



ADVANCEMENT AND PROMOTION AT UC RIVERSIDE

CONTENTS

I. UNDERSTANDING THE REVIEW PROCESS.....	3
STEPS IN THE PROCESS	3
CONFIDENTIALITY	4
DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW	4
AD HOC COMMITTEE COMPOSITION, ROLE AND REVIEW	4
DECANAL REVIEW	5
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL, CHANCELLOR, EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR & PROVOST, AND VICE PROVOST FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEWS	5
PROMOTIONS	5
EXTRAMURAL REFEREE PRACTICE AND ROLE	6
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR REVIEW INDICATORS	6
MERIT REVIEW OUTCOME	7
APPRAISAL OUTCOME AND USE	7
II. ASSISTING THE REVIEW PROCESS	7
TIMELY SUBMISSION OF MATERIALS	7
RECORDING ACHIEVEMENTS	8
TEACHING EVALUATIONS	8
ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL ASSIGNMENTS	8
RESEARCH ACTIVITY AND ACHIEVEMENT	9

SELF-STATEMENT FOR REVIEW FILE	9
EXTRAMURAL REFEREE SUGGESTIONS FOR PROMOTION FILES.....	10
III. PREPARING AND PLANNING FOR ADVANCEMENT	11
ADJUSTING TO A NEW ENVIRONMENT	10
ADVANCEMENT STRATEGIES	11
BALANCING DEMANDS ON TIME	11
PLANNING FOR SABBATICAL LEAVES	12
FOCUSING RESEARCH	12
PUBLICATION DECISIONS AND PRACTICES	12
THE DEPARTMENTAL CHAIR	13
CAMPUS COLLEAGUES	13
PRE-TENURE DEVELOPMENT OF RECOGNITION	13
IV. GENERAL CONCLUSION	14

This brochure presents information about the process of advancement and promotion at the University of California, Riverside which should prove helpful in understanding the process and meeting its goals. It is not intended to replace either the [Academic Personnel Manual](#) or the annual [UCR CALL](#) but rather to underscore key aspects of the procedures in a more informal and interpretive manner. It aims to minimize misunderstanding of the process and its criteria and to assist faculty in meeting its expectations. For guidelines for all non-academic senate appointments, please refer to your college guidelines.

The text consists of three interrelated parts, each of which presents information and assistance on topics bearing on advancement through the personnel review process: (1) Understanding the Review Process, (2) Assisting the Review Process, and (3) Preparing and Planning for Advancement.

UNDERSTANDING THE REVIEW PROCESS

Categories considered in all academic advancements consist of the following: teaching, scholarship and research, professional activities and service including university and public service. Excellence in these categories is expected by the University and clear documentation is required. Because of the need for maintenance of the intellectual and academic strength of the institution, advancement to tenure or appointment at tenure requires superior intellectual attainment with regard to research and excellence in teaching. At the same time, the process is designed to ensure a fair, full, and balanced consideration of each candidate.

Personnel advancement decisions are reached through faculty and administrative reviews. All have a strong contribution to make to personnel decisions, one that is in direct correlation to the objectivity and professionalism with which they render their views and reach their recommendations.

The schedule for review of various ranks is set forth in UCR's Annual Call issued by the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, and in the [Academic Personnel Manual](#) (APM) (See APM 210, 220). [The CALL](#) also presents in detail the academic review process as it operates at UCR. Both of these are available in every department office and on the web (<http://academicpersonnel.ucr.edu>). In addition, department chairs meet with and advise each new faculty member regarding the schedule and procedures for merit and promotion review. Chairs can be an important source of counsel because of their familiarity with the academic discipline as well as with the review process. During the first year of service, new faculty should aim to develop a clear sense of the process and how to prepare a strong file which accurately reflects their academic achievements and goals.

