

The background features a large, light gray watermark of the University of California seal. The seal is circular with a dotted border and contains the text "UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA" around the top. In the center, there is a five-pointed star above an open book with the letter "A" on its left page.

ADVANCEMENT AND PROMOTION

AT IRVINE

A Handbook of Advice for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Advancement and Promotion at Irvine is a cumulative presentation of multiple offices including Equal Opportunity and Diversity; Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom; Academic Affairs; the Council on Academic Personnel; and the Office of Academic Personnel with special editorial contributions by the ADVANCE Equity Advisors.

This 2012 updated edition was compiled by Herb Killackey, Vice Provost, Academic Affairs, and the Office of Academic Personnel.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|---------------|
| PART I: INTRODUCTION TO THE REVIEW PROCESS..... | - 7 - |
| A. The Review Process..... | - 7 - |
| B. Academic Review Process and Delegation of Authority | - 7 - |
| C. Timeline of Reviews | - 7 - |
| D. Normal Periods of Service within Rank and Steps..... | - 8 - |
| Assistant Professor Rank: | - 8 - |
| Associate Professor Rank: | - 9 - |
| Professor Rank: | - 9 - |
| Professor, Above Scale:..... | - 10 - |
| | |
| PART II: ADVICE FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY..... | - 11 - |
| A. THE TENURE PROCESS | - 11 - |
| Tenure Process..... | - 11 - |
| Midcareer Appraisal | - 12 - |
| Tenure Review | - 14 - |
| Access to Your Review File..... | - 21 - |
| Can the Final Decision Be Appealed?..... | - 21 - |
| Confidentiality..... | - 22 - |
| B. RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT | - 22 - |
| Making Research a Priority | - 22 - |
| Developing a Scholarly Program | - 25 - |
| Extramural Funding | - 25 - |
| Preparing for Publication | - 26 - |
| Building Relationships: Increasing Your Visibility as a Scholar | - 27 - |

Within Your Department..... - 27 -

Within the Campus Community..... - 28 -

Within a National and International Network of Colleagues..... - 29 -

C. KEEP RECORDS ABOUT YOUR ACCOMPLISHMENTS - 30 -

 Research and Professional Recognition - 30 -

 Drafts and Publications - 31 -

 Teaching - 32 -

 Service - 34 -

D. SOURCES OF HELP - 35 -

 Official Rules and Regulations - 35 -

 People - 35 -

 Administrative Offices..... - 36 -

 Remember Your Supporters - 36 -

**E. FOSTERING THE DEVELOPMENT OF JUNIOR FACULTY -
ADVICE TO CHAIRS AND OTHERS - 37 -**

 Initial Counseling..... - 37 -

 Mentors and Continued Advising - 37 -

 Advice on Obtaining Grants and Awards..... - 38 -

 Using the Midcareer Appraisal Constructively..... - 38 -

 Advisors beyond the Department - 39 -

 Counseling Faculty through Difficult Reviews - 39 -

Appendix I: Summary of University of California Access to Records Policy..... - 40 -

PART III: ADVICE FOR TENURED FACULTY..... - 41 -

A. MERITS AND PROMOTIONS - 41 -

 Post-Tenure Review..... - 41 -

 Associate Professor Rank - 41 -

 Full Professor Rank..... - 42 -

Career Equity Review..... - 42 -

B. RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH..... - 44 -

 Keep Research a Priority - 44 -

 Administrative Service - Pros and Cons..... - 44 -

 Developing a National and International Reputation - 45 -

**C. FOSTERING THE DEVELOPMENT OF MIDCAREER TENURED FACULTY -
ADVICE TO CHAIRS AND OTHERS - 45 -**

 Recognizing Faculty Achievements..... - 45 -

 Maintaining Salary and Resource Equity..... - 46 -

 Continued Advising - 46 -

 Developing Leadership within the Department..... - 46 -

PART IV: DIVERSITY, GENDER AND WORK LIFE ISSUES - 47 -

 Family Friendly Accommodations Resources for Tenure Track Faculty..... - 48 -

 Stopping the Tenure Clock for Eligible Faculty Parents - 48 -

 Interaction with Midcareer Appraisal for Eligible Faculty Parents - 49 -

 Active Service Modified Duty or Approved Teaching Relief for Eligible Faculty Parents - 49 -

 The “Active Service-Modified Duties” option is also available to natural
fathers and adoptive parents of either sex. - 50 -

 Leave without Pay for Eligible Faculty Parents - 50 -

 Summary of Childbearing and Childrearing Leave Policy - 50 -

 University of California Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policy Regarding
Academic and Staff Employment - 51 -

PREFACE

The *Advancement and Promotion* handbook presents information about the process of faculty advancement and promotion at the University of California, Irvine, and is intended to highlight, more informally than the *Academic Personnel Manual*, key aspects of procedures. It includes summaries of University policies and provides advice about strategies for advancement and promotion and attempts to minimize misunderstanding of the process and its criteria.

[Part I Introduction to the Review Process](#) provides general information for all in line faculty on the review process, the timeline of reviews, and rank, step, and normal periods of service within steps.

[Part II Advice for Tenure-track Faculty](#) consists of five sections which give advice to assistant professors on the following topics: (1) the tenure review process, (2) research and professional development tasks critical for tenure preparation, (3) record-keeping regarding accomplishments, (4) whom to go to for help, and (5) advice to Chairs and others on mentoring junior faculty.

[Part III Advice for Tenured Faculty](#) consists of advice for associate and full professors on the following topics: (1) merits and promotions, (2) research and professional growth, and (3) advice to Chairs and others on supporting the career development of tenured faculty.

[Part IV Diversity, Gender and Work Life Issues](#) discusses constraints encountered with diversity, gender and work life issues.

The information included in this document reflects the most recent revisions of the policies and procedures governing academic personnel reviews; however, policies are frequently modified. Therefore, this handbook does not represent, nor should it be relied upon as, the official or complete statement of the academic personnel policies and procedures at the University of California, Irvine. Instead you are encouraged to visit the AP website for the most complete up-to-date academic personnel policies and procedures (<http://www.ap.uci.edu>).

PART I: INTRODUCTION TO THE REVIEW PROCESS

A. The Review Process

The Academic Personnel office prepares a list of faculty eligible for review each year based upon years of service at rank and step. This list and additional instructions, known as the “Annual Progress Report,” is distributed to deans and department chairs. Department chairs may meet with each assistant professor annually or more often if requested, as part of their mentoring role. This meeting allows the junior faculty member and their chair the opportunity to review research plans, monitor service commitments, and review the variety and level of teaching assignments.

B. Academic Review Process and Delegation of Authority

The Chancellor retains authority for decisions on promotion to associate professor and full professor, in addition, to the non-reappointment of assistant professors. Decisions on all other academic personnel actions have been delegated to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, the Vice Provost, or to the deans.

A comprehensive list of the delegations of authority to various officers of the University for Academic Personnel Actions appears at <http://www.ap.uci.edu/Policy/delegations.html>.

C. Timeline of Reviews

Generally, assistant professors are reviewed for a merit (step) increase with a requisite reappointment every two years. The midcareer appraisal or assessment in the third or fourth year is a review of your progress toward tenure, with evaluations provided to assist you in identifying strengths and weaknesses in your performance. The tenure review normally occurs either in the sixth or no later than your seventh year.

You may ask to be reviewed earlier, or your department may suggest an earlier review, considering previous positions or accelerated progress. The review schedule may also be altered due to childbirth/childrearing extensions.

Results of personnel actions are issued when final decisions are made. Delays may occur because of the difficulty in scheduling an *ad hoc* committee or the need to request additional information from the candidate, department, chair or dean. A delay does not mean that your performance is viewed as negative.

D. Normal Periods of Service within Rank and Steps

The information in this summary concerns primarily the faculty in the professorial ranks: assistant, associate, and full professor. There is a normal period of service for most steps within these ranks, as indicated in the following table. However, movement between ranks (promotion) or from one step to another within a rank (merit increase) *depends upon excellence. It is never automatic*, and advancement can be faster than normal in recognition of outstanding performance (acceleration) or delayed when performance is not considered normal progress in the field.

| Assistant Professor (8 year limit, tenure-track) | | Associate Professor (6 years normal, tenured) | | Professor (indefinite, tenured) | |
|---|---------------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Step | Period of Service (years) | Step | Period of Service (years) | Step | Period of Service (years) |
| I | 2 | | | | |
| II | 2 | | | | |
| III | 2 | | | | |
| IV | 2 | | | | |
| V | 2 (overlapping step) | I | 2 | | |
| VI | 2 (overlapping step) | II | 2 | | |
| | | III | 2 | | |
| | | IV | 3 (overlapping step) | I | 3 |
| | | V | 3 (overlapping step) | II | 3 |
| | | | | III | 3 |
| | | | | IV | 3 |
| | | | | V | 3 |
| | | | | VI | 3 |
| | | | | VII | 3 |
| | | | | VIII | 3 |
| | | | | IX | 4 normal minimum |
| | | | | A/S | 4 normal minimum |

Assistant Professor Rank:

On this campus, the normal period of service at the rank of assistant professor is six years. (The maximum allowable period of service may not exceed eight years under the Eight Year Rule. See [APM 133](#).) The normal period of service at a given step is two years.

The first four steps in rank, and corresponding salary levels, are for normal use. Assistant professor, step I may be considered entry level for a recently completed Ph.D. (in which case, a recommendation for promotion would be normal after two years at step III). Step II or step III may be considered entry level for an appointee with postdoctoral training (in which case, a recommendation for promotion would be normal after two years at step IV or step V).

Steps V and VI may be used in exceptional situations and with proper justification. Service at assistant professor, step V, may be in lieu of service at associate professor, step I, for which the published salary is slightly higher; service at assistant professor, step VI, may be in lieu of service at associate professor, step II. Whether or not the time at these steps should count in lieu of service at the higher level should be addressed at the time of the promotion review. Also see the Council on Academic Personnel's (ACADEMIC PERSONNEL STANDARDS AND CRITERIA | FAQ #12) <http://www.senate.uci.edu/Councils/CAP/faq.pdf>.

The tenure review and subsequent promotion to the rank of associate professor is such an important advancement in the UC system that promotion to associate professor, step I should be considered appropriate and normal advancement. Promotion to a higher step requires additional justification for the proposed step. The record should reflect performance commensurate with the step proposed: if the proposal is for associate professor, step II, for example, the candidate should exhibit performance equivalent to others at that step. It would be helpful to include letters from UC faculty who can address the level proposed. Having several of these is essential for tenure and promotion cases.

Associate Professor Rank:

The normal period of service at the rank of associate professor is six years. The normal period of service at any one of the first three steps is two years.

Steps IV and V may be used in exceptional situations and with proper justification. Service at associate professor, step IV, may be partly or entirely in lieu of service at professor, step I, for which the published salary is slightly higher; service at associate professor, step V, may be partly or entirely in lieu of service at professor, step II. Whether or not the time at these steps should count as time at the higher level should be addressed at the time of the promotion review.

Professor Rank:

The normal period of service at any of the first four steps is three years. Service at step V may be of indefinite duration.

Advancement to step VI normally will not occur after less than three years of service at step V. For review purposes, this advancement will be treated like a promotion and will be granted on evidence of great scholarly distinction and national or international recognition, highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellent University teaching. (The Council on Academic Personnel defines teaching activities broadly to include supervision and mentorship of graduate students and postdoctoral scholars.) Service at step VI may be of indefinite duration.

