

Tips on Preparation of School of Medicine Appointment Files

Departments 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. 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>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. Appointment files should be submitted to Academic Personnel by June 1 whenever possible. • A candidate must hold an appropriate visa before beginning employment. The department should contact the International Center for guidance as soon as it is aware that a candidate has visa issues. • A copy of the approved Recruitment Compliance Report (or waiver) must accompany the appointment file. Files will be returned if this documentation is not included. 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 department chair and/or division chief is a candidate's mentor, co-author, or collaborator, he/she should be recused from preparing or contributing to the file, including preparing the solicitation letters to external referees. • Candidates' 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, department chair, or division chief 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, chair, or division chief does contribute to the file, his or her relationship to the company and the candidate should be detailed. The chair should note any conflicts of interest in the departmental recommendation 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.
<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 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. (Note: Does not apply to Health Sciences Clinical Professor series.) • *For appointments at 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 department should explain on the Referee I.D. form why they were selected as

	<p>the best-qualified referees. <i>This information should appear only on the Referee I.D. form, not in the departmental letter.</i> (Note: Does not apply to Health Sciences Clinical Professor series.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For appointment in the Project Scientist and Specialist series, evaluation letters may be solicited from individuals who are not professionally independent of the candidate; however, additional letters from more independent sources should be obtained if possible. Added August 2008
Solicitation letters	<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 Academic Personnel Web page under “Forms and Examples.” • Solicitation letters for Clinical X series actions should ask external referees to address the candidate’s regional and national recognition as a clinical academician and as an outstanding and innovative clinical teacher and practitioner.
Referee I.D. Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A list of departmental search committee members must be included in the Recruitment Plan. Thus it is not necessary to list committee members on the Referee ID form. Committee members should not be named in the departmental recommendation letter. Added August 2008 • If there is also a departmental 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 departmental recommendation letter.</i>
Departmental vote	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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> • *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.
Departmental and/or committee recommendation letters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The departmental 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 departmental or committee letters. Only the Referee I.D. form identifies and describes the qualifications of external referees. • Excessive quoting of external referee comments in the recommendation letters is discouraged. • The departmental letter should address the candidate’s qualifications for appointment based on criteria specific to the proposed series. The department should ensure that the proposed series, rank, and step are appropriate, based on the candidate’s experience, and that a detailed research plan is included as part of the letter.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The departmental 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. Added August 2008 • *The departmental letter should describe the candidate's teaching experience and effectiveness, or the potential for successful instructional performance, and provide a teaching plan. The letter should also describe the specific contributions that the candidate will make to the departmental instructional program. • *The departmental letter should define the candidate's distribution of effort by providing a clear description of the proposed academic responsibilities in a separate paragraph. Clinical and teaching responsibilities should be addressed in sufficient detail for CAP to identify likely contact hours per quarter or year. For appointment of clinical faculty, the letter should address how the candidate will distribute his or her effort between clinical responsibilities and research (for clinical faculty), or between research and teaching, if the series requires demonstration of research and/or teaching excellence for advancement. The letter should address the ways the department will provide "protected time" for research. This is critical for CAP's evaluation of the candidate and proposed series, especially when evidence of research and/or scholarly contributions is required for future advancement. • *In general, appointments in the Clinical X series should be proposed at the Associate Professor level or above. Evidence and impact of clinical scholarship is required to justify appointment at the Assistant Professor level. Appointment in the Clinical X series will be evaluated on the basis of 1) a defined area of scholarship and/or creative work, which should be clearly defined and referenced in the file; and 2) the exportability and/or impact of that work, i.e., the degree to which work will be visible and influential outside the home institution.
<p>Teaching evaluations</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.