STEPS IN THE PROCESS

The review process itself has several steps depending on whether the contemplated action is a merit increase or promotion. These are: review by department colleagues; the Chair, the Dean; a Senate ad hoc committee (at the discretion of the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, Committee on Academic Personnel, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost or the Chancellor); the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP); the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP), Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost (EVCP) and the Chancellor. For final authority on review actions, see the [Delegation of Authority Chart](#) on the Academic Personnel (APO) website. The general purpose of such a stratified and diversified review process is to provide the maximum input, to contribute to a campus-wide perspective on academic performance, and to protect the candidate from narrowly biased views and decision-making.

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. The candidate may request in writing redacted copies of all confidential extramural letters before the start of the departmental review. In addition, the candidate may request a copy of the departmental letter. The candidate may provide a rebuttal to go forward with the departmental letter if they so wish. 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.

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW

All personnel reviews commence at the departmental level in accord with a schedule and timetable determined by the University and specified in the APM. The departmental review of the merit or promotion file involves an appraisal either by a committee appointed by the chair to evaluate and report on the record and/or by all individual members eligible to vote. At a confidential personnel meeting the record is discussed in detail and a vote taken, either at the meeting or later as a mail ballot. The chair prepares a departmental letter, which reports the recommendation and the vote, as well as the arguments and evidence pro and con developed in the meeting in connection with the recommendation.

This letter is provided to the candidate with minority reports, if applicable. The Chair will orally report to the candidate the substantive nature of the department's recommendation and assessment. It is possible for a candidate to prepare a written response to such information if he/she feels that aspects of the record may have been misunderstood, overlooked, or misrepresented. Such a response may be addressed to the Chair, the Dean or the VPAP by using [Attachment H](#). (See [The CALL](#), Procedures After the Departmental Recommendation is Determined, for details.) This response becomes a part of the file and is considered by the remaining levels of the review process.

SENATE AD HOC COMMITTEE COMPOSITION, ROLE AND REVIEW

An ad hoc review committee may be appointed for any action when it is determined by CAP, VPAP, EVCP or Chancellor that additional expert analysis is required in order to make a more informed recommendation. In cases when an ad hoc committee is utilized, the Dean's letter will be removed from the file being forwarded to the ad hoc committee. The redacted ad hoc report will be forwarded to the Dean and the Dean will be given the opportunity to respond. Both of the Dean's letters will then be added to the file and will remain as part of the file.

The ad hoc committee is appointed in confidence by the VPAP after consultation with CAP. It usually consists of three or four faculty members, typically from cognate departments or disciplines and one from the candidate's department or discipline. Though the membership is usually drawn from UCR faculty, special situations and circumstances may call for the appointment of one or more persons from other campuses.

The role of the committee is to provide an assessment independent of that of the home department while remaining cognizant of that unit's perspective through the contributions of the non-voting departmental member. The latter is expected, however, to recognize also the perspectives and standards presented by the other members and to play the role of interpretive resource person rather than that of departmental advocate.

The intent for such a body is to provide an in-depth assessment of the research, to allow for cross-disciplinary assessments, to maintain campus standards of academic and professional excellence, and to provide a check or balance against bias, whether positive or negative, on the part of the home department.

Occasionally, a candidate may have experienced personal or professional disagreements of such an intensity with a campus colleague in a contiguous discipline that it is felt that the colleague's participation on such a committee would significantly diminish its capacity for objectivity and detached assessment. That concern should be communicated by writing directly (not via the Chair or Dean) to the VPAP so that the concern may be considered in the establishment of the ad hoc committee. Such communications should be made only on the basis of genuine personal conviction and significant evidence of conflicts of such a severity as to render professional dispassionateness unlikely. The intent of this provision is not to develop a mechanism for the exclusion of input from knowledgeable colleagues of differing intellectual views.

DECANAL REVIEW

The next level of review is that of the Dean, who receives the file, the redacted ad hoc committee report (where applicable), and the department's recommendation. S/he assesses these from the decanal perspective and experience regarding acceptable records of achievement for the level and nature of advancement for which the candidate is eligible. Typically, the Dean prepares a letter of evaluation and interpretation of the contents of the file. In normal, on-time merit cases with a clear department recommendation, the Dean may simply concur with the department and opt to forego a Dean's letter if s/he has nothing evaluative or informative to add.