Advancement from professor, step VI to step VII, from step VII to step VIII, and from step VIII to step IX, usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the lower step and will be granted only on evidence of continuing great distinction, national or international recognition, highly meritorious service and excellent teaching performance.

Professor, Above Scale:

Advancement to an above scale salary is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed, whose teaching performance is excellent, and whose service is highly meritorious. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at step IX. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at step IX is not a justification for further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to step IX was based.

A further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an above scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Continued good service is not an adequate justification. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinite, and only in the most superior cases where there is strong and compelling evidence will advancement at intervals shorter than four years be approved.

Service at professor V through IX or at the above scale level may be for indefinite duration. Accelerated advancement before three years of service at these steps (four years at step IX and above scale) will occur only in exceptional cases. Everyone at these levels will be formally evaluated at least once every five years (mandatory review).

PART II: ADVICE FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A. THE TENURE PROCESS

Tenure Process

The tenure process actually begins at the time of initial hire as an assistant professor. You are carefully reviewed and approved appointment reflects a judgment that, in principle, you are tenurable at some point in the future. Since continued employment, merit increases, and promotion depend on your performance, it is important to know the expectations held by your department and the University. The University's policies and procedures relating to the professor series can be found in the *Academic Personnel Manual* ([APM](#)). More specifically, APM 210 discusses the criteria for appointment, promotion, and appraisal; APM 220-80 describes the general procedures for recommendations and review. Policies and procedures specific to the Irvine campus can be found in the *UCI Academic Personnel Procedures Manual* ([APP](#)). In addition to reading the policies that apply to all faculty, you should talk to your department chair and to your colleagues about the expectations for achieving promotion to tenure in your academic discipline.

As an assistant professor, you will be reviewed every two years for reappointment and merit (or step) increases. You should be aware of the possibility that your appointment could be terminated (non-reappointment) at any one of these two-year reviews. However, you cannot be terminated without a review. If you are reappointed *without* a merit increase, take this very seriously. It is an indication that you need to improve. Find out what areas, your department review committee considers, improvement is needed, and then work on them. These problem areas should be carefully clarified by the department - if not, ask for specifics from your chair.

Normally, you will be reviewed for tenure in your sixth year; however, you may ask to be reviewed sooner, if you feel you are ready for promotion due to previous academic positions or accelerated progress. You may also request postponement of your tenure review to the seventh year, if you have significant work in progress that will be completed within a year but not in time to be included in a sixth-year review. The postponement [file](#) (which consists of the assistant professor's request, the department's recommendation, and the dean's approval letter) should be accompanied by the candidate's full merit or reappointment file, which is normally required for continuation beyond the sixth year.

Postponement of tenure review files (accompanied by a full merit or reappointment file) must be forwarded to the Academic Personnel Office for further review by the Council on Academic Personnel. The Vice Provost will review the postponement of tenure review files and inform the deans of the decision to grant or deny postponement of the tenure review. It is critical that

these files be forwarded to the Academic Personnel Office by November 1, so that decisions can be rendered in a timely manner. Academic Personnel Procedure ([APP 3-50](#)) can assist departments in documenting [postponement](#) of tenure files appropriately.

In addition, the schedule for your tenure review may be altered in the event that you request a delay due to childbirth/childrearing.

Stopping the Tenure Clock for the Care of a Child or Children — Upon request of a faculty member who has responsibility for 50 percent or more of the care of a newborn child or newly-adopted child under age five, time off the tenure clock of up to one year may be granted by the Chancellor for each birth or adoption during the probationary period provided that all time off the tenure clock totals no more than two years in the probationary period. The tenure clock may be stopped more than one time during the probationary period. Each request for time off the tenure clock must include a written statement by the faculty member certifying that he/she has responsibility for 50 percent or more of the care of the child or children. Requests for time off the tenure clock must be made within two years of a birth or adoption (APM 133-17-h and APM 760-30-a and -b). Stopping the clock will not delay the timing of a merit or reappointment review. However, academic appointees may request to defer a formal appraisal or promotion review by one year to correspond with the stopping of the clock in accordance with campus policies (APM 760-30-d). Please see APM 760 for other “Family Friendly” accommodations or the AP website at <http://www.ap.uci.edu/programs/famfriendly.html>.

In order to automatically defer a Midcareer Appraisal, the notification to “Stop the Clock” should be submitted by the end of the faculty member’s third year (by June 30). If the notification to “Stop the Clock” is submitted after the Midcareer Appraisal, the notification of intent to “Stop the Clock” **must** be made before July 1 of the academic year in which a tenure or promotion review is to occur. Also, a Stop the Clock will not be granted for a faculty member who has primary responsibility for a young child when that child is born or adopted during the year of the tenure or promotion review.

Midcareer Appraisal

A critical review point prior to the actual tenure review is the midcareer appraisal, which normally occurs in your third and fourth year following appointment. It typically coincides with a review for a reappointment with a merit increase. These two reviews are separate but overlapping: the merit review covers new work done since your last merit increase while the midcareer appraisal is an evaluation of your entire career at UCI and its future promise. The purpose of the midcareer appraisal will help you and your department to identify strengths and weaknesses before it is too late to improve the record. In a few cases, the outcome of a midcareer appraisal may be non-reappointment (In the case of an assistant professor who is not making minimally acceptable progress toward tenure, the department may recommend a

terminal appointment), but more typically the candidate is reappointed with advice about facets of performance that need improvement. If weaknesses are identified, you should use this occasion to determine what the causes are, and how they can best be addressed prior to the tenure review. Overall, the midcareer appraisal provides a good chance for the department to get to know your record, and it can provide a constructive point of departure for collegial conversations you may not have had before.

It is important to put the midcareer appraisal in perspective. Sometimes, early productivity will have slowed down, and the midcareer assessment may be an opportunity to alert your department to circumstances that may have temporarily inhibited your productivity. A less-than-positive midcareer appraisal (after essentially only two or three years of new work and so early in one's career) can be daunting. However, the midcareer appraisal gives you information about specific strengths and weaknesses that you can work on to address in the time that remains, in this manner giving you the opportunity to improve your overall record for the tenure review.

Midcareer Appraisal is characterized as either:

- **“Positive”** - if the candidate continues on his/her current trajectory, it is likely he/she will qualify for promotion in the normal time.
- **“Cautionary”** - there are some areas that need improvement to make a strong tenure case.
- **“Negative”** - if the candidate continues on his/her current trajectory it is very unlikely that he/she will eventually qualify for promotion. Major improvements are needed.

CAP tends to evaluate MCAs more strictly than departments. (See [CAP FAQ #16](#)) Cautionary MCAs from CAP are quite common. A Cautionary MCA is intended to be **helpful** rather than threatening, by encouraging the candidate to take steps to increase their chances for a smooth transition to tenure.

Typical concerns where the Midcareer Appraisal was less than favorable include:

- research productivity was quantitatively weak;
- creative contributions were not clear if much of the work is collaborative;
- the quality of the work was not strong;
- teaching did not meet a high standard;

- an unbalanced record with respect to the several criteria for promotion (e.g., devoted too much time to the service requirement as compared to teaching or creative endeavor);
- exhibits high promise but the achievement record was weak (note that superior “attainment” and creative “achievement” is required for advancement).

If an assistant professor has received acknowledgement of a “Stop the Clock”, they will have the option to still submit a midcareer appraisal and/or promotion review during its normal time. Also, quarters “off the clock” due to a combination of childbearing leave, parental leave, and/or primary childbearing responsibility may not exceed one year for each event of childbirth or adoption for a total of two exclusions during the probationary period.

Tenure Review

There are several levels of faculty colleagues and faculty administrators who may review your case for promotion to tenure, in the following order:

- Your Department
- Your Department Chair
- Your Dean
- The Council on Academic Personnel (CAP)
- Campus *Ad Hoc* Review Committee
- The Vice Provost
- The Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
- The Chancellor

1. Departmental Review

The first and most important level of review is your department. Departments have a strong voice in academic personnel decisions.

Your promotion — like your initial appointment, midcareer appraisal, and your merit increases — depends not only on decisions made within your department, but on the presentation of your work the department chooses to send forward for review by higher levels. Your department discusses your review file, votes on a recommendation, and prepares a department report that sets out your case for subsequent review levels. While the department is charged with writing an analytical report that reflects the critical judgment of your case, it selects information; it emphasizes; and it uses rhetoric that can have an impact on the eventual outcome. Departments have a strong voice in academic personnel decisions.

The department review can involve an assessment by a committee in your department that evaluates and reports on your work. Usually, the report is discussed (without you present) by voting members of the department. After consideration by the faculty the report may receive

possible modifications, and a subsequent vote. Tenured faculty in your department have the right to vote on promotions, and some departments extend this vote to tenure-track faculty as well ([Senate Bylaw 55](#)). [APP 1-14](#), *Departmental Voting Procedures* explains the departmental voting procedures and current Irvine campus practice. The vote is reported in your file and is forwarded with the departmental report to subsequent levels of reviews.

2. What to Submit for Your Tenure File

There is a strict schedule for submission of personnel recommendations to the administration for review. Therefore, you must submit your own materials on time. It is important to determine who (you or support staff) will give the materials you prepare to your departmental review committee. Be sure to check that all of the materials you prepare for the committee, and for the outside reviewers, go forward for departmental review.

a. Your Self-Statement

The self-statement is a carefully developed statement of your research and publication record, awards and honors, teaching, professional and administrative activities, and University and public service activities (listed here in their approximate order of importance in your tenure review). This document may be an important part of the tenure process in your department. It is an opportunity for you to analyze and describe the progression of your research, emphasize its unique contributions to your particular field, and highlight future directions.

Not all departments require faculty to provide self-statements, but you may submit a self-statement as part of your dossier, whether or not your Chair requests it. Given that the criteria for evaluation vary somewhat from department to department, you should discuss the criteria with friendly mentors or advisors early in your career. You will know where you should be publishing, as well as the realistic weighting of the various formal criteria as they are used in your department. This knowledge will help you present your work.

Candidates presenting such a statement should concentrate on:

- Highlighting aspects of the above topics thought to be particularly noteworthy or not immediately susceptible to full recognition for their individual significance or general relevance to other achievements.
- Writing the statement so as to be easily understandable. The statement will be read by other than departmental colleagues and disciplinary experts and so explicit attention to the general role and significance of the activities within the discipline as a whole, particularly those of a research nature, is desirable.

Discussing the general criteria for review with knowledgeable and experienced colleagues (particularly any who have served on CAP), including the chair, who can advise one realistically is a useful step prior to writing your self-statement. Such perceptions can help

sharpen and focus the candidate's presentation and assessment of his or her own achievements. It also affords the candidate an opportunity to analyze the progress of the career and its contributions to the University's missions as well as to identify future directions.

b. Documents for Your Department

For your tenure review by the department, you should submit the following: names of outside referees who have stature in your field and who you believe to be well qualified to evaluate your work; an updated *curriculum vitae*; a description of your research, teaching, professional activities, and service in as much detail as possible; and a complete set of work you would like to have evaluated, covering your entire career. You may also wish to include a summary of your teaching, consisting of, among other things, a description of your philosophy of teaching, instructional innovations, and your contributions to the teaching culture in general.

