. Once “approved”, the awards committee can access all packets as PDF files, through their DMS committee page
       - Review of each packet (rating/ranking) is done outside of the system. The awards module acts as a central repository of documents, and by design does not attempt to accommodate a shared committee rating/ranking component.
    6. Packets are archived by Academic Year

- Do we want to restrict by eligibility. Technically possible to automatically determine mid-career faculty, would require additional information from UCI OIT (We have Rank Code, but not Step).

**Upload Stage**

Who is responsible for uploading the various documents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nomination Letter</th>
<th>Upload By</th>
<th>Upload By</th>
<th>Upload By</th>
<th>Upload By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nominator (Primary)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Analyst Can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Vitae</td>
<td>Nominator (Primary)</td>
<td>By Nominee needed?</td>
<td>Analyst Can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of Support (max of three)</td>
<td>Nominator (Primary)</td>
<td>Analyst Can</td>
<td>Letter Writer directly (future enhancement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal teaching Evaluation questionnaires (for Teaching Award Nominations)</td>
<td></td>
<td>By Nominee needed?</td>
<td>Analyst Can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Letters of Support
- Currently need to be uploaded by **nominator**
- Can be uploaded by analyst. (If letter writers send to analyst directly, and the letter is uploaded by the analyst, letter content is hidden from nominator/nominee, but its presence is indicated)
- Future enhancement will allow letter writers to upload themselves.
  - Who provides the list of letter writers? Nominator or Nominee? Or both? (Borrow from UC Recruit referee workflow)

**Committee Review Stage**
- Are incomplete packets reviewed by the committee?
- Are packets reviewed by the Senate Analyst FIRST, before being released to the Committee?
- Are all 7 awards reviewed by a single committee?
  - If all awards are reviewed by a single committee, a single form would be fastest to implement and easiest to manage by analyst
  - Can switch between initially selected award and any of the other available ones (for example changing from faculty to mid-career faculty)
  - Nominees (Packets) will be visually grouped in committee view (similar to grouping of documents within an issue)

**andy**
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