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (CAP) AND EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR & PROVOST (EVCP) REVIEWS

The file and the departmental recommendation augmented by the Dean's recommendation and the ad hoc report (if applicable) are forwarded to the Academic Personnel Office (APO). In all cases, CAP reviews the file, assesses the achievements, and forwards its recommendation to the VPAP. The VPAP will typically present the file together with his/her recommendation to the EVCP and the Chancellor for a final decision. For appraisal and quinquennial reviews the VPAP makes the final decision.

If all parties agree on a positive recommendation, the action in review is approved.

If the preliminary assessment on an appointment, appraisal, or promotion file is contrary to the departmental recommendation, a preliminary assessment letter (in accord with [APM 220-80-j](#)) is sent to the departmental chair through the Dean indicating the grounds for the preliminary decision. After consulting the candidate, the department may respond with such additional evidence and clarifications as it deems appropriate. This response is reviewed by the Dean, CAP, the VPAP, the EVCP and the Chancellor before a final decision is announced.

PROMOTIONS

Promotion represents a particularly important decision both to the candidate and to the University whether it is for advancement to tenure, to Associate Professor, to Full Professor, to Professor Step VI, or to Professor Above-Scale (Distinguished Professor). The latter two are merit advancements that resemble promotion in terms of expectations and procedures. The two procedural additions to these reviews are: the possible use of a **Senate ad hoc committee** to review and make a recommendation on the file and the

solicitation of extramural referees' letters of assessment of the candidate's record of achievement (required for all above actions).

Assistant Professors need to be aware that no one can be continued in that rank beyond the eighth year of service and that such service includes cumulative service on all campuses of UC and any performed as Acting Assistant Professor and Visiting Assistant Professor ([APM 133](#)). All Assistant Professors in their seventh year at UCR are mandatorily reviewed for possible advancement to tenure. Should the decision be negative, the candidate receives an obligatory terminal year at the rank of Assistant Professor. ([APM 220-82](#)).

EXTRAMURAL REFEREE PRACTICE AND ROLE

The use of **extramural referees** to assess achievement, particularly in the areas of research and professional activity, is a long-standing practice at the University of California as well as at many other institutions. Its intent is to provide for a national perspective of peers on the advancement of faculty at particularly critical stages in their careers.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR REVIEW INDICATORS

In the case of Assistant Professors, it is important to recognize that the initial appointment is based on a careful review before being approved. It represents a considered judgment that such individuals possess the potential to earn promotion before the time limit resulting from the eight-year rule. ([APM 133](#))

The review process provides a valuable overall assessment in two ways prior to the actual tenure evaluation. The first way is the regular biennial **merit review** for merit and step advancement whose departmental findings, coupled with the administrative decision, provide a useful measure of progress toward tenure. These bi-annual merit reviews are required for Assistant Professors.

The other way is through an **appraisal** of an Assistant Professor's prospects of gaining tenure; it occurs in the fifth year of service. It may or may not coincide with a merit review for a step increase depending on the step level of the initial appointment or past merit decisions. ([APM 220-83](#))

Each addresses a separate concern: **the merit review evaluates the performance in the three chief categories (research, teaching and service) since appointment or the last advancement; the appraisal evaluates the entire career (focusing on accomplishment since appointment as an Assistant Professor here at UCR or elsewhere) to date and assesses the likelihood of tenure being conferred on or before the mandated deadline for expiration of the probationary period.**

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 (or designee) 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](#)). 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.

