Questions from UCM Assistant Professors for Discussion at the CAP/Assistant Professors Meeting on February 8, 2008.

MERIT:

1) Why do we have (at UCM) 2nd and 4th year reviews when (as we understand it) those are not standard procedures at other UC´s?

These are standard elsewhere if not everywhere. UCM might decide to change, if 'legal'

ALL ASSISTANT PROFESSORS ARE REVIEWED AT 2 YEAR INTERVALS.

2) Will reviewers and case-writers be informed that we don't have traditional departments at UCM, and that the latter not only values but encourages interdisciplinary research?

A wise move for outside reviewers.

EXTERNAL CAP MEMBERS ARE AWARE OF THIS.

3) Can a Website such as UCSC (http://www2.ucsc.edu/ahr/resources_for_academics/original_docs_and_pdfs/BiobibNet_User_Guide.pdf) with different merit and promotion procedures be implemented at UCM?

These are the coming thing. UCI is or has gotten the past records in digital form.

THIS IS A FUNCTION OF AP.

4) How long should a self-statement be?

UCI has carefully not answered this; professors must have an opportunity to present their own cases. But it is good to include before the first level of review to avert errors, to review pertinent elements of your career, and to satisfy needs of the review bodies for documented information not otherwise available. Requests for special consideration, equity, etc. are often included. The tone should be as objective and brief as possible, since intemperance and length may work against the candidate's interests.

FAQ 48. Should faculty members provide a self-statement for the dossier?

This is a matter best judged by the professor's department. However detailed a candidate's self-statement may be, the department should provide its independent and thorough analysis of all aspects of a professor's academic work. CAP does not require such self-statements, and only a minority of departments at UCI routinely includes them in the dossier. In departments that embrace a wide range of very different disciplines, a professor's explanation of the character of the work may be helpful to the professor's colleagues in preparing a department letter. Professors should not feel obliged to praise themselves in these statements.

MID-CAREER

1) We need specific clarification on what a mid-career review consists of. Is it like mini-tenure?

It is a candid and objective report on the candidate's progress to tenure. CAP often adds its own opinion or asks the unit to be more rigorous in cases where they have tried to do a 'feel-good' report, soft-pedalling weaknesses. The final MCA is meant to help the candidate where she/he has time to do something about shortcomings.

FAQ 17. What does CAP look for in a mid-career appraisal?

The purpose of the mid-career appraisal is to inform an assistant professor in a thorough and formal way about her or his prospects for tenure on the basis of the accomplishment so far. It is a crucial document and one of the most effective instruments in the UC personnel system.

The mid-career appraisal thus serves a very different function from the departmental letter for a merit increase and should not simply re-state the case made for a merit increase. Of utmost

importance are rigorous evaluation and complete candor. If there are weaknesses in the candidate's career to date, a department's natural reluctance to cause pain can do much more harm than good to the candidate and the university. CAP very often rejects mid-career appraisals that withhold severe judgment out of a misguided sense of kindness.

The most common weakness in an assistant professor's early career is a lack of strenuous effort toward research publication. The University of California is a research university, and provides generous resources and time for research. A relatively thin publication record (or its equivalent in the arts) cannot be lightly passed over. Fields vary in their expectations for tenure, and mid-career appraisals reflect this. In general, however, positive mid-career accomplishments show evidence of research independent from doctoral work, of research projects that promise leadership in the field, and peer-reviewed evidence that research will continue once tenure is granted. In the sciences, the award of grants for research is a prominent piece of evidence that the research program is valid, although grants do not in themselves substitute for lack of published scholarship. Letters from outside referees are not required for a mid-career appraisal, but can be included at the option of the department.

2) Does the case-writer need to be from the UC system?
Yes. Few outside the system understand well the UC guidelines.

3) Can we pre-contact any potential writers ourselves?
No, the unit should seek untainted, objective reviewers. But you have the opportunity to give a list of potential reviewers and say why they would be appropriate. Prior contact taints a review, and those contacted are turned off by special pleading.