Your department will ask you to complete either the Review Profile or the *Addendum* (Form [UCI-AP-10](#) or [UCI-AP-10-Clin](#)). The Review Profile, printed from "myData" (an online faculty database), assists faculty to track teaching, research and service activities. Once a faculty member's data is entered into the system, you can extract from the database a subset of information to produce the "Review Profile" which is replacing the *Addendum* UCI-AP-10 and UCI-AP-10-Clin in most departments. The Review Profile or the *Addendum* outline the activities (teaching, research and creative activity, professional competence and activity, and committee and administrative service) that reviewers expect to see documented in the file for the review period. For normal reviews, the Review Profile or *Addendum* should cover activities only since the last review. However, for promotion to tenure, the Review Profile or *Addendum* should document activities since your appointment as an assistant professor. You can access "[myData](#)" – Faculty Online Database," and the [Addendum](#) form online on the Academic Personnel [Website](#).

The Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) considers that a carefully prepared, accurate Review Profile or *Addendum* is crucial to the review process. Poorly prepared or inaccurate forms often result in requests for clarification being sent back to the department and may detract from or delay your case.

c. Documents for Outside Reviewers

For the outside reviewers, you should prepare packets of your work, including an updated *curriculum vitae* and a statement of your research development and directions. In contrast to the Review Profile or *Addendum*, the format and items in your *curriculum vitae* are your choice. Your vitae may also be prepared from the "myData" database for use in your review file. Your chair should forward the packets to outside reviewers along with a letter requesting an evaluation of your work. It is vitally important that the outside reviewers have at hand copies of your work to facilitate their evaluation. You should check that these packets are complete and up-to-date, and that they are actually sent along with the solicitation letters. A good chair

informs outside reviewers that the University is seeking comparative assessments and makes sure that reviewers will receive comprehensive documentation of your work. You may also submit names to the chair of persons you believe would be appropriate or inappropriate evaluators. In cases where you believe someone would be inappropriate, give a reason. Departments will most likely avoid contacting reviewers you believe to be inappropriate; however, those reviewers are not automatically disqualified.

In suggesting referees, remember that faculty peers and administrators involved in the tenure review will want evaluations from persons with expertise in your field but who are not closely identified with you. For example, former mentors and former or present collaborators may not be regarded as objective evaluators. Please clarify your relationship to the suggested referees. Indicate if they are: an independent reviewer; a current or recent collaborator; a former advisor; or, a former student (See the “Identification and Qualifications of External Referees” [AP-11](#)). The department will select outside evaluators both from your list of suggested referees and from their own, independently generated list. Because the identities of letter writers are strictly confidential, you will not be told which letter writers were selected.

After the external letters have been received and before the departmental recommendation is determined, you should have the opportunity to request redacted copies of letters from outside reviewers. You may want to provide a written statement in response to the letters; your response(s) will be included in your review file.

3. If You Have Problems with the Departmental Review

Before your case leaves the department, you may request a copy of the department letter disclosing the vote and opinion of the faculty. If, after reading the department letter, you feel that aspects of your work have been misrepresented, misunderstood, or omitted, you may respond in a written statement that will accompany the materials sent forward to subsequent review levels. Sometimes chairs allow this opportunity for feedback and candidate rebuttal or clarification immediately following the departmental meeting and prior to the actual vote. Again, departments and chairs vary in how they handle these procedures. Nevertheless, your written response becomes part of the dossier and goes forward to the dean and other levels of review.

If you believe special problems exist in your case, you should may notify your dean, chair, or equity advisor, the Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, or the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel. Potential problems may include prejudice on the part of the chair, conflicts due to internal departmental politics (e.g., competition over space, graduate students, or other resources), or hostility because you have refused a sexual advance, etc. It is important to handle such problems professionally, and this can be done with the help of one of the administrators listed above.

A full set of your materials should be sent forward with the departmental letter and the chair's letter. You have the right to see the departmental checklist of the materials included in the dossier, the right to inspect the non-confidential records in your file, and the right to request redacted copies of the confidential material, as stated above. Candidates should not hesitate to exercise these rights.

Finally, you will be asked to sign a form, the Certification Statement for Academic Personnel Reviews, ([UCI-AP-50](#)) to indicate that you have received all of your rights in the process. If you believe you have not been afforded all of the rights outlined on the Certification Statement, you should indicate this on the form and discuss the omissions with your chair.

4. Your Department Chair

The chair of the department plays a critical role in the implementation of the review process. The chair has responsibility for explaining the tenure review process to you before it begins (See "Chair's Guide for Academic Personnel Reviews" the [UCI-AP-15](#)). Once the review is underway, the chair has the ultimate responsibility for the department letter that will explain your case to subsequent reviewers. Finally, the chair may write a separate letter expressing his or her opinion on the case. The chair's separate letter is confidential. While the *Academic Personnel Manual* ([APM](#)) and the *UCI Academic Personnel Procedures Manual* ([APP](#)) outline a standard set of procedures and criteria, their application varies widely from unit to unit. Departments vary in the degree to which the faculty member under review participates in the preparation of the case, in the criteria for evaluation, and in the actual procedures of the review. Talk to your chair about all of these aspects of your tenure review.

If changes to your record occur during the course of your review and prior to the final decision, you should keep your chair informed. For example, you should give your chair new letters of acceptance for publications, and also notices of grant funding, prizes, honors, and awards since the submission of the original file. Reports of new research or creative activity may be submitted during the course of the review for promotion cases, though not for other types of reviews.

5. Your Dean

Your materials are sent by the chair of your department to the dean of your school, who adds his or her own letter of evaluation to the file. The dean may appraise and interpret the departmental vote (split votes often require explanation) on the basis of his or her knowledge of department politics and external factors. The dean's letter is confidential during the review period, but will be available, upon request, after the review is completed.

6. Council on Academic Personnel

The dean sends your dossier to the Office of Academic Personnel where it is reviewed to ensure that the requisite information is present in the file. From Academic Personnel, the

dossier is sent forward to the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP), an elected Senate committee of faculty whose charge includes the review of appointments, merit increases, promotions, and non-reappointments. CAP provides an additional level of peer review beyond the department, and brings a campus-wide perspective to promotions that encourage the application of common standards across the campus. CAP takes into account the standards and criteria of the department, as well as, the quality of the department's analysis and evaluation. Although the deliberations of this committee are confidential, you may obtain a copy of the CAP report at the close of the review. Many CAP procedures, policies, and criteria are in CAP's Frequently Asked Questions ([FAQs](#)) document, which is available on the [Senate Website](#).

Optional Campus *Ad Hoc* Review Committee

For tenured appointments, promotions, non-reappointments, advancement to professor, step VI, and accelerations of more than two years, a campus *ad hoc* review committee may be chosen consisting of UC faculty who are in research areas pertinent to the candidate's field. In these cases, the report and recommendation of the *ad hoc* review committee is considered by CAP. However, in most cases, CAP acts as its own review committee.

The campus *ad hoc* review committee may be a crucial factor in the outcome of your case. Its basic task is one of evaluation — have you met the expectations inherent in the proposed action? As this committee reviews your entire case, it is important that you prepare your materials with an eye toward this audience as well as the departmental audience. Keep in mind that some of the committee members will have only marginal expertise in your field and will be looking for clear guidelines both from you and from outside reviewers as to the significance of your scholarly contributions.

CAP nominates the membership of the *ad hoc* committee, which is confidential, but you can have some influence on its composition by notifying your chair, before the case leaves your department, if there are any individuals who you feel have sufficient personal antipathy to you or your work as to be considered prejudiced. If you are in an unusual specialty, you could advise your chair as to the ranges of expertise and sources of persons appropriate to review your work. Your suggestions may or may not be followed, and the availability of faculty may constrain who can serve on the *ad hoc* review committee. You also may notify your dean or the Office of Academic Personnel should you feel that internal opposition exists from, for example, a hostile chair.

The *ad hoc* review committee writes and forwards its report to CAP for consideration.

7. Vice Provost, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, and Chancellor

After reviewing the material submitted by the school, chair, department and candidate, CAP votes and forwards its recommendation to the Vice Provost. If CAP disagrees with the

department's recommendation or if CAP needs more information, the Vice Provost will write to the department (with a copy sent to you) communicating the discrepant recommendation and to ask whether further information exists that should be considered.

Depending on the action proposed, material not previously included in the dossier may be submitted for consideration by the department faculty through your Chair. This "new" material may be considered if the additional information concerns work to be published, accepted or received any other recognition or activity, during the review period (See CAP [FAQs #28](#) for submission of materials past the review period for your promotion). Such information will be forwarded to CAP through the appropriate levels of review and, where sufficiently compelling, can result in a reversal of a tentative negative decision. You will be asked to sign a form, the Certification Statement for Additional Information Added to Academic Review, ([UCI-AP-50A](#)) to indicate that you have received the information added to your file.

If the Vice Provost and the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost agree with CAP's recommendation, the file is forwarded to the Chancellor for the final decision. If the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost disagrees with CAP's recommendation, it may be sent back to CAP for reconsideration. In advising the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost can reject the advice of the Council on Academic Personnel, although CAP's recommendation is most often upheld. Thus, the tenure decision is typically a faculty-derived decision rather than an administrative one. Final decision-making power resides with the Chancellor.

In the case of a tenure review when the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost's preliminary assessment is to deny the promotion, or in the case of non-reappointment or non-promotion of an assistant professor, the candidate has enhanced access to information in the file and an opportunity to comment at this point. In simple terms, the Chancellor's decision cannot be a negative one without the preliminary assessment notification process. If the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost's preliminary assessment is for non-reappointment, both you and your department Chair will have an opportunity to respond after receiving access to extra-departmental documents in your review file — intact copies of the Dean's letter and CAP report, plus redacted copies of the Chair's letter and any *ad hoc* review report. These, plus a copy of the department letter and redacted copies of outside letters, will be sent to you via the Dean's office at the time of the preliminary assessment, if you did not request them at the time of the departmental review. (See [APP 3-50](#) and [APM 220-84-b](#))

You will then have five (5) working days from the date you receive notice of the adverse preliminary assessment to provide a response to the issues raised during the review. You will be able to submit any additional materials to your chair, and your response, together with additional recommendations from your department and dean, will then be returned to CAP for final review. Policy allows you to respond directly to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

if you choose to, but the response will be returned to the department for advice. This response, together with additional recommendations from the department, chair and dean, will be returned for final consideration by CAP, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, and the Chancellor.

Any new material or documentation must be submitted to the department in order that it may comment. It is inappropriate to resubmit the evidence previously advanced.

Examples of new evidence may be:

- Documentation regarding new publications (with updated vitae, review profile or addendum)
- Department-solicited extramural reviews of *new* material
- Additional evaluations made by the department and/or dean
- Statements made by the candidate

It is important to remember that new evidence (additional information) can only be submitted at prescribed times: in response to a preliminary assessment, or at the request of the dean, CAP, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, or Chancellor. Such evidence is submitted via your department and is reviewed by subsequent reviewers.

Access to Your Review File

Access to your entire file is limited to the information that is made available at specified points of the review. As stated earlier, at the departmental level you may request redacted copies of outside referee letters as well as an intact copy of the departmental letter disclosing the vote. In addition, you may request a redacted copy of the departmental *ad hoc* committee report (if applicable) either before the departmental recommendation or after the Chancellor's final decision. After the final decision, you may request redacted copies of all confidential letters in your review file as well as intact copies of non-confidential materials. (See Appendix I for a summary of access guidelines).

Can the Final Decision Be Appealed?

The outcome of a tenure review is final and may not be appealed once the Chancellor has made a final decision. You should exercise your rights during the review process to provide written comments or additional materials when given the opportunity. If you believe that a procedural error occurred in the course of your tenure review which adversely affected the outcome, you may file a grievance with the Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure ([CPT](#)).

