

2008-2009

Tips on Preparation of SIO Review Files

Departments 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><b>Who may participate in file prep and review</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• *If the department chair 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.</li> <li>• 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, with an explanation below the signature line in the committee report stating why they were selected to serve. Additionally, a fourth member could be added to the committee.</li> <li>• Chairs should note conflicts of interest in a file. Any faculty member or department chair 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 chair does contribute to the file, his or her relationship to the company and the appointee should be detailed in the departmental recommendation letter.</li> <li>• No academic appointee may participate in any academic review affecting a near relative. (For the definition of "near relative," refer to <a href="#">APM 520, Appointment of Near Relatives</a>.) 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. <b>Added August 2008</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Retention files</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dean and the senior vice chancellor should be apprised of potential retention cases immediately so they may partner with the department to retain outstanding faculty.</li> <li>• A copy of the outside offer letter(s) must be included in retention files.</li> <li>• A discussion of how the competing institution compares to UCSD must be included in the departmental recommendation letter.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Selection of external referees</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• *<i>External referees should be individuals who are independent of the appointee.</i> Letters from 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, from the home institution, etc.) or because they have a personal relationship with the appointee, may be included if they shed light on collaborations. However, non-independent letters do not count toward the minimum number of external letters required.</li> <li>• * External 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 Referee I.D. form should explain why they were selected as the most 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</i></li> </ul>

	<p><i>the departmental letter.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of external referees should be selected by the department.</li> </ul>
<b>Solicitation letters to external referees</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solicitation letters to external referees should include wording that explains the significance of the proposed action to external referees. <a href="#">Sample review solicitation letters</a> containing appropriate wording are available on the Academic Personnel Web page under “Forms and Examples.”</li> <li>• The same documents (especially the same list of publications) should be sent with the solicitation letter to each external referee. <b>Added August 2008</b></li> <li>• 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. <b>Added August 2008</b></li> </ul>
<b>Use of external referee letters</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All external referee letters solicited and received by the department must be included in the file, whether or not the final departmental recommendation requires external letters. For example, if the department solicits 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 departmental faculty must be included in the file so that campus reviewers consider the identical file documents.</li> </ul>
<b>Departmental ad hoc reports</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The departmental 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).</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Excessive quoting of external referees should be avoided.</li> </ul>
<b>Teaching effectiveness (if applicable)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A detailed evaluation of appointees’ teaching is required. It is difficult to evaluate appointees who teach courses with small enrollments; in these cases, reports on classroom visits by colleagues and letters from students are especially valuable. <b>Added August 2008</b></li> <li>• Student evaluation forms are required.</li> </ul>
<b>Crossover merits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 departmental recommendation letter, and evidence (documentation) of this work must be provided. The departmental letter should explain how promotion will be justified when this work is complete.</li> </ul>

<b>Accelerations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For accelerations, information on the department's standards for a normal merit advancement to the recommended rank and step must be included in the departmental letter. This information is essential in order for reviewers to determine the appropriateness of the proposed action.</li> <li>• Files proposing acceleration should be strong in all areas (research and creative activity, teaching, and service).</li> <li>• Off-cycle acceleration files are discouraged unless there are extraordinary reasons for submitting them.</li> <li>• "Rare and compelling" reasons are required for accelerated advancement to or as Professor, Above Scale. Departments must provide these reasons in the departmental recommendation letter in order to justify such advancement.</li> </ul>
<b>Off-scale salary components</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• *Thorough justification for awarding or requesting policy exceptions for bonus or market off-scale salary components should be included in the departmental letter. It is particularly important to provide justification for continuation of market off-scale components beyond the six-year limit.</li> <li>• Requests for bonus off-scale awards in the absence of scholarly activity are discouraged.</li> </ul>
<b>Departmental vote</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The faculty vote must comply with the policy requirement that 50% of faculty eligible to vote and in residence at UCSD at the time of the vote support the proposed action. The faculty vote reported in the departmental letter should agree with the vote recorded on the Academic Recommendation Summary form. <i>[Note: The summary form reflects the <u>departmental</u> recommendation as voted on by faculty or a departmental ad hoc committee. A chair's personal recommendation may differ from that of the faculty or ad hoc committee.]</i></li> <li>• The 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 departmental recommendation letter.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional tips for departmental letters</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excessive quoting of external referees should be avoided.</li> <li>• *The chair should list the top journals in the appointee's discipline and should explain the importance of the appointee's publication venues in relation to these.</li> <li>• *The letter should contain a discussion of teaching effectiveness, rather than merely a listing of courses taught. The department chair should discuss any problems in the area of teaching and delineate specific plans to correct the problems (or the appointee may do so in his or her personal statement).</li> <li>• *The quality of service contributions should be indicated.</li> <li>• The quality of diversity contributions should be indicated.</li> </ul>