4) The mid-career review isn't a letter of recommendation (and even if it were, everyone communicates in advance with their candidate-recommended reviewers). In a normal setting, the case writer is a close colleague in one's own department. As long as there are no conflicts of interests, are assistant professors free to choose internal or external reviewers for our cases?
The problems here reflect the need for outside reviewers looking at how the candidate actually stacks up in the profession. Choosing them is a crucial element of the case, especially if the MCA is positive, but a second reviewer at tenure is not impressed. A false sense of security is a dangerous outcome of an MCA.
FAQ Letters from outside referees are not required for a mid-career appraisal, but can be included at the option of the department.

6) People at other institutions may not know the amount of service we put. We sure have it in our bio-bibs, but we should ask our respective academic chairs to let the case-writer pay close attention to this item.
This should be part of the voting unit's case analysis, but solicitations for outside letters might call attention to this issue.
FAQ 3. How does CAP weigh university service?
Service counts. It can be a deciding factor in close decisions. Especially heavy service commitments, with documented effective performance, can partially compensate for reduced achievement in other areas. However, normally advancement in the University of California cannot take place without effective teaching and continuing superior scholarly or creative productivity as well as good service. CAP expects less service from untenured professors and expects significant service to the campus and university at higher ranks.

CAP understands that certain administrative duties can reduce one's creative output. CAP takes this into consideration in making recommendations; however, university service, especially compensated university service, cannot wholly replace creative activity. The APM provides flexibility for special cases. For example, a department chair's effective leadership and administrative work are in themselves academic activities, and reviewers may evaluate these in personnel actions. Especially burdensome administrative work, such as chairing a large department, can offset diminished accomplishment in other areas of review. The APM says "it is entirely appropriate to award a merit increase, or if performance warrants it, an accelerated increase, primarily for demonstrated excellence in the chair appointment." But note that this last sentence continues, "when accompanied by evidence of continued productive involvement in scholarly activities." Further, the APM specifies that advancements above professor, step V "should require substantial justification beyond excellence of administrative service."

CAP takes these statements to mean that unusually heavy and effective service should count significantly in personnel reviews (and of course all service should be evaluated and given proper weight), but that even heavy administrative responsibilities cannot compensate for nearly abandoned research or creative activity. Acceptance of administrative activity that reduces scholarly or creative activity nearly to zero must be rewarded by other means than by advancement in the professorial series. This stricture applies more severely at the point of a major action (promotion to tenure or to full professor), or for any step above professor, step V. If service is a particularly important part of a particular action, its effectiveness, not merely its formal responsibilities, should be documented in the dossier.

7) We did get a package explaining the mid-career review procedure, but some assistant professors were advised to request a "sample self-statement" from people who went under the same process at other UC´s. Department chairs usually have those samples and, in many case, they have them available in the libraries. Related to it, when we go for tenure we must have some guidelines for writing the self-statement. E.g. We have heard wildly different things about what constitutes a good self-statement, ranging from "Long and detailed" to "concise and only the highlights".
See (4) under MERIT, above. UCM should decide this.
See #4 above. Self statements are not required.

8) Other advice some of the assistant professors received: make sure the person(s) we put in the list as potential mid-career case-writers can be "called again" when we go for tenure. Sometimes, once somebody writes a case for an assistant professor, the same person can not write a second one.
A given reviewer should be able to write for MCA and for tenure. No rule excluding this applies at UCI

9) Due to the interdisciplinary nature of our research, perhaps it would be wise to request the input of at least two evaluators.
That is usually done for interdisciplinary faculty at other campuses.

TENURE
1) It is essential to our success and well being that no later than Spring 09: a) all of the procedures and standards are clear and well documented, b) there is an AP staff person who has jurisdiction over tenure and is totally accessible to assistant profs coming up for tenure.
Sounds good. Also, advice from the unit Chairperson or faculty delegate should be available on demand. We have a faculty mentor system in many departments at UCI for assistant professors

that makes this much easier. A staff person should limit him/herself to mechanics. A handbook or other instrument for advice on both substance and mechanics is obligatory.