Confidentiality

During the entire review process, confidentiality is a critical requirement. Breaches of confidence are subject to disciplinary action by the Chancellor. The candidate is not allowed to see the confidential portions of the file except in redacted (i.e., identities removed) form and only during specific periods between the initiation of a departmental recommendation through the final administrative decision. Following the final decision, if requested in writing, non-confidential material and a redacted copy of all confidential material presented as part of the file may be obtained.

B. RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

When you take up a new role in a social system, there is much to learn. You must gain access to the flow of information within the system, and you must juggle multiple responsibilities. The professorial role in a major research university includes research, teaching, and professional and public service, and in some cases, administration or applied activities such as clinical practice. Faced with multiple responsibilities, you must make daily decisions about how best to allocate your time and the aspects of organizational life in which you should become involved.

Acceptance of administrative and professional duties, including professional activities, campus and public service, should be recorded regularly for incorporation into the file. Trusting to one's own memory when the review file is being assembled can lead to inadvertent omissions of important activities. Wherever possible, it is desirable to be able to document evidence of the effectiveness and impact of such service functions. Communications testifying to effective service should be preserved for inclusion in the file. In general, service to the University and the profession carry greater weight than public service although there are notable exceptions in which such service contributes significantly to the goals and missions of the academic community.

Making Research a Priority

The University structure is set up primarily around your teaching functions. Your daily life is most visibly organized around the academic calendar; that is, when instruction begins, when classes meet, and when grades are due. Yet your research accomplishments, not your teaching successes, over the course of each year are the primary basis for your evaluation and promotion to tenure. Evidence of a productive and creative mind will be sought in your published research. In fields such as art, dance, music, literature, and drama, distinguished creation will receive consideration equivalent to that accorded to distinction attained in research. For promotion to tenure, there must be evidence that you are continuously and effectively engaged in research or creative activity of high quality and significance.

Despite this reality, one common mistake is to let your teaching functions organize your daily life and to fit in your research and writing on the side. The more productive approach (and an essential aspect of your preparation for tenure) is to **organize your year around your own research and scholarly activities**. Develop an overall five-year plan for your own scholarly development, with each year devoted to a subset of the overall goals. Reassess this plan for its feasibility every year. Plan for what you want to accomplish by the midcareer appraisal and, further, for what you need to have completed by the time of tenure evaluation. Successful plans include the following:

(1) Develop your agenda not only around quarters and courses but around the best times to collect data, to attend conferences and submit grants, and to write.

For example, if you are faced with particularly heavy teaching responsibilities one quarter, determine how you can use your time weekly to collect data or to do your library research so that when more open blocks of time become available you are ready to begin writing. As you approach the tenure review, you may wish to ask your Chair for a lighter teaching load. This might entail teaching fewer courses in a given year, courses that involve less preparation, or courses with smaller enrollments. Consider repeating courses you have already taught, rather than developing new ones, the year or two prior to the tenure review.

(2) Protect blocks of time each week to work on your own research activities.

Do not give them up under any circumstances. For example, in scheduling student appointments, keep an appropriate number of hours open for students, but do not deviate from the schedule. Some people work best in whole-day blocks of time; others find mornings or afternoons the best time to write. Schedule classes, meetings, and appointments with these considerations in mind, making sure you earmark sufficient, high-quality time for your own scholarly activities. Do not use these precious blocks of time to read your email, answer correspondence, or finish lectures or other work that has spilled over into the time allotted for your research. Guard your research time as you would actual appointment times that cannot be broken.

(3) Plan for some leave time in order to maximize your opportunities to write.

Apply for a grant with some release time from teaching, or for a faculty [Career Development Award](#) (keep checking the link for the open call, this program is not currently funded) that would allow you time off from teaching or a summer free to write or pursue your research. If such funding is not available to you, draw on your sabbatical time before tenure or even consider a leave without pay, if you can manage it financially. Such leaves ensure an uninterrupted period in which to complete a body of work. Be careful, though, about taking too much time off or accepting visiting appointments at other institutions. You will not get credit for teaching at an institution

other than UCI, and it is important to have a presence among your departmental colleagues, since their opinions will be basic to the success of your tenure review.

You accrue sabbatical credit for each quarter of half-time or more service as Assistant Professor. The table below details the sabbatical credits needed for specific sabbatical leaves. Start planning your sabbatical early to fit into your research plans and department needs. Normally, you need to request [sabbatical](#) during the fall or winter quarters of the academic year prior to the leave.

Sabbatical Credit Usage for Academic Year (9-month) Appointees
(Maximum Accrual: 30 Quarter Credits)

| Quarters of Leave | Sabbatical at Full Salary | Sabbatical at Partial Salary | | | | Sabbatical In Residence |
|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|
| | 100% Salary | 89% | 83% | 78% | 67% | 100% Salary |
| 1 Quarter | 9 credits | ----- | ----- | ----- | 6 credits | 6 credits |
| 2 Quarters | 18 credits | ----- | 15 credits | ----- | 12 credits | 12 credits |
| 3 Quarters | 27 credits | 24 credits | ----- | 21 credits | 18 credits | 18 credits |

Sabbatical Credit Usage for Fiscal Year (11-month) Appointees
(Maximum Accrual: 40 Quarter Credits)

| Quarters of Leave | Sabbatical at Full Salary | Sabbatical at Partial Salary | | | | | | Sabbatical In Residence |
|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|
| | 100% Salary | 92% | 89% | 83% | 78% | 75% | 67% | 100% Salary |
| 1 Quarter | 9 credits | | | | | | 6 credits | 6 credits |
| 2 Quarters | 18 credits | | | 15 credits | | | 12 credits | 12 credits |
| 3 Quarters | 27 credits | | 24 credits | | 21 credits | | 18 credits | 18 credits |
| 4 Quarters | 36 credits | 33 credits | | 30 credits | | 27 credits | 18 credits | 18 credits |

By actively designating appropriate time for your research, and by developing a five-year plan, you can build a research program that has both room and time to grow.

Developing a Scholarly Program

It is essential that there be clear evidence of your UCI-based research program. Your scholarly contributions will be evaluated for evidence of growth, impact on the field (e.g., work that opens new lines of investigation), and future promise. Often, that means your work needs to be programmatic or progressive — it is expected to unfold, with one contribution leading to another. Consequently, you will be faced continuously with choices about what to do next. Each discipline varies in terms of what kind of scholarly contribution it most values (whether it is a book or a journal article) and whether it is empirical or theoretical work. Your colleagues can advise you about these criteria of achievement, and you must choose wisely about shaping the direction and scope of your scholarly activities. If books are required, you write journal articles at your peril, and vice versa. Similarly, publication of your dissertation is a mandatory first step in some fields, but is considered less critical in others. Tenure review is based on new work after you have been hired.

Several rules probably hold true across disciplines. Publication of popular books and textbooks does not count heavily in your tenure review. The writing of a textbook can be viewed as a teaching activity, but it is unlikely to be regarded as scholarship, unless colleagues' letters attest to the textbook's scholarly contribution. Ask for such letters if you have written a textbook and you believe that it makes such a contribution. Work that is too narrow in scope might be considered during the review process to be repetitive and/or insufficient to constitute an important contribution. Work that is too broad or reflects too many unrelated interests, in contrast, may be seen as dabbling or lacking focus or a set of themes. Work done in collaboration with someone else (in particular someone senior to you) is difficult for reviewers to evaluate, and questions might be raised about the nature of your independent contribution. Therefore, it may be important to complete some singly authored papers in order to establish your independence.

Extramural Funding

In the sciences, once a research emphasis has been established, grants are necessary to help provide financial support to conduct the research, and such support provides an opportunity to devote a concentrated block of your time to research. This is critical in the building of a viable research program. The ability to attain competitive grants is also a mark of your development as a scholar in the sciences. Talk to a faculty mentor and one or more trusted department colleagues about the expectations in your field or department for attaining national grant funding before tenure or promotion.

Your senior colleagues are your best source of information. Run your ideas by them. Solicit their feedback on drafts of your grant proposals.

The Office of [Research Administration](#) presents up-to-date information on sources of intramural and extramural funding. In addition, intramural (campus-based) funding is available to school research committees for competitive awards for basic and applied research, and for conference and workshop support. The Office of Research Administration also publishes information on UC fellowships, grants, and awards, and posts downloadable forms and application deadlines for the most-used funding sources.

Preparing for Publication

There are choices to be made about when to publish, what to publish, and where to publish. Your colleagues can be very helpful about the criteria of achievement in the field and about the reputation of journals. Colleagues can also provide helpful advice on drafts of your papers before you submit them.

It is important to publish your work as promptly as you can so that wide groups of scholars can learn about it, cite it, and provide constructive feedback which will help you shape your future work. Do not wait until a book is completely finished before earmarking a piece (perhaps a pilot piece) for professional communication. In that way, you begin the process of building visibility, and you keep the door open for important criticism to which you may need to respond in your work. On the other hand, avoid publishing too many small, incomplete pieces of your work that by themselves are insignificant.

If you are working in a science field, you should be sure to approach publication of your research results properly. First, the research itself should be either completed or have reached a point that makes a logical stage for reporting. Multiple small papers or case reports increase the quantity of publications listed in your curriculum vitae, but may detract from the overall quality of your achievement. Once the results of your work are available and worth reporting, you must make several decisions. The paper should be well written and reviewed internally by experts who can provide helpful feedback prior to submission to a journal. Everyone who participated in the research should have an opportunity to examine and review the manuscript before it is sent to a journal. Co-authors should be listed in sequence according to the conventions of your discipline. Faculty members who have read the paper but have not participated in the research should not be included as co-authors.

Prepare your work for the most respected publications in the field. Do not settle for journals or publishers of poor quality, since their prestige influences the assessment of your reputation. In fields where journal publication is important, invited chapters do not count as much as articles in refereed journals, because chapters usually do not undergo the rigorous peer review that

journals require. Publication of popular books and textbooks may generate independent income, but these may not count heavily in your tenure review. As mentioned before, the writing of textbooks is viewed as a teaching activity, not a research effort, unless respected professionals can attest to your textbook's scholarly contributions. You must consider carefully whether writing a chapter is a better use of your time than preparing a journal submission. As noted earlier, conference proceedings are generally not weighted as heavily as chapters or articles in peer-reviewed journals. However, exceptions exist in some fields, such as computer science, where conference proceedings may be peer-reviewed.

Furthermore, in choosing the journal for publication, you need to make thoughtful decisions about the particular audience you want your work to reach. If your work is interdisciplinary or has implications for multiple subfields within your discipline, or if it has applied implications (for teachers, as an example), you might want to have some papers that address each of these audiences.

Finally, your manuscript needs to be in good shape (in format as well as substance) before submitting it for publication in order to lessen the time it is under review and to make sure it is appropriate for the particular journal you have targeted. Your colleagues can really help you with this. On the other hand, extreme perfectionism that needlessly delays submission is not a wise use of time given that most journal reviewers ask for some revisions by the author.

Building Relationships: Increasing Your Visibility as a Scholar

It is important to remember that a strong record of research and teaching will be given much greater weight than will successful networking when it comes time for promotion or tenure review. Nonetheless, relationships with departmental and campus colleagues can be important sources of information, support, and intellectual exchange, and relationships with professional colleagues outside of the University help to establish one's visibility as a scholar. These different realms of relationship-building are discussed below.

