

V-2
DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR
ACADEMIC COORDINATORS
(Revised 9/21)

All appointments and advancements are to be submitted via AP Folio—

APPOINTMENTS

I. Departmental letter of recommendation

Accurate and analytical letters of recommendation from the department are essential in the review process. See Red Binder I-35 for further detail of content of departmental recommendations:

- Are the dates of the appointment, rank and step all clearly stated?
- Is the recommended salary on the published salary scale?

II. Complete CV and UCSB Academic biography form

- Is the CV up to date?
- Is the UCSB Academic biography form complete, signed and dated?
- Have all links to supporting documents been verified?

III. Job Description

- Does the job description address program scope and complexity, degree of independence, budgetary responsibility, level of professional accomplishment required and scope of impact on the campus mission (See APM 375, Appendix A)?

IV. Supportive documentation

- Has a representative sampling of supporting documentation been submitted?

Other considerations:

1. If a search was conducted, the search report must be approved in UC Recruit before the appointment is submitted. If no search was done, a waiver must have been approved.
2. The Procedural Safeguard Statement is not used for new appointments. However, candidates for appointment, once appointed, do have the right to inspect non-confidential documents in their files and to have a redacted copy of the confidential academic review records contained in the personnel review file received pursuant to APM 220-80-i.
3. When putting forward a case for a non-resident alien (i.e. not currently a US Citizen or a Permanent Resident), the department is strongly encouraged to consult with the Office of International Students and Scholars at the time the offer is being considered to be assured that labor certificate processing deadlines are met.

MERITS AND PROMOTIONS

I. Departmental letter of recommendation

Accurate and analytical letters of recommendation from the department are essential in the review process. See Red Binder I-35 for further detail of content of departmental recommendations:

- Is the letter an accurate, extensive, and **analytical** representation of the case?
- If there is a recommendation for an acceleration, are the reasons for the acceleration specifically stated?
- In the case of a negative departmental recommendation, is the basis of the recommendation clearly documented?

Is all relevant information from the Departmental letter accurately entered on the case up-load screen?

II. **Updated CV or Bio-bib**

Is the CV up to date?

Is the Bio-Bib in the proper format?

Is the Research section a **cumulative** list of publications (or creative activities) with a line drawn separating all new items from where the bio-bib from the last review case had ended?

Are the numbers the same as in the previously submitted bio-bib, and have items previously listed as “In Press”, “Submitted” been accounted for?

Are all items, including “In Press”, “Submitted”, and “In Progress” properly numbered?

Have all links to supporting documents been verified?

III. **Job Description**

Is an updated job description included if there have been changes since the last review?

If there have not been changes in the job description, does the departmental letter state that fact?

IV. **Safeguard Statement (RB III-5).**

The candidate must sign an on-line safeguard which will be forwarded with the departmental recommendation. If it is difficult or impossible to obtain this document, the Chairperson should explain the situation and indicate in what manner he/she has attempted to meet the requirements outlined in the form.

Has the candidate signed the safeguard statement? The case may not be forwarded until the candidate has signed.

If there are confidential documents (e.g. letters of evaluation), the appropriate box under #5 and #6 should be checked.

Are copies of everything the candidate has provided, or been provided, included with the case (e.g. redacted letters, list of potential evaluators)?

V. **Supportive documentation**

Has a representative sampling of supportive documentation been submitted?