2) Need clarification on sabbatical before tenure. Is that true we are entitled to at least one semester off. Some people have taught a huge amount of classes because there were no faculty available to teach them. Is there any possibility to obtain more than a semester off for those people?
If a sabbatical is available only after 6 years, it is too late for it to do much good. Instead, many assistant profs can be given reduced service and teaching loads when they need it most. It's up to UCM.
APM 710 DEFINES SABBATICAL. ARE THEY TALKING ABOUT STOPPING THE CLOCK?

4. Stopping the clock for the care of a child or children

- This is not a leave; it is a stoppage of the eight-year clock in certain titles for purposes of childrearing. Mothers and fathers, adoptive or natural, who have 50% or more responsibility for care of an infant or newly adopted child under the age of five are eligible to request a Stop the Clock.
- Such requests must be made within two years of the birth or adoption of the child and must be exercised before July 1 of the academic year in which a promotion review is to occur (no later than the second half of his/her actual fifth year).
- Any assistant professor **who is not currently undergoing review for advancement to tenure** or, in the case of those in the In Residence Series, for promotion to Associate Professor in Residence, and who falls under the provisions of APM-133 may be granted a stoppage of the eight-year clock on the limitation of service as provided in these policies.
- A request for a Stop the Clock may not be made **after** the sixth year has begun. 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.
- **NOTES**: (1) Quarters "off the clock" due to Childbearing Leave, Parental Leave, and/or Primary Responsibility may not exceed one year for each event of childbirth or adoption. (2) Because the review cycle is conducted in terms of full, not partial, years, and partial years count toward the next full year, exclusion of one or two quarters for an academic year appointee or up to three quarters for a fiscal year appointee will not necessarily affect the timing of the tenure or promotion review.

3) We definitely need guidelines and workshops for people who are going for tenure. Some assistant professors have been asking Nancy Tanaka's office for workshops and were promised we will get them soon. Any news on that? When do those workshops start?

4) Clarification on timeline. A person who started working July 1, 2004, goes for tenure in 2010 or 2011? Does the person need to turn in her/his paperwork in Fall 2009 or Fall 2010?
Tentative from RHD: those beginning in 04-05 will have six years before submitting their tenure cases (04-05, 05-06, 06-07, 07-08, -08-09, 09-10). The action will be a tenure action. A delay of one year may be given in promising, but incomplete records, but the action then is final.
FOR TENURE REVIEWS MOST CAPS ACCEPT ADDITIONAL PUBLICATIONS UP TO THE DAY OF REVIEW.

5) We understand there is a possibility of a special 8-year tenure time for assist profs. with proof of extraordinary commitments to service and teaching. We need more information on this issue. Does it apply only for those who started working in 2004 or 2005?
Is the 8-year rule in play? How much discretion is there?
THE CLOCK IS THE CLOCK. UCM CANNOT REWRITE THE APM.

6) Some assistant professors were hired at step 3 or 4. We are getting merit reviews, but not '4-year' reviews. That means we will not get the same feedback before going up for tenure. This may be a problem, because the standards for tenure seem to be a rapidly moving target at UCM right now.
The 7-year rule is operative. Since high-step hiring is common, no stigma attaches to Assistant steps V and VI, even though those at step IV are eligibile for tenure.
The schedule allows for an MCA at the second review. At this time, the independence of the candidate from pre- and postdoctoral mentors can be assessed.
STANDARDS HAVE BEEN CONSISTENT FROM THE BEGINNING. ONE SHOULD NOT GO UP FOR TENURE UNTIL READY. RATHER, ASSISTANT PROFESSORS SHOULD MOVE TO ASSISTANT V AND VI IF NECESSARY AND IF ITS WITHIN THE 8 YEAR TENURE TIMEFRAME.