MERIT REVIEW OUTCOME

Should a step or merit increase be approved, it may generally be regarded as an indication that one is making normal progress for the rank and step held. At the same time, one should recognize that somewhat greater latitude is generally permitted on the first review to take account of the time needed to start up a research program and to attain tangible results as evidenced in publication. It is important also to remember that the tenure decision is based on a cumulative assessment of the entire record in teaching, research, and service so that the expectation of achievement is certain to be greater toward the end of the probationary period.

Should a step or merit increase be denied as the result of a review, the denial should be taken very seriously as evidence that improvement is needed. Understanding the problem and taking corrective action before the next review and, ultimately, the tenure decision are essential to a successful career.

APPRAISAL OUTCOME AND USE

The **appraisal's purpose** is to assist the candidate and the department to identify strengths and weaknesses in specific areas before it is too late to effect the necessary improvements in the record. Commonly, the appraisal provides such advice as may be deemed necessary regarding aspects of the performance in need of improvement as well as information on the quality of the performance in the three areas under review. Where possible, suggestions may be made as to how improvement can be effected. **The appraisal gives the candidate and the department a useful campus collegial and administrative perspective on the candidate's record.**

At the same time, it is important for the candidate and colleagues to keep the appraisal in perspective regardless of its outcome. It is a guarantee neither of tenure nor of eventual termination; it is an informed estimate of the likelihood of tenure given the record of achievement available at the time. Understandably, there are instances during the probationary period in which research productivity may be slowed down or teaching performance affected by particular personal or professional circumstances.

In such cases, a qualified positive or negative appraisal may initially be particularly distressing to the candidate. It is for that reason that UCR allows a substantial period of service before undertaking it, though not so much so that the record cannot be significantly improved by the time of the tenure decision. Consequently, relatively severe appraisals in a number of instances have been followed by positive tenure decisions as a result of the appraisal's concerns having been addressed effectively.

ASSISTING THE REVIEW PROCESS

The candidate can materially assist his or her colleagues to make an informed assessment in several ways.

TIMELY SUBMISSION OF MATERIALS

Knowing and adhering to the precise and rigid schedule for the submission of all materials for personnel recommendations makes it easier for the department Chair to schedule requisite personnel meetings and indicates a cooperative professional attitude.

The chair advises candidates of the dates for receipt of various materials. The prudent candidate will check with the appropriate departmental staff (MSO, AA, etc.) to determine whether he or she or the staff member is supposed to supply particular materials for the file. Before the file is ready for departmental review, the candidate must also verify that all the material and information desired for inclusion is available and that it is correct and sign the top portion of the [Procedural Safeguards Statement](#). (See [The CALL](#))

RECORDING ACHIEVEMENTS

It is wise and ultimately time-saving to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the information in the file by keeping ample records of accomplishments from which relevant documentation may be drawn for merit and promotion files and reviews. To assist faculty with this task, the eFile System was developed to capture granular data in a relational database in the support of merit/promotion actions and immediate generation of faculty bio-sketches and other reports supporting various faculty needs (e.g. extramural funds requests). It is used for a routed, paperless review of merit and promotion files. General information regarding the eFile system can be found on the eFile website at <http://efileinfo.ucr.edu/>.

At the outset of UCR service, the chair and/or the staff member in charge should be consulted to learn what record-keeping responsibilities the department routinely assumes and which are those of the candidate. It is a good idea to arrange to receive annually copies of records kept by the department which figure in personnel reviews. Records of formal courses taught as well as sabbatical and other leaves approved are usually kept by the department. This is a good time also to determine whether the department has a full vita recording the candidate's professional career (i.e., the appointment file) and publications dating from the start of a career, not just the UCR appointment.

TEACHING EVALUATIONS

The APM required student evaluation of teaching. While the department oversees the distribution, collection, and submission to the office of Undergraduate Academic Programs of the student teaching evaluations, it is useful to retain one's personal official copies not only for record-keeping but for individual analysis and assessment over time. The department will receive official copies and place them in the candidate's file.

