

**Tips on Preparation of ORU Review Files
(for Research Scientists, Project Scientists and Specialists)**

Organized Research Units/centers and deans' offices are responsible for ensuring that files are ready for campus review—i.e., that files are complete, accurate, and comply with policy. The tips below are based on common problems seen in review files. Further information on academic personnel policies and procedures may be found at:

<http://academicaffairs.ucsd.edu/offices/apo/>

Asterisks (*) denote the most common problems causing file delays.

<p>Who may participate in file prep and review</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • *If the director is an appointee's mentor, co-author, or collaborator, he/she should be recused from preparing the file, including preparing the solicitation letters to external referees. • Appointees' mentors, co-authors, or collaborators should not chair departmental ad hoc committees. However, they may serve as committee members if their expertise is needed. • Any faculty member or director who has a financial or management interest in a company providing support for either an appointee's research or an appointee'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 appointee should be detailed. The director should note any conflicts of interest in the departmental 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 departmental recommendation letter should state that the academic appointee did not participate in the review. Added August 2008
<p>Selection of external referees</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • *Except as noted below, external letters should be solicited from referees who are independent of the appointee. External referees whom campus reviewers may not regard as objective or independent evaluators, either because they are too close to the appointee professionally (e.g., collaborators, co-authors, thesis supervisors, etc.), are from the same institution as the appointee, or have a personal relationship with the appointee, may be included if they shed light on collaborations. However, except for Project Scientists and Specialists (see below), non-independent letters do not count toward the minimum number of external letters required. • For advancement in the Project Scientist and Specialist series, evaluation letters may be solicited from individuals who are not professionally independent of the appointee; however, additional letters from more independent sources should be obtained if possible. Added August 2008 • Letters should be solicited from senior scholars (Associate level and above) who are at the same rank as that proposed for the appointee, or higher. If external referees are not senior scholars, the unit should explain why they were selected as the best-qualified referees and identify their particular expertise within the field or specialty. <i>This information should appear only on the Referee I.D. form, not in the unit letter.</i> • It is important to solicit a sufficient number of external referees. Five external letters are required for files proposing promotion to the Associate level, and three external letters are required for files proposing promotion to the Full level.

<p>Solicitation letters to external referees</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solicitation letters to external referees should include wording that explains the significance of the proposed action to external referees. Sample review solicitation letters containing appropriate wording are available on the Academic Personnel Web page under “Forms and Examples.” • The same documents (especially the same list of publications) should be sent with the solicitation letter to each external referee. Added August 2008 • Appointees’ personal statements are implicitly biased. It is up to the department to decide whether to send personal statements along with the CV and publications to external referees. If the personal statement is included, the solicitation letter should be revised to state this explicitly. Appointees should be informed that the personal statement is being sent to referees. Added August 2008 • While appointees may suggest external referees, the majority of external referees should be selected by the unit.
<p>Use of external referee letters</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All external referee letters solicited and received by the unit must be included in the file, whether or not the final recommendation requires external letters. For example, if the unit solicits external letters for a promotion and, after reviewing those letters, determines that an action other than a promotion (e.g., a crossover merit) is appropriate, the external letters received and reviewed by the unit’s faculty must be included in the file so that campus reviewers consider the identical file documents.
<p>Departmental ad hoc reports</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The unit’s ad hoc or review committee report should be included in the file, and the committee membership should be indicated at the end of the report (with members’ signatures). If a written report is not provided, the committee membership should be an addendum to the Referee I.D. form. • If the departmental ad hoc report fails to describe the content and importance of research or creative activity, this should be included in the departmental letter. • Excessive quoting of external referees should be avoided.
<p>Crossover merits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order for an appointee to be awarded a crossover merit, ongoing research must be listed in Section C of the bibliography and discussed in the unit recommendation letter and evidence (documentation) of this work must be provided. The unit letter should explain how promotion will be justified when this work is complete.
<p>Accelerations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For accelerations, information on the unit’s standards for a normal merit advancement to the recommended rank and step must be included in the recommendation letter. This information is essential in order for reviewers to determine the appropriateness of the proposed action. • Off-cycle acceleration files are discouraged unless there are extraordinary reasons for submitting them.
<p>Off-scale salary components</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • * Thorough justification for awarding or requesting policy exceptions for bonus or market off-scale salary components should be included in the unit letter. It is particularly important to provide justification for continuation of market off-scale components beyond the six-year limit. • Requests for bonus off-scale awards in the absence of scholarly activity are discouraged. It is particularly important to provide justification for continuation of market off-scale components beyond the six-year limit.

Voting procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Units are encouraged to establish voting procedures and to ensure compliance with campus policy and practices.
Principal Investigator's assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the Project Scientist series, the file should include a letter from the Principal Investigator in whose lab the appointee is employed.
Additional tips for unit letters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria for appraisal, advancement, and reappointment in the Research Scientist series are the same as for the ladder-rank Professor series in the area of research and creative activity, and the appointee's contributions in this area must be addressed in the unit letter. Excessive quoting of external referees should be avoided. * The director should list the top journals in the appointee's discipline and explain the importance of the appointee's publication venues in relation to these. *The quality of service contributions should be indicated for appointees at the Associate Research Scientist and Research Scientist levels. Service at the Assistant Research Scientist level is encouraged but not required. Beware of using the word "promotion" in files for normal merit advancements. Only advancement from one rank to the next (Assistant to Associate or Associate to Full) is considered a promotion.
Preparation of files for joint appointments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only one file should be prepared for each appointee due for review. If an appointee holds appointments in two or more departments/units, the home department/unit should take the lead in preparing the file (i.e., gathering material from the appointee, soliciting external letters, obtaining a completed and signed UCSD Academic Biography and Bibliography Form, gathering publications, etc.). Each department, however, should act independently in arriving at its recommendation for inclusion in the review file. Added August 2008