

Common Chair Letter Issues That May Result in a Packet Being Returned for Correction

- Missing or insufficient justifications for:
 - accelerated/decelerated actions
 - advancement to special “overlapping” steps (e.g. Assistant Step VI, Associate Step I V)
 - retroactive effective date
- Missing required senate faculty vote
- Missing comments or required review category left completely blank
- Missing rating or “N/A” for required category, with an insufficient or incorrect explanation
Examples:
 - “N/A” rating is indicated for University and Public Service and/or states in the comment box “University service is not a requirement for this position” – when it is required by policy.
- Discrepancies between Chair Letter and content of the packet
Examples:
 - Missing significant publications and research summary program when there’s evidence of such activities on the CV and required for series.
 - N/A rating for Significance of Research but CV lists 25 peer-reviewed publications, 10 of which were first authored by the candidate
- Discrepancies between ratings and comments in Chair Letter
Examples:
 - “Needs Improvement” rating given but comments state outstanding work
 - High ratings are filled in the bubbles for specific categories; however there is nothing listed in the CV to support the rating --Outstanding rating for University/Public Service with a comment “Dr. Doe has no University/Public Service”
- Discrepancies between Chair Letter categories and comments
Examples:
 - Comments on research are made in the section for teaching
- Insufficient explanation OR missing explanation for lack of required items/criteria, in the comments field:
Examples:
 - Reference letters/ teaching assessments (e.g. “5 references were provided only 2 responded”)
 - Lack of required criteria on CV not explained in Chair letter
- Irrelevant or prohibited information
 - Medical diagnosis or illness
 - Self-solicited references or letters

- Reference to protected class (ethnicity, sex, disability, age, veteran status, etc) is made in the section for "Contributions to Diversity"
- Names or identities of referees mentioned in the letter
- Typos, Inaccuracies and contradictions
 - grammatical errors
 - incorrect action details (e.g. action profile = promotion, but chair letter states merit)
 - Copy and pasting someone else's CV info
- Other
 - Chair certified as joint chair
 - Lack of teaching responsibilities for new faculty appointments (brief description of what the candidate will be doing at UCSF).