Student evaluations are an important part but not the totality of the University's concern with and assessment of teaching. Other aspects bearing on teaching which the candidate should be sure to record include:

- letters from students and/or colleagues who have observed your teaching
- guest lectures in colleagues' classes together with any feedback they may have provided
- curriculum development activities including awards of Instructional Development
- textbooks or chapters in textbooks together with such reviews or publishers' assessments as may be available

These may provide information useful to the review process in meeting the charge to consider the candidate's effectiveness as a teacher in accordance with the criteria set forth in [APM 210-1-d.1](#).

ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL ASSIGNMENTS

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.

Maintaining a reasonable level of activity without overburdening oneself requires careful choices and sensible time management. Pre-tenure faculty, in particular, should be careful not to commit unduly to such activities. Women and members of a minority group may find requests for their services numerous and time-consuming, and they must be prudent in assessing their valuable input in relation to other demands on their time. Some meaningful service at this stage of the career is desirable, but not at the expense of the teaching and research responsibilities. The chair and senior faculty can provide helpful advice on selecting service involvements.

RESEARCH ACTIVITY AND ACHIEVEMENT

The most obvious form of research achievement and creative activity is the acceptance of materials for publication or performance. At the time of recording this information, it is a good practice to prepare as full a bibliographic citation as possible including the number of manuscript or printed pages, whether peer-reviewed or invitational as this information will be called for in the preparation of the advancement file. In the case of jointly authored publications, it is useful practice to note the specific areas and measures of responsibility at the time of initially recording the citation and the title and location of co-authors. Such information must be included in the file and will be most helpful to colleagues in assessing the file and to the departmental Chair in writing the departmental letter.

Other records and information useful to keep current include:

- invitations to deliver research colloquia
- papers delivered at professional meetings, special symposia, panels, and the like
- contributions to books and special journal issues
- requests to serve on editorial boards, as a manuscript consultant for journals or presses, or as a peer review consultant to other institutions or UC campuses, or as panel members on Federal grant panels (i.e., NSF).
- reviews of published works
- receipt of grants and fellowships including their durations, amounts, sources, and topics.
- awards and honors

SELF-STATEMENT FOR REVIEW FILE

Another way of assisting colleagues to make a sound assessment is for the candidate to consider carefully developing a clear and concise self-statement of the record for the period under review. This is voluntary but highly recommended.

Pertinent topics include an overall view of the research publications and their importance to the discipline, teaching, including a description of any new courses developed, new programs proposed, administrative

duties, professional activities, public service, and awards and honors. The candidate may submit his or her own statement as part of the file, whether or not the chair requests it. A lengthy statement is neither required nor sought; optimally it should not exceed a couple of pages. Self-statements in quinquennial reviews and merit files are limited to a two-page maximum. Advancements to Professor VI, Professor Above-Scale, within Professor Above Scale, promotions, career reviews, reappointments, and appraisals are not limited in length.

Candidates presenting such a statement should focus 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 one's 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.

EXTRAMURAL REFEREE SUGGESTIONS FOR PROMOTION FILES

Additional assistance which a candidate can provide colleagues is with regard to extramural referees whose services are required in tenure and other advancement cases. The candidate should endeavor to see that the chair has the following **materials readily available for promotion:**

- (1) a **list of names of persons** he or she believes would be appropriate evaluators of their published research. In suggesting referees, it is desirable to include the best qualified persons in the field or sub-discipline. Those closely affiliated with the candidate or his/her work such as major professors, collaborators or postdoctoral mentors may be included but their assessment is given less regard than that of independent evaluators.

The chair will solicit assessments in approximately equal numbers from this list as well as from one provided by colleagues in the department, including the chair.

When someone is believed to be inappropriate, he or she may be listed separately and a reason provided

- (2) a **statement of the research development and directions** to be enclosed with the chair's letter to outside reviewers. This may be the self-statement in the file. Such a statement is particularly valuable to candidates for tenure since their work may not be as immediately familiar to referees as that of more advanced colleagues.

