

Tips on Preparation of SIO Appointment Files

Divisions and deans' offices are responsible for ensuring that appointment files are ready for campus review—i.e., that files are complete, accurate, and comply with policy. The tips below are based on comments by the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) and others regarding common problems seen in appointment files.

<p>Planning for appointment file preparation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy requires that offers of faculty positions be made prior to April 1 to tenured or tenure-track faculty at other UC campuses, and prior to May 1 to such faculty at institutions that are members of the Association of American Universities, if the appointment is to be effective during the following academic year. Check the AAU Web site for the most current membership listing. All new appointment files should be submitted to Academic Personnel Services no later than June 1. • A candidate must hold an appropriate visa before beginning employment. The division should contact the International Center for guidance as soon as it is aware that a candidate has visa issues. • The number of the approved Recruitment Selection Report (or waiver) must be recorded on the Summary sheet of the file. Files will be held if the approved number is not provided. Note that this information is not provided to campus reviewers.
<p>Who may participate in file prep and review</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the division director is a candidate's mentor, co-author, or collaborator, he or she should be recused from preparing the file, including preparing the solicitation letters to external referees. • Candidates' mentors, co-authors, or collaborators should not chair divisional/ad hoc committees. However, they may serve as committee members if their expertise is needed. • Conflicts of interest should be noted in the file. Any faculty member or division director who has a financial or management interest in a company providing support for either a candidate's research or a candidate's salary should avoid contributing to the file. If such a faculty member or director does contribute to the file, his or her relationship to the company and the candidate should be detailed in the divisional/ad hoc letter. • No academic appointee may participate in any academic review affecting a near relative. (For the definition of "near relative," refer to APM 520, Appointment of Near Relatives.) If an academic appointee would have participated in the review if the reviewee were not a near relative, the divisional/ad hoc recommendation letter should state that the academic appointee did not participate in the review.
<p>Selection of external referees</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All files proposing appointment at the Assistant Professor level must contain at least two external letters from tenured professors. For Assistant-level appointments proposed at Step I or II in any series, letters from the candidate's mentors and colleagues are acceptable; however, additional letters from more independent sources should be obtained if available. • For appointments at the level of Assistant Professor, Step III, or higher and for tenured appointments, letters should be from senior scholars (Associate level and higher) who are at or above the rank proposed for the candidate and are independent of the candidate. If external referees are not senior scholars or are not independent of the candidate (e.g., former colleagues, co-authors, or collaborators), the division should explain on the Referee I.D. form why they were selected as the best-qualified referees. <i>This information should appear only on the Referee I.D. form, not in the divisional/ad hoc letter.</i>
<p>Solicitation letters</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solicitation letters to external referees should include wording that specifies the level of appointment being proposed, e.g., "appointment to the tenure-track position of Assistant Professor" or "appointment to a tenured position as Associate/full Professor." The significance of appointment at Steps VI-IX or as Professor, Above Scale, should also be explained. Sample appointment solicitation letters containing appropriate wording are available on the Forms and Examples page on the Academic Personnel Services Web site.

Tips on Preparation of SIO Appointment Files

<p>Referee I.D. Form</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A list of divisional/ad hoc search committee members must be included in the Recruitment Plan, so it is not necessary to list committee members on the Referee ID form. <i>Search committee members should not be named in the divisional/ad hoc recommendation letter.</i> • If there is a divisional/ad hoc or review committee, members' names should be included in the file; if a written report containing member names is not provided, committee membership should be included as an addendum to the Referee I.D. form. <i>Members should not be named in the divisional/ad hoc recommendation letter.</i>
<p>Divisional vote</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a faculty vote is required for a proposed action, the action must be supported by at least 50% of faculty eligible to vote and in residence at UCSD at the time of the vote (PPM 230-20.V.F.2). The faculty vote reported in the divisional/ad hoc letter should agree with the vote recorded on the Summary form. <i>(Note: The summary form reflects the <u>divisional/ad hoc</u> recommendation as voted on by divisional faculty. A director's personal recommendation may differ from that of the faculty or division/ad hoc committee.)</i> • Reasons for any negative faculty votes, if known, and for abstentions, absences, or lack of compliance with campus voting policy should be explained in the divisional/ad hoc recommendation letter.
<p>Divisional/ad hoc recommendation letters</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The divisional/ad hoc recommendation letter should state either that an open recruitment was conducted or that it was waived, and it should briefly explain why the candidate proposed was the best qualified for the job. The names of other candidates and details regarding their gender, race, and ethnicity should be omitted. • External referees must not be identified in divisional/ad hoc recommendation letter. Only the Referee I.D. form identifies and describes the qualifications of external referees. • Excessive quoting of external referee comments in recommendation letters is discouraged. • The divisional/ad hoc recommendation letter should explain the standards and expectations for productivity in the discipline. Specifically, the letter should explain what is expected at the recommended level of appointment in terms of research productivity and teaching, as applicable to the series. This is particularly important in fields in which productivity is assessed by means other than publication of peer-reviewed research articles. The letter should also address the quality of venues in which the candidate's creative work has appeared. • Thorough justification for any proposed off-scale salary should be included in the divisional/ad hoc recommendation letter. If an off-scale salary is proposed to counter an offer from another institution, a copy of the competing offer(s) should be included in the file. • The divisional/ad hoc recommendation letter should describe the candidate's teaching experience and effectiveness, or the potential for successful instructional performance. The letter should also describe the specific contributions that the candidate will make to the section/divisional instructional program.
<p>Teaching evaluations (if applicable)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The file should include teaching evaluations if the candidate holds or has held a professorial or other instructional title at another academic institution.