Within Your Department

It is important to get to know your departmental colleagues. When the department votes on your promotion, your colleagues' familiarity with you and with your work will be vital. That familiarity should not just be based on their taking the time to read your work. Rather, if they have the sense of you as a lively, responsive, thinking scholar, they will be much more able to take a favorable stance in reading the departmental review committee's report.

How can you get to know your colleagues? Talk to them about their recent work. Ask their advice about the directions you are taking in your own work. If your department has a colloquium or brown bag series, volunteer to give a presentation, especially if you can use this

occasion as a “dry run” for an upcoming presentation at a professional meeting. Serve on departmental committees, but do not do so at the sacrifice of your first priority - research. Co-teach with a more experienced colleague; you will learn from each other (but be sure you have an independent teaching and writing record). If you would like a colleague to read an early draft of a paper, first pick someone who is known for friendly and constructive criticism, and then try to lighten the burden by asking for quite specific help (e.g., “I’d especially like your comments on pages 5-9”).

Often mentorship will be of great value to you early in your career. If you would like a mentor, you should discuss this with your department Chair or your Dean and ask them for help in facilitating access to appropriate mentoring.

You should talk at least annually to your Chair, as well as to your colleagues, about important professional choices and about the criteria for promotion and “normal” productivity, although creating such opportunities for discussion is more difficult than you may first assume. You need to keep the Chair informed about your accomplishments — the research you are doing, the professional meetings you are attending, the papers submitted, and the invitations received. Keep in mind the important role that the Chair plays in the tenure review process. In a sense, you are the person who can best help the Chair put together a convincing case on your behalf.

Within the Campus Community

It is important to get to know your colleagues outside of your department, particularly those who do work that is relevant to your own. Not only can they provide additional advice and feedback about your work, but they also can help make you and your work more widely known on campus (e.g., by inviting you to give a talk in their department or area, by recommending you to be a member of an important committee). Moreover, if your case is forwarded to an *ad hoc* committee for review, they are likely to be among the pool of outside faculty who may be asked to serve on your *ad hoc* committee. It is important to remember that, in the tenure review, the departmental vote is not the only vote. The review and vote by the *ad hoc* committee may be crucial to the final outcome.

For a tenure-track faculty member, department and school committee service is important and useful. Working on an Academic Senate committee is also a good way to get to know your colleagues, but you must watch the time commitment carefully. Participation on one important Academic Senate committee is likely to be more helpful than is participation on several smaller, less influential school or program committees. However, you must make careful decisions about committee service because it does not count as heavily in the tenure decision as does scholarship. Remember, you have the responsibility for monitoring your own workload. It is not wise to accept any time-consuming service that detracts seriously from your teaching

or research accomplishments before tenure. If you have any questions, you can consult your mentor, Chair, or Dean for advice.

Within a National and International Network of Colleagues

Assessment of your national and international reputation as a scholar is an important part of the tenure review process. Gaining such a reputation during the relatively short time period before the tenure review (typically five years) requires some careful planning. You can take active steps to increase the visibility of your work. Publication of your work in highly regarded journals is most clearly important. Send copies of your preprints and reprints to people whom you cite and who would be interested in your work. A published critical review of the research literature in your area can be helpful.

Participation in conferences and other professional meetings also helps you establish professional contacts. The presentation of papers at these meetings (which require less lead time than does journal publication) nearly as heavily in the tenure review process as are publications in refereed journals. Small meetings where you can engage in serious intellectual discussions with colleagues can often be more helpful than larger, more anonymous meetings with a national network of colleagues. You also may need to participate in establishing a national network of colleagues in your area if such a network does not already exist. Planning your own conference might facilitate the building of such a network, so long as the time devoted to such an activity does not compromise your research productivity.

Remember that in the tenure review assessment of your professional reputation, you will be asked to give your department Chair a list of potential outside reviewers. These reviewers should be senior faculty (full professors) at well-regarded universities, and it helps if you and your work are already known to them.

In summary, building professional relationships on a national and international level is an important component of academic advancement, including that to tenure status. For the junior faculty member, then, the first half dozen years are critical in establishing a professional reputation.

The most important single means of gaining recognition is, of course, through publication of strong research and scholarly findings in the forms most important to one's discipline. Other possible means of gaining recognition and developing a wide range of professional relationships are as follows:

- arrange to have reprint articles sent to former dissertation directors and professors as well as to persons important in the field, some of whose interests overlap with your own,

- attend professional meetings where contacts can be made with persons whose research and interests resemble your own,
- present papers at important conferences as a means of disseminating your research findings quickly and receiving immediate feedback, which can develop into dialogues and even collaborations; wherever possible, such papers should be developed into published articles since the latter generally carry more overall weight in the advancement and particularly the tenure process,
- discuss with local and national colleagues the prospect of planning a conference of your own on a topic of interest which would involve the participation of persons most likely to make important and stimulating contributions.

C. KEEP RECORDS ABOUT YOUR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

You should keep ample records of your accomplishments from which you can draw documentation for merit increases and for promotions. Do not assume that your department is doing this for you. Entering information into the [MyData](#) database may be helpful (see page 16). Be sure that the department has your full curriculum vitae, with a record of your professional career and publications that goes back to the start of your work, not just your UCI appointment. The *curriculum vitae* should not contain personal information that is irrelevant to your professional work.

Research and Professional Recognition

In addition to reporting your publications to your department, be prepared to include information on research colloquia to which you are invited, as this is an important indication of professional recognition. (Even if you decline, such invitations may be considered quite an honor.) Attending national and regional research conferences is critical in the development of your professional reputation. Giving presentations and organizing symposia at national meetings enhance your visibility. Poster presentations provide you with an excellent opportunity for meeting individuals working in your area.

Keep a record of requests to speak; requests to contribute to books, special journal issues, and panels; requests that you serve on editorial boards as a consultant; requests to review books. Keep records of important citations, letters of praise, and reviews of your work. For some fields, it may be useful to check the Citation Index to find out how often your work is being cited and by whom. Receipt of grants and fellowships is also a good indicator of professional reputation.

Consider putting letters in your file from persons acknowledging your professional or service work, or suggest that the person be consulted by the department. Send your work to such

people to keep them abreast of your new activities. If you receive a feeler about a job elsewhere, be sure to keep a complete record, including date and time and caller, even if you do not plan to proceed further.

Remember that some members of your department and CAP may have a very difficult job assessing the importance of your work. They must rely heavily on professional indicators that show you are contributing to your field. Therefore, evidence of national or international recognition should be collected and retained at all stages of your career.

Drafts and Publications

For your midcareer appraisal, include not only published work but also your plans for the next four years. When work in progress is submitted, the department must thoroughly and critically evaluate it, with the aid of extramural reviewers if appropriate. Your unit can present and analyze work in progress if it seems appropriate in a particular case. It is most appropriate for a normal merit in which a long-term research or creative project does not fit into the normal two or three-year cycle of review. It is wisest not to list work not yet accepted for publication on the Review Profile or the Addendum form. Nonetheless, if work in progress forms a significant part of the basis for the current action, that work cannot again be the sole basis for a future action. In short, work is credited only once. As in many ambiguous matters in personnel reviews, the key here is for the candidate and the unit to explain fully and candidly what is taking place. In many departments it is not the custom to submit work in progress for review; it is certainly not required.

Material not yet accepted for publication is never considered for merit increases or promotions; it is preferable to include published or accepted (forthcoming) articles only. Your *curriculum vitae* may list work in progress, drafts, etc., but the official Review Profile **or** Addendum, normally should not.

When you are being considered for tenure, do not let anyone dissuade you from submitting all of your scholarly published material for your review file, not just the most recent. Your entire career is being judged at this point.

Teaching

Although you are judged primarily in terms of your research and publications, excellence in teaching is also essential for promotion at UCI. The University's Instructions to Appointment and Promotion Committees ([APM 210](#)) clearly states "superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions." Teaching at UCI ranges from formal lectures in large classrooms to informal discussions with individual students and postdoctoral scholars. It is important to document what and whom you teach, the quality of your teaching, any work on curriculum and course development, service on theses and orals committees, and contributions to textbooks.

If you are spending a great deal of time with students, consider how to reflect this activity in your record. Students who obtain graduate degrees under your supervision appear in the record; other students often do not. Joint publication with students may benefit both you and the student. Add student publications to your listing of projects.

1. What and Whom You Teach

Your **formal courses** will be listed in your department's records. Be sure that those records are accurate. If you co-teach, check that your name is included and that you are credited for the course. If you teach laboratory or discussion sections yourself, have your name listed, not "Staff." Keep your own file of individual tutoring and independent studies and research. Keep a good set of qualitative records to show your concern with teaching: course outlines, reading lists, extra instructional materials, evidence of your work in developing new courses and new methods, and work on textbooks. Keep a record of theses and orals committee participation (including undergraduate honors theses, master's theses, oral qualifying examinations, doctoral dissertations); record your role in evaluating performance in graduate students' performance on comprehensive examinations (under teaching or departmental service). Your department will not know about your extra-departmental service or about your service on other campuses, so keep a file of notices about such committees and a record of dates of completion of dissertations.

2. The Quality of Your Teaching

The quality of your teaching will be evaluated from the following data: student evaluations, students' letters, colleagues' letters, achievements and professional status of former students, evidence of your concern for teaching, and the quality of theses and dissertations you have directed. Student evaluation of your formal course work is usually handled through your school. Depending upon the school in which you teach, you may have a say in which aspects of your teaching will be evaluated. Know your teaching strengths. For example, if your lectures are highly organized but not dynamic, be sure that your organizational ability is appropriately

evaluated. If the effectiveness of your communication style is your strength, include that information as one aspect of your teaching that you wish to have evaluated.

Be sure that your students provide teaching evaluations. In some departments the students themselves distribute, collect, and deliver their evaluations to the department, and the department collates or summarizes the material. If you are a woman or minority, and you feel your student evaluations express hostility or bias because of your gender or race, you may consult with the Director of the [Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity](#), or with your department Chair. Departments also can conduct a peer review of your teaching. Two ways to approach this are (1) to ask to give departmental colloquia in order to display your lecturing abilities and (2) to give guest lectures in your colleagues' classes.

If your initial teaching evaluations are disappointing, as they often are for new assistant professors, create a record that shows your efforts to improve your skills. Pay attention to the evaluations, particularly the written comments of students. Visit other classes; get help from colleagues known to be good teachers. You may want to go to the Teaching, Learning and Technology Center or visit the [TLTC website](#). The TLTC provides free, confidential consultations to help you to enhance your instructional skills and to improve student learning. TLTC staff will help you to identify your strengths as a teacher, as well as problem areas and strategies for improvement. The TLTC offers ongoing programs and workshops on many topics, including Problem Based Learning, as well as technology institutes. Your efforts will be rewarded by better student learning and by improved teaching evaluations.

Some courses — often at the graduate level — do not receive formal evaluation. If you feel that you are a much better teacher of graduate-level courses, be sure to solicit student evaluations from your students in those courses. Otherwise, this aspect of your teaching may never be documented. Your efforts in teaching are also documented by your handouts and course outlines. Be sure to keep a complete set of handouts in each of the courses you teach. These will document your concern for your teaching.

Student letters are also an important means of evaluating the quality of your teaching. If you are tutoring a student, be sure to ask the student if he or she has found your tutorials helpful. If so, make a note of it. Tell the student that you may ask him or her for a letter for your promotion or merit at a later date. Know how you can reach the student.