7) After a junior faculty accepted an offer of employment at UCM and arrived on campus, the Dean of the School of XXXXXX informed her/him that in order to be eligible for tenure, she/he first have to have a graduate student complete their PhD. Some senior faculty dispute this, saying others have received tenure without meeting this requirement. For those of us who were hired at step 3 or 4 after extended time in research-only positions, this requirement is potentially a serious complication. There is only so much time until we need to go up for tenure and it is not trivial to bring students to UC Merced and get them through a PhD program here given the state of our graduate curriculum. Is there a norm with respect to graduate student progress when applying for tenure? How is this assessed?
It is not a rule at UCI that graduate students be finished their dissertations before tenure is considered for the professor. However, it the professor has no graduate students, particularly in the sciences, it suggests that the professor might not be sufficiently active in research or graduate training - a teaching criterion.
FAQ 9. What are the criteria for tenure? If an assistant professor completes a major project earlier than expected, e.g., turns the dissertation into a book within a year, is acceleration to tenure appropriate? CAP expects a tenure file to describe a career of a person whose accomplishments match those of an associate professor (see Question #1 above). These include the publication of doctoral work, a start on a second, independent project, renewal of initial funding according to disciplinary norms (e.g., in many of the sciences), and external evidence of visibility in the profession. Reasonable experience in teaching, professional activity, and university service are expected.

Evidence of formal acceptance of books, journal articles and book chapters is essential if the works are not available in published form at the time of the tenure review. For fields in which book publication is the norm for tenure, a completed book manuscript does not carry nearly as much weight as one that has been fully peer-reviewed and evaluated. A provisional contract does not carry nearly as much weight as evidence that a book manuscript is in its final form, formally accepted for publication, and in production. If a book is primarily a revision of the dissertation, peer-reviewed evidence of a second, independent project is expected. Published reviews in professional journals provide incontrovertible evidence of a book's significance and impact. Assistant professors are sometimes advanced to tenure in less than six years, especially if they are hired at an advanced step.

8) Some of us would like to spread our risk across a greater number of graduate students by co-advising students with research interests that overlap two faculty members' areas of expertise. We get to work with more students for the same money and a greater time investment on our part. How is CAP likely to assess our contributions to co-advising graduate students?
This should be handled on a case-by-case basis, with data in the dossier documenting the input of each collaborating advisor.
(SEE FAQ 5 BELOW)……CAP also considers supervision of graduate students to completion of their degrees and their subsequent placement as evidence of teaching effectiveness.

9) Course and curriculum development: Teaching and developing new courses, as we do again and again, is both time consuming and difficult. Will we be given special consideration for developing courses to sustain our majors? In that same vein, many of us have participated in and taken the lead on projects that are out of the ordinary for junior faculty, including the writing of proposals for majors, the chairing of search committees, and the development of research institutes. Such activities have been crucial to the future of UCM. Will that be acknowledged?
This should be handled on a case-by-case basis, with data in the dossier documenting the input of each collaborating advisor.

FAQ 5. How does CAP weigh teaching?
Good teaching is essential for any advancement, and can be the deciding factor in an acceleration. CAP gives more weight to courses for which evaluations are provided (except for the College of Health Sciences). Bad teaching can sink an otherwise adequate case for a merit increase. It cannot be the sole basis for advancement; CAP is obliged to consider the four areas enumerated in question #1 above. The University of California is a research university, and its professors are given released time in order to carry on vigorous research programs; its faculty cannot be advanced on the basis of teaching alone. CAP also considers supervision of graduate students to completion of their degrees and their subsequent placement as evidence of teaching effectiveness.

At UCI a professor may provide a "Teaching Portfolio" as part of the materials for review. Information about these is available from the Instructional Resources Center. CAP does not require a Teaching Portfolio, but does require careful evaluation by the department of a candidate's teaching, according to guidelines spelled out in the Academic Personnel Manual.

10) We understand we can request certain faculty member to be excluded from writing a case analysis or being in a tenure case committee. Does the vetoed faculty member still have the right to vote on your case at the unit 55 level?
I believe everyone has a vote. The reasons for excluding an outside reviewer should be part of the dossier, but how to exclude UCM colleagues should be left to UCM. This issue comes up rarely and is often handled by private consultation so no further prejudice is aroused.
ALL ELIGIBLE FACULTY MEMBERS HAVE THE RIGHT TO VOTE. See Bylaw 55
Irvine's Faculty Handbook states: 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.** ……. The department will pick outside evaluators both from your list of suggested referees and from their own, independently generated list. Because