- (3) **copies of the candidate's publications** such as articles of consequence and books in order to facilitate full and fair evaluation by the extramural reviewers. These should be up-to-date and complete so far as significant research findings are concerned.
- (4) other items such as the **curriculum vitae** and **grants record** may be included.

PREPARING AND PLANNING FOR ADVANCEMENT

ADJUSTING TO A NEW ENVIRONMENT

On entering any new organization, there is always much that is unfamiliar and hence much to learn. This is particularly true for the new assistant professor just out of graduate school or coming from a post-doctoral research stint. But even for the experienced, tenured, new appointment mastering the organization's structures and procedures, its information flow, and expectations require adaptation to multiple roles and responsibilities. A major research university system such as the University of California expects its faculty to participate professionally in a wide range of activities. These include teaching, research, and service both within the University and as part of the profession and community at large. For some faculty, the adaptation may be as apparently simple and mundane a task as adjusting from a semester to a quarter teaching schedule. For others, it may be as formidable as developing a research agenda whose fulfillment will contribute to advancement.

BALANCING DEMANDS ON TIME

It is important at the outset to develop a scenario which establishes, subject to ad hoc revisions, adequate time for the three factors--teaching, research, and service--on which advancement reviews are based.

Speaking very generally, it would appear reasonable at a research university to devote a significant amount of time for one's scholarly and research activities, equal or somewhat less time to teaching after the courses are well-established, and the least amount of time to service when one is pre-tenure.

At the same time, it is important to recognize that this allocation of time requires flexibility and common sense application. **Teaching responsibilities**, in particular, should not be slighted or dealt with peremptorily either in or out of the classroom. UCR has a strong and envied tradition of dedication to student instruction, and the review process reinforces it. Student evaluations of teaching, particularly initial ones, can provide a useful index as to how successfully one is adapting to the UCR instructional environment and whether adequate time and attention is being devoted to instruction and its preparation.

During the earlier years of appointment, inexperienced teachers in particular can benefit from **teaching a particular course or courses more than once**. They can modify or correct facets of their performance, enhance their knowledge and organization of the material, and experiment with techniques derived from colleagues or acquired from the Office of Instructional Development.

It is also useful to assess **what sort of teaching schedule**--classes close together or distributed in time, balance or concentration in levels (lower-division, upper-division, graduate) and kinds (large/normal lecture, discussion, seminar) of instruction--work best for the instructor and the quality of instruction provided.

PLANNING FOR SABBATICAL LEAVES

Information on the earning of sabbatical leave credits and the conditions under which sabbaticals may be approved can be found in [APM 740](#). Assistance with the procedure and timetable for requesting such leave is available from the Chair.

Extramural grants providing for release time from teaching for specific research projects should be investigated and applied for at times when they are likely to be most useful and most likely to be reviewed favorably by external agencies.

The University endeavors to assist in this area of faculty development by providing Regents' Faculty Fellowships and Faculty Development Awards for released time, supplies and equipment, and summer research assistance. These are awarded in the Spring of each year for use in the following academic year commencing July 1.

FOCUSING RESEARCH

Critical to professional development and advancement is the establishment of a clear area and measure of expertise and achievement. A deliberate and conscious effort should be made to develop a coherent program of scholarly activity

In general, promotion to tenure and subsequent advancements are less affected by the publication of popularized studies and textbooks. Textbooks are usually assessed as contributions to teaching.

Also to be considered is a particular discipline's view of refereed articles vs. invited chapters. Some disciplines give distinct and strong preference to the former. Others find the latter to provide nearly equally compelling evidence of achievement since the invitation signals significant peer recognition and achievement. This is particularly true if the edited collection of original articles is rigorously peer reviewed prior to acceptance and publication. A sense of balance and a general knowledge of the standards of the particular discipline are essential in building a bibliography.

A young faculty member needs to be alert about the complications involved in collaborative efforts. Many disciplines require or benefit from collaborative research activities. Inevitably this raises questions about the measure of contribution of the parties involved. These can be addressed, but they need to be done so explicitly and directly, preferably at the time the publication is completed.