The achievements and professional status of students with whom you worked closely can provide an indication of your excellence as a teacher and/or research mentor. Keep a record of important awards received by undergraduate and/or students with whom you worked closely. Information about the professional status (e.g., job placements) of former graduate students who you trained often is included in your record (in the Review Profile or *Addendum*) during merit and promotion reviews, so it is a good idea to keep this information up to date.

If you are an outstanding teacher, you may be nominated for one of the teaching awards on campus, such as the Academic Senate's [Distinguished Assistant Professor Award for Teaching](#). Inquire if your school gives annual teaching awards.

3. Curriculum and Course Development

If you have spent time on curriculum development in your department, be sure that there is some evidence of this in your records. You may need to ask your Chair or students to write about this work. If you have developed a new course or a new method of teaching a subject, be sure to write about it in your self-statement.

4. Theses and Orals Committees

Keep a record of the names of the students, dates of their oral examinations, and dates of graduation. Clearly identify your role: advisor, co-advisor, committee member (i.e., reader), Chair of exam committee, member of exam committee, etc.

5. Textbooks

Your experience in writing textbooks or chapters in published textbooks should be documented. This provides evidence that you are lecturing to a broad base of students.

Because departments vary considerably in the methods of evaluating teaching and in the value placed upon teaching relative to other criteria, you should discuss the norms and practices in your department with the Chair or another advisor. Then, it's a good idea to submit, along with tangible evidence, a narrative of your teaching accomplishments to integrate the various kinds of evidence and to highlight those accomplishments most valued by your department.

Service

Keep careful records of all your committee, consultant, and public service work. If products resulted from your work, include these in your materials (e.g., in the development of a new program, include a program description). Solicit letters for your file concerning your contributions. Document any evidence of your impact and effectiveness. It is important to realize that you may be the only person keeping a record of these types of service. If you are a woman or a member of a minority group, you may find yourself overburdened with committee work. Should this occur, careful documentation of work you have already done may help you to decline further committee assignments. It is important that you have some service at this stage of your career, but not at the expense of your research or teaching responsibilities.

D. SOURCES OF HELP

Official Rules and Regulations

To learn your rights and privileges within the University, you should refer to the *Academic Personnel Manual* (APM), the [UC Faculty Handbook](#), and the *UCI Academic Personnel Procedures Manual* (APP), all of which are readily available online through the Academic Personnel Website. The Office of Academic Personnel also can provide you with information concerning your employment. If you wish to learn the status of your review at any time during the review process, talk with your department chair. The Office of Academic Personnel provides your school with status reports of open cases during the review cycle.

If you receive an unfavorable review, your department chair will be informed by letter before a final decision is reached. The letter will ask for any new information that may alter the decision. Obviously, any changes of duties, new manuscripts or grants, and new teaching evaluations or accomplishments should be submitted at that time.

If you feel your case has been misrepresented after reading your copies of the departmental report and redacted outside letters, you have several channels of recourse open to you. If you believe that internal bias exists, talk to your Chair, Dean, or one of the resources listed below.

People

If you suspect unfair treatment, exhaust the channels for informal inquiry before trying formal complaints. People are inclined to be helpful on a voluntary basis but are more likely to become defensive when threatened with outside scrutiny. For many reasons, institutions are often hostile to outside investigation and can be very critical of those who go outside for help. The University is generally more responsive to people who begin with an internal complaint process. Therefore, you should be judicious in the order of your actions. The risk of both great expense and professional ostracism exists. Be sure to get good advice before making a formal complaint.

The following internal “people” channels are available:

- Your Chair
- Your Dean
- The Faculty Equity Advisor for your school (See the current list at <http://advance.uci.edu/equityadvisors.html>)
- Your school’s personnel analyst in the Dean’s Office or the Office of Academic Personnel ([AP](#))

The following administrative channels are available:

- The University [Ombudsman](#)
- The Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity ([OEOD](#))
- The Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure ([CPT](#))

Each of the above can look into your file, correct errors and injustices, and advise you about other courses of action.

Administrative Offices

If you decide to undertake a formal complaint, you can go to one or more of the following: the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, the Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure, the Office of Civil Rights in the U.S. [Department of Education](#), or the courts. Some individuals have won court victories when substantiated with good data; however, the California Information Practices Act of 1977 makes access to some data very difficult.

Remember Your Supporters

The day-to-day life of a faculty member can be very stressful, and it is important for you to retain your perspective. There may be times when your grant proposals are not being funded, your research program is stalled, your teaching evaluations are disappointing, and some journal editor has just asked you to do a few (thousand!) additional experiments before your paper can be accepted. As if this were not enough, your tenure clock keeps ticking, and there is little you can do to stop it. At such times it is hard to offer any consolation except to remind you that these types of problems are endemic to all University faculty. It is important to realize that there are a number of individuals and groups on campus who are interested in your advancement, promotion, and development as a faculty member:

- Senate Council on Academic Personnel — [CAP](#) is comprised of senior faculty members who devote a great deal of time to faculty promotion and issues relating to academic personnel
- Senate Council on Faculty [Welfare](#), Diversity, and Academic Freedom — concerned with issues and policies that are relevant to all faculty, including women and minority faculty members
- Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure — [CPT](#) addresses faculty rights and privileges
- Faculty Equity Advisors for your school — responsible for setting up support networks necessary to guide assistant professors through the tenure barrier and associate professors through promotion to full professor

- [Vice Provost](#), Academic Personnel — the Office of Academic Personnel reports to this position and is devoted to serving the faculty and ensuring that policies related to faculty are expeditiously and fairly implemented

The Office of Academic Personnel sponsors a variety of very useful faculty development activities, including a faculty orientation program each fall featuring presentations by the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, Vice Provost, and the Chair of the Council on Academic Personnel. These programs are highly recommended for all new faculty members.

E. FOSTERING THE DEVELOPMENT OF JUNIOR FACULTY - ADVICE TO CHAIRS AND OTHERS

Initial Counseling

- Make sure that you give new assistant professors explicit advice about record-keeping and about strategies related to promotion, given that they may lack informal contacts.
- Make clear what the standards of promotion are in your department.
- Show the new assistant professor the publication records (and with permission, the self-statements) of the most recently tenured associate professors in your department as a frame of reference.
- Make this *Advancement and Promotion at Irvine* guide available to new assistant professors.
- Allow new assistant professors to serve on midcareer review (drafting) committees and/or tenure review committees to help throw light on the process.

Mentors and Continued Advising

- Make sure that each new assistant professor has a specifically designated tenured professor to help guide the new appointee's progress. Women and minorities often find themselves socially isolated and lacking informal advice about publishing, conferences, and research planning that is essential to progress.
- Inform new appointees about normal teaching loads, available assistance, available funds, and research facilities. In some departments these resources are seen as zero-sum and, hence, not to be shared with new faculty. In this case, the Chair should take appropriate steps to remedy this problem when it has the potential to adversely affect the junior faculty member's productivity.
- The Chair should be sure to keep track of conferences for new faculty, where they publish, and so on.

- Chairs are particularly responsible for preventing assistant professors from being overloaded with administrative and committee work.
- Chairs do not have the right to censor research topics, rewrite papers, or interfere against the will of candidates.
- Advise faculty that they have the right to paid childbearing leave. Childbearing faculty are also eligible to request an additional period of active service–modified duties. **The “active service-modified duties” option is also available to natural fathers and adoptive parents of either sex.** See [APM 760](#), Family Accommodations for Childbearing and Childrearing.
- Advise assistant professors that they have the right, under certain circumstances provided for in academic personnel policy, to request an extension of their time before tenure review if they have been involved in childbearing since being hired (APM 133-17h). In addition, helpful resources are available on the AP website under the “[Faculty Initiatives](#)” Tab.

Advice on Obtaining Grants and Awards

- Women and minority assistant professors should be encouraged to apply for faculty [Career Development Awards](#).
- Assistant professors should be told how to obtain funds from the [Research Committee](#) and how to procure equipment through available University funds.
- Mentors should keep tabs on grant submissions, appropriate agencies, review content, etc.
- Chairs should assess the candidate’s grant activity for the possibility of proposing accelerated merits.

Using the Midcareer Appraisal Constructively

- Use the midcareer appraisal, like a student’s midterm exam, as a good time for pointing out problems to a candidate, but be careful about frightening a candidate who lacks self-confidence.
- Give supportive advice that encourages constructive change. Because of the isolation of women and minority assistant professors in many departments, they particularly need such encouragement to reassure them about their situation.
- Do not write glowing reviews for the midcareer appraisal unless the department can project its support at the tenure review. In some cases, midcareer reviews have been too positive and have failed to identify difficulties that could have been remedied if there had been adequate advising.

- Emphasize that criticisms and suggestions in the midcareer appraisal will be revisited in the tenure review.
- Show the candidate bibliographies of successful tenure cases in the department. These presumably set the standard. The files themselves are confidential, but the bibliographies are not.

Advisors beyond the Department

- Urge women and minority faculty members to meet their Deans, their school's Equity Advisors, and the Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity. It is part of the responsibility of those administrators to be advisors to women and minority faculty and to be aware of resources they may need.

Counseling Faculty through Difficult Reviews

- If a tenure review case is at all controversial, encourage the candidate to request access to redacted copies of the confidential review records in the file and to request a copy of the department letter and vote. These must be made available within five days of the request so as not to delay the review.
- Be sure that the file contains no inappropriate material that could have influenced the outcome of the personnel review.
- Encourage candidates to verify their Review Profile or Addendum for completeness before signing, and encourage them to write a complete statement of their achievements to be included in the dossier. This self-statement will help the review committee understand the goals and pattern of a candidate's work.
- At the time of the tenure review, make sure that all relevant material is forwarded to outside reviewers and to subsequent review levels.
- Help the candidate construct the best list of outside reviewers, and make sure the department generates an independent list of appropriate outside reviewers. Send each referee a packet of material. Ask a staff member to call all those who do not respond fast enough, and keep records of the calls.
- Do not make assumptions about reasons for non-response, and make sure that others also do not.
- If any letter received contains inappropriate language, return the letter to the referee and ask that the letter be rewritten. All solicited letters have to be forwarded to the next level of review.
- Be sure the Dean knows when your junior faculty, including women and minority faculty, have competing offers so that there is help preparing the best retention case possible.