The work of a junior faculty member collaborating with senior colleagues or former mentors at his or her own institution or other institutions is particularly susceptible to being queried about the nature of the independent contribution being made. For this reason, it is also wise, to the extent the discipline renders possible, to produce first or last authored articles.

Junior faculty, in particular, may find it helpful to think in terms of a **four-year plan** since that will dovetail well with the pre-tenure appraisal review. In developing a plan for any stage of the career, it is important to be realistic as well as insightful concerning what can be achieved in a given period of time.

PUBLICATION DECISIONS AND PRACTICES

Placing one's research in publication outlets is, as indicated above, a matter for careful choice and planning as to when, what, and where items will appear. The advice of former dissertation directors, post-doctoral supervisors, and mentors, can be of enormous help in determining the quality and reputation of journals and

the criteria by which a discipline gauges research achievement. This ISI journal impact factors are often used to gauge the quality of a journal in a subfield, and should be consulted.

If one's major research is to issue in a book-length publication, it is advisable to submit one or more chapters for journal publication. The feedback will provide additional perspectives on and suggestions for the development and focus of the book itself. Such "portent" pieces also have the additional value of staking a claim to a particular subject or topic and arousing anticipatory interest in the book's later appearance. In following this course of action, it is important not to dissipate the book's impact by publishing too many incomplete sections.

The overall aim should always be to **publish articles in the high-quality peer-reviewed journals** enjoying the greatest measure of respect in the discipline. The prestige of the journals in which one's work appears influences the assessment of the work itself.

The experience of others can prove helpful in determining the length of time various journals take to reach an editorial decision. Since the competition for acceptances by journals is very keen, one should be prepared for rejection but not unduly discouraged. Perhaps the best practice is to review the manuscript in the light of any editorial suggestions or comments made and to resubmit it to another well-regarded journal as soon as possible.

THE DEPARTMENTAL CHAIR

Periodic consultations with the departmental chair regarding possible career choices, departmental criteria and expectations for advancement at the various ranks and steps, ways of satisfying these expectations, and any perceived problematic collegial relationships are helpful. They provide informal feedback and information based on the chair's ability to monitor the ongoing evaluation process. They also afford one the opportunity to bring to the chair's attention recent accomplishments and to elicit advice concerning future plans.

CAMPUS COLLEAGUES

Developing relationships within the greater campus and University community is also important. Colleagues outside one's department often have expertise in ancillary disciplines to one's own.

Contact with an even broader array of University colleagues can be gained through service on Academic Senate and administratively appointed committees. It is important to consider carefully the assignment proposed, its importance, and its demands on one's time. In decisions about tenure, teaching and research carry more weight than does service. Judgments as to whether to accept a particular committee assignment is the individual's personal responsibility, but consultation with the chair or other senior colleagues can help in reaching an informed decision.

PRE-TENURE DEVELOPMENT OF RECOGNITION

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 reprints of one's articles sent to former dissertation directors and professors as well as to persons important in the field, some of whose interests overlap with one's own
- attend professional meetings where contacts can be made with persons whose research and interests resemble one's own.
- present papers at important conferences as a means of disseminating your research findings quickly and receiving immediate feedback, which can be developed 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 one's own on a topic of interest which would involve the participation of persons most likely to make important and stimulating contributions.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

To sum up the suggestions in this section on academic advancement, it is perhaps sufficient to reiterate that an academic career at the University of California is best fostered by a strong commitment to the integrity and advancement of one's discipline, by a genuine, sustained dedication to teaching at all levels and in informal, as well as formal situations, by a broad consultation within and without the University as to the practical details of professional growth, and by the exercise of common sense, energy, and initiative in reaching one's goals. Attaining stature in one's research field in itself is a major service to the University and should be a major effort on the part of the pre-tenure faculty member. Once tenure is attained, more service at the department and campus level is desirable.