Appendix I: Summary of University of California Access to Records Policy

| Type of Record | Classification | Access Policy Access by Individual |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| Outside Letters of Evaluation Solicited by School | Confidential | May receive redacted copies (1) before departmental recommendation or (2) after the final decision |
| Description of Qualifications of Outside Letter Writers (AP-11) | Confidential | No Access |
| Internal or External Unsolicited Student/Colleague Letters Requested by Candidate (usually not by formal letter) | Non-Confidential | May receive copy intact |
| Department Letter | Non-Confidential | May receive copy intact |
| Statistical Teaching Evaluations | Non-Confidential | May receive copy intact |
| Department Vote | Non-Confidential | Vote to be disclosed in department letter |
| Candidate Certifies Access Rights have been granted (AP-50) | Non-Confidential and Confidential | May receive a copy of the departmental letter and vote May receive a copy of redacted confidential material May request opportunity to respond |
| AFTER THE DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION | | |
| Chair's Personal Letter | Confidential | May receive redacted copy after the final decision |
| Dean's Letter | Non-Confidential | May receive intact copy after the final decision |
| DURING THE COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL'S REVIEW | | |
| Chancellor's <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee Report | Confidential | May receive redacted copy after the final decision |
| Request from CAP for Additional Information or in response to tentative recommendation | Non-Confidential | May receive copy and has opportunity to respond |
| Additional Outside Letters of Evaluation Solicited by School (may be needed for further review) | Confidential | May receive redacted copies (1) before departmental recommendation or (2) after the final decision |
| Description of Qualifications of Outside Letter Writers (AP-11) | Confidential | No Access |
| Department Letter response to request from CAP | Non-Confidential | May receive copy intact |
| Additional Information submitted by Department or by Chair on behalf of the Department and certified by candidate (AP-50-A) | Non-Confidential and Confidential | May receive a copy of additional information submitted for further consideration May receive a copy of redacted confidential material May request opportunity to respond |
| Chair's Personal Letter | Confidential | May receive redacted copy after the final decision |
| Dean's Letter | Non-Confidential | May receive copy intact after the final decision |
| AFTER THE COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL'S RECOMMENDATION | | |
| Council on Academic Personnel Report | Non-Confidential | May receive copy intact after the final decision |
| Other Administrators' Recommendation Letters | Non-Confidential | May receive copy intact after the final decision |
| Chair's Personal Letter | Confidential | May receive redacted copy after the final decision |
| Chancellor or Designee's Final Decision | Non-Confidential | Receives copy after the final decision |

PART III: ADVICE FOR TENURED FACULTY

You have made it over the tenure hurdle, and your colleagues have welcomed you as a permanent member of the department. What happens next?

A. MERITS AND PROMOTIONS

Post-Tenure Review

While the granting of tenure may be the most important decision affecting your career, the merit-based review system is an ongoing process that will occur every few years throughout your tenure at the University. Post-tenure review has only recently entered the national discussion, but at the University of California it is a well-established reality.

It will be especially important for you to keep up the momentum of your scholarly work after the tenure review. You will want to make good progress throughout the associate professor rank and on to full professor by way of a series of merit and promotion reviews.

Associate Professor Rank

For an associate professor, there are three normal steps — step I, II, and III - each with a normal service period of two years before the next review. Thus, the normal period of service at the rank of associate professor is six years, after which time you should expect to be reviewed for promotion to full professor. The promotion review is similar in complexity to the tenure review.

Two additional steps, IV and V, may be used in certain cases for candidates who are not quite ready for promotion to full professor, but whose performance in research, creative activity, teaching and service is seen as meritorious. Steps IV and V are called “overlapping steps” because their salaries are virtually the same as professor, step I and II. At one time, it was considered fairly normal for service at the overlapping steps to be counted as equivalent to service at the higher rank and to be promoted from associate professor, step V, directly to professor, step III. However, CAP currently considers that, whatever the step the individual occupies at the associate level, normal promotion is to professor, step I.

Associate professor, step IV or V, are considered to “overlap” with professor, step I or II, respectively (see **APM 220-18 b (2) and (3)**). Time served at the overlapping steps of lower rank may be considered as service at the overlapping step at the higher rank. However, this does not automatically justify “skipping” a whole step at the time of promotion. The default promotion is to step I of the next rank even when one has been at an overlapping step. Using the overlapping steps in lieu of steps in the higher rank must be carefully justified. Departments

should consider addressing the prospects of later using steps at a lower rank in lieu of overlapping steps at the higher rank at the time the step at the lower rank is proposed. Promotion is a weighty sign of academic success in itself. On the grounds of equity, the step to which a professor is promoted should be based on the career profile as a whole, as judged in comparison with the professor's peers. Regardless of step, a salary increase at the time of a promotion is always provided by the Administration, as an off-scale salary adjustment, if necessary.

What this means is that a candidate could spend three years at associate professor, step IV, and three years at associate professor, step V, in addition to the normal six years at the associate rank, and then only be moved to professor, step I, at the time of promotion. For this reason, use of the overlapping steps is normally discouraged.

Full Professor Rank

For a full professor, there are nine steps. The first five steps have a normal period between reviews of three years. Service at step V may be of indefinite duration. Beyond step V, there are additional, more stringent criteria for advancement. Advancement to step VI, or higher, requires great academic distinction and national or international recognition in scholarly achievement or in teaching, as well as evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in scholarship or creative achievement, University teaching, and service. Advancement to step VI, in terms of review, is similar to a review for promotion. Merit increases from step VI to step VII, step VII to step VIII, and step VIII to step IX, usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the lower step, and will only be granted upon evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to step VI. Advancement to professor above-scale is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed, whose teaching is excellent, and whose service is highly meritorious. This advancement review is also similar in process to a promotion review.

Career Equity Review

A Career Equity Review (CER) is an evaluation to determine whether a faculty member is correctly calibrated in rank and step. It is not a means of appeal for, or expression of, disagreement with a single personnel decision. The CER process examines cases in which normal personnel actions, from the initial hire onward, may have resulted in a rank and/or step designation not commensurate with the candidate's overall record of achievement. When appropriate, a CER review may result in the recalibration of the faculty member to a higher rank and step consistent with prevailing UCI standards.

Available to Senate faculty members (excluding those at the PSOE, Assistant Professor, or Professor, Above Scale, levels), the decision to initiate a CER rests solely with the faculty member and generally may be started at the time of his or her regular on-cycle academic review. The faculty member may submit a written request either to the department chair or to the appropriate dean. If the request is submitted to the department chair, a copy should also be submitted to the dean. If the faculty member selects review by the Dean (and subsequent confidential *ad hoc* committee) the proposed CER will be conducted prior to the department review.

A request for a [CER](#) must contain the specific rank and step desired including justification for the recalibration. Possible justification may include, but is not limited to, the following assessments: 1) the cumulative record warrants recalibration; 2) the rank/step was low at the time of initial appointment; or, 3) particular work and contributions were overlooked, undervalued, or had a delayed impact. The faculty member must identify the specific area(s) of the record that he or she believes should be reevaluated and may highlight selected publications from earlier review periods that he or she considers relevant to the CER request.

When the faculty member requests the CER at the department level, it is usually conducted in concurrence with the regularly scheduled academic review. The department chair should compile an academic review file that addresses the appointee's entire academic record (an "expanded dossier") for the purposes of the CER, as well as the regular action for the current review period. If the CER request involves advancement to or beyond a "barrier" step (promotion to full professor or advancement to professor, step VI, or to professor, Above Scale), the department must seek external referee letters addressing the barrier step advancement for inclusion in the file. The academic review file must include the faculty member's request for the CER.

The department's recommendation on the CER should be based upon the appointee's overall record and the University's established criteria for the requested rank and step, with one exception: the case will not require demonstration of the basis for an accelerated advancement. The purpose of the CER is to assess rank and step, and therefore recommendation of an additional off-scale salary award in lieu of recalibration is not appropriate.

The CER recommendation must be separate from, and in addition to, the proposed action, with separate letters and a separate department vote for each action. The department letter should also state what materials were evaluated in order to arrive at the recommendation regarding the CER. The Academic Summary Form (for the appropriate on-cycle action) should clearly indicate that the file is both a review for the regular action for the current review period and a Career Equity Review.

If recalibration is approved, the effective date may be the same as that which would have applied to the regular action. CERs are intended to supplement regular academic reviews, and they neither replace nor affect existing procedures for regular reviews. If the CER does not result in an adjustment, this will in no way affect the regular merit or promotion review.

The Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost's decision on the CER is not subject to appeal and is not retroactive.

B. RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Keep Research a Priority

It is important for your career that you set goals that will help you achieve promotion to full professor in a timely manner. Promotions and merit increases will be based primarily on your scholarly publication record, and therefore research should remain your priority. If you are in a department with many colleagues who receive accelerated merits, talk to your Chair about the department's criteria for both "normal" and "accelerated" advancement. Associate professors who are accelerated through the steps may achieve promotion to full professor earlier in their careers than others and may be looked upon as "rising stars."

Continue to follow the good work habits you developed as an assistant professor — plan your academic schedule around your research agenda. Develop five-year plans. Use sabbatical leave opportunities wisely, combining them with grant or fellowship-supported leaves whenever possible.

Administrative Service - Pros and Cons

You will undoubtedly be asked to provide more department and campus service as an associate professor than you were as an assistant professor, when your time was somewhat protected. Service on departmental personnel committees and on campus *ad hoc* review committees will give you valuable insights into how the review process works. Service on administrative or Academic Senate committees will provide you with opportunities to network with faculty colleagues across the campus who you might not otherwise have the opportunity to meet. Service contributions are valuable to you and to the campus. However, they will drastically impact the time you can devote to your research and can slow down the rate at which you advance to full professor.

Newly tenured women and minority faculty need to be especially judicious about protecting their post-tenure research time.

If you have an interest in and talent for administrative service, you may be asked to take on a more time-consuming role, such as department Chair or associate Dean. Effective leadership is an important contribution to the University, and it may provide attractive rewards in the form of stipends or other additional pay. However, you should remember that merits and promotions are based primarily on scholarly achievement, and so you will need to protect your time for research. While APM 245-11, "Criteria for Evaluating Leadership and Service in the Academic Personnel Process," indicates that reviewers will give credit for effective leadership up to the level of Professor, Step V, and that they will allow for reduced activity in teaching and/or research, the fact remains that good service will not make up for poor performance in teaching or research. **Reviewers will expect to see substantial scholarly achievement for promotion.**

Developing a National and International Reputation

In addition to maintaining an active research agenda, promotion to full professor and beyond is based upon developing a national and international reputation in your field.

National reputation is generally built on the originality and quality of research. It can be further enhanced by learning to be a well-organized, clear, and persuasive lecturer in your research field. Service on editorial boards, site-visiting teams, study sections, and consensus conferences takes time and effort, but such activities represent valuable contributions that help the profession as well as the individual. Be generous with your time when called upon to work for scientific societies in your field of endeavor. The education of young colleagues and their professional success constitute very important ingredients of your reputation.

International reputation is probably the most difficult to achieve and takes the longest time. It is based on national reputation, on the training of foreign research fellows, attendance at international meetings, service on international committees, and lectures and paper presentations at international meetings. When reached, it is the ultimate addition to your own prestige and to that of your department.

C. FOSTERING THE DEVELOPMENT OF MIDCAREER TENURED FACULTY - ADVICE TO CHAIRS AND OTHERS

Recognizing Faculty Achievements

- Find ways to recognize and convey appreciation for the ongoing achievements of midcareer tenured faculty. This can include pursuing nominations for university and national awards, as well as announcing/publicizing faculty achievements in faculty meetings and university publications.

- Consider the development of a nominations committee in the department to ensure that opportunities for faculty recognition (at all ranks) are identified and strong nomination packages prepared.

Maintaining Salary and Resource Equity

- Faculty morale and retention can be enhanced by active efforts to avoid disparities in faculty salaries and resources. Inequities can be minimized through regular review of salaries, merit raises, teaching workloads, office and research space, committee service, nominations for awards, and opportunities for departmental leadership roles.
- Consider initiating proactive salary adjustments to redress inequities, rather than waiting for faculty members to become frustrated or to seek outside offers, thereby risking their loss to another institution.

Continued Advising

- Midcareer tenured faculty sometimes can benefit from advice and guidance about their career development. This is particularly true of individuals whose advancement from associate to full professor has become delayed as the result of reduced productivity. Make yourself available to meet with such individuals to discuss causes of the reduced productivity and ways to revitalize their scholarly activities. Providing a small amount of departmental seed funding or linking the faculty members to shared research facilities or sources of bridge funding to support new work may be effective. It may be useful in some cases to identify senior faculty members with active research programs who are willing to provide informal (and sympathetic) mentoring.

Developing Leadership within the Department

- Consider rotating the membership and leadership of important departmental committees at appropriate intervals so that faculty members have an opportunity to learn about different aspects of the department's functioning. Rotating committee membership fosters the development of leadership potential within the department, ensures that the committees benefit regularly from fresh ideas and perspectives, and reduces the probability that particular faculty members will feel excluded or devalued.

PART IV: DIVERSITY, GENDER AND WORK LIFE ISSUES

UC Irvine is committed to faculty diversity, gender equity and work-life balance. This commitment is grounded in our unique role as a public land grant university that serves the people of California. It also reflects the fact that the experience of career is not identical for all faculty. Even though the university aspires to be meritocratic, it remains a social institution. Here, as in other organizations, the categories of class, gender sexual orientation, race and ethnicity, and national origins may differentially affect the perception and experience of faculty labor and reward. Employment laws and campus policies prohibit discrimination. Our procedures and best practices are designed to promote equity in all aspect of faculty career. But, an inclusive culture cannot be mandated. Instead, it is a product of the collective choices and actions of individual faculty to intentionally build and sustain.

Until recently, the very structure of labor and reward advantaged males. The promotion system is designed for ambitious researchers who are attentive to the criteria for achievement in their profession. The system was based on the availability of a partner to support career development; freeing a faculty member from the tasks of childrearing to ensure uninterrupted periods of work as well as capitalize on training opportunities and appropriate advancements. This model of career advantaged married male faculty while disadvantaging primary care giving women faculty and male faculty who shared equally in the responsibilities of childrearing. Yet, all faculty were subject to the same expectations for research productivity. Recognizing this structural inequity, the University of California adopted family friendly accommodation policies. These policies, which apply to all new parents, permit qualifying faculty to defer their midcareer appraisal and/or extend their tenure clock. It is important to note that these policies do not minimize the expectations for promotion, but seek to accommodate the responsibilities of career and family. (See resource page for these policies and other resources.) Still, in a career that demands total commitment, a residual stigma is still associated with utilizing these policies.

Even among highly educated people, bias and stereotyping exist. An extensive body of research has demonstrated that even the most well intentioned colleague is not necessarily free of socially constructed expectations. Faculty who are either from historically under-represented racial and ethnic minority populations or are members of marginalized groups are subject to implicit bias. Unless department or school faculty promote an inclusive culture, women and faculty of color may face these hurdles and barriers even as they are members of the professoriate. In many fields they have not reached critical mass. This is particularly the case for women in STEM fields and generally for African Americans, Chicanas/Chicanos, and Native Americans across the vast majority of academic programs. The experience of social isolation as well as hyper-visibility is common. In the former, they may be excluded from networks that enhance opportunities for recognition, leadership and distinction. Alternatively,

woman faculty and faculty of color may also bear a disproportionate share of service assignments that relates to diversity and equity because of who they are rather than their research or teaching specialization.

Diversity should be a responsibility for all faculty. It is for this reason that the University of California and the Academic Senate adopted a statement in support of broadening participation in the educational experience of all campuses. Since 2007 guidelines for promotion, review and appraisal encourage the recognition of contributions that “promote diversity and equal opportunity”. Since 2009 space is now included on the bio-bibliography for faculty to annotate the ways in which their research, teaching and service contributes to the campus commitment to diversity and equity. The value of these guidelines ultimately depends on whether the faculty as a community establishes meaningful expectations. (See resource page for this policy and related resources.)

Stereotyping is also not uncommon in the university. Several ADVANCE program climate surveys have documented the differential experience of women faculty based on gender schemas. In comparison to men, women experienced more incidents of uninvited use of nicknames or belittling terms from faculty and staff, and inappropriate references to age from students. Women experienced greater levels of exclusion from key processes than did men such as more incidents of discouragement and demoralization about career advancement possibilities in departmental personnel-related activities. Although the results were consistent with survey responses from other organizations in- and outside of higher education, it is clear that each member of the university community can play a part in promoting a climate free of bias. To this end, the academic senate and the ADVANCE program adopted a statement in support of an inclusive faculty culture. (For more information, visit <http://advance.uci.edu/>.)

Family Friendly Accommodations Resources for Tenure Track Faculty

University policy regarding leave time for the birth or adoption of a child, as well as time off the tenure clock for childrearing duties, may be found in the following sections of the [Academic Personnel Manual](#):

- [APM 760](#), Family Accommodations for Childbearing and Childrearing
- [APM 715](#), Family and Medical Leave
- [APM 133](#), Limitations on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles

Stopping the Tenure Clock for Eligible Faculty Parents

If you have substantial responsibility for the care of an infant or newly adopted child under age five during your pre-tenure years, you may request an extension of the eight-year clock for each event of child birth or adoption. The clock may be stopped more than once, and you may

have up to two years total off the clock ([APM 133-17](#)). This policy attempts to take into account the difficulty junior faculty have in teaching and doing research while raising young children.

In 2010, campus policies addressing "Stop the Clock", for the purpose of childrearing responsibility were simplified to a one-step process. The notification to "Stop the Clock" may be submitted by completing the "Childrearing Stop the Clock Certification Form" ([UCI-AP-92](#)), certifying the need. After the "Stop the Clock" notification has been acknowledged, the tenure clock will automatically stop for up to one year for each event of birth or placement, provided that the total of time off the clock does not exceed more than two years in the probationary period. Stopping the Clock is not a leave; it is a stoppage of the tenure clock for eligible academic appointees and will automatically defer a Midcareer Appraisal and/or tenure or promotion review by one year. This also may apply to other titles for purposes of childrearing. An academic appointee must provide notice to "Stop the Clock" within two years of the birth or adoption of the child, and before July 1 of the academic year in which a tenure or promotion review is to occur.

Any faculty member, who falls under the provisions of [APM 133](#), and is not currently undergoing a tenure or promotion review, may initiate a stoppage of the tenure clock on the limitation of service as provided in these policies.

Interaction with Midcareer Appraisal for Eligible Faculty Parents

In order to automatically defer a Midcareer Appraisal, the notification to "Stop the Clock" **should** be submitted by the end of the faculty member's third year (by June 30). If the notification to "Stop the Clock" is submitted after the Midcareer Appraisal, the notification of intent to "Stop the Clock" must be made before July 1 of the academic year in which a tenure or promotion review is to occur.

Please note, once a "Stop the Clock" has been acknowledged, faculty have the option to still submit a Midcareer Appraisal and/or promotion review during the normal time. Also, quarters "off the clock" due to a combination of Childbearing Leave, Parental Leave, and/or Primary Childrearing Responsibility may not exceed one year for each event of childbirth or adoption.

Active Service Modified Duty or Approved Teaching Relief for Eligible Faculty Parents

Current APM policy allows an academic appointee who is a birth mother and who has a full-time appointment for at least one full academic year (three quarters or two semesters) to be eligible for a total period of childbearing leave plus Active Service-Modified Duties of two quarters (or two semesters) to enable her to recover fully from the effects of pregnancy and childbirth and to prepare for and/or care for the newborn child. If she gives birth during the

summer or an off-duty term, she is eligible for a total period of active service-modified duties of two quarters (or two semesters). Eligibility for a period of Active Service-Modified Duties shall normally extend from 3 months prior to 12 months following birth or placement.

The “Active Service-Modified Duties” option is also available to natural fathers and adoptive parents of either sex.

See [APM 760](#), Family Accommodations for Childbearing and Childrearing. Parental leave is leave without salary granted for the purpose of child care. Normally, this leave, combined with childbearing leave and/or Active Service-Modified Duties, may not exceed one year for each birth or adoption ([APM 760-28](#)). It is helpful to consult with a number of recent birth or adopting parents about practices in your department or school and/or your school Equity Advisor.

Leave without Pay for Eligible Faculty Parents

It is possible, financial circumstances permitting, to take a leave without pay in order to better juggle your research, writing, and domestic responsibilities. Relief from teaching duties can go a long way in helping to balance commitments.

Summary of Childbearing and Childrearing Leave Policy

| Type | Pay Status | University Duties | Time to Count Toward Sabbatical If Employee Is Eligible | Time to Count Toward 8-yr. Clock* | Duration/ Limitations | Primary (50% or more) Responsibility Required |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Childbearing Leave | May be with or without salary | None | See APM 760-35-d | No, if leave equal to or greater than one quarter, time is automatically excluded | Normally up to 6 weeks | No |
| Active Service - Modified Duties | Normal salary | Modified | Yes | Yes | Combined total of Act. Serv./Mod. Duties plus Childbearing not to exceed 2 qtrs. for each birth or adoption | Yes |
| Parental Leave | Without salary | None | No | No, if leave equal to or greater than one quarter, time is automatically excluded | Up to 1 year (see APM-760-35b(1)) | No |
| Childrearing Stop the Clock | Normal salary | Normal duties | Yes | Maximum of two years total extension | This, combined with any of the above exclusions/ extensions, may not exceed one year for each birth or adoption | Yes |

*NOTE: Periods less than one full year may not affect the tenure/promotion review date.

University of California Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policy Regarding Academic and Staff Employment

It is the policy of the University not to engage in discrimination against or harassment of any person employed or seeking employment with the University of California on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity, pregnancy¹, physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer-related or genetic characteristics), genetic information (including family medical history), ancestry, marital status, age, sexual orientation, citizenship, or service in the uniformed services (as defined by the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment rights Act of 1994).² This policy applies to all employment practices, including recruitment, selection, promotion, transfer, merit increase, salary, training and development, demotion, and separation. This policy is intended to be consistent with the provisions of applicable State and federal laws and University policies.

University policy also prohibits retaliation against any employee or person seeking employment for bringing a complaint of discrimination or harassment pursuant to this policy. This policy also prohibits retaliation against a person who assists someone with a complaint or discrimination or harassment, or participates in any manner in an investigation or resolution of a complaint of discrimination or harassment. Retaliation includes threats, intimidation, reprisals, and/or adverse actions related to employment.

In addition, it is the policy of the University to undertake affirmative action, consistent with its obligations as a Federal contractor, for minorities and women, for persons with disabilities, and for covered veterans.³ The University commits itself to apply every good faith effort to achieve prompt and full utilization of minorities and women in all segments of its workforce where deficiencies exist. These efforts conform to all current legal and regulatory requirements, and are consistent with University standards of quality and excellence.

In conformance with Federal regulations, written affirmative action plans shall be prepared and maintained by each campus of the University, by the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, by the Office of the President, and by the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources. Such plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Office of the President and the Office of the General Counsel before they are officially promulgated.

This policy supersedes the University of California Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policy Regarding Academic and Staff Employment

Inquiries regarding the University's equal employment opportunity policies may be directed to:

Kirsten K. Quanbeck, Assistant Executive Vice Chancellor
Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity
University of California
103 Multipurpose Science and Technology Building
Irvine, CA 92697-1130
Telephone: (949) 824-5594

Discrimination and Sexual Harassment Hotline: 949.824.7037

Email: oeod@uci.edu

¹ *Pregnancy* includes pregnancy, childbirth, and medical conditions related to pregnancy or childbirth.

² *Service in the uniformed services* includes membership, application for membership, performance of service, application for service, or obligation for service in the uniformed services.

³ *Covered veterans* includes veterans with disabilities, recently separated veterans, Vietnam era veterans, veterans who served on active duty in the U.S. Military, Ground, Naval or Air Service during a war or in a campaign or expedition for which a campaign badge has been authorized, or Armed Forces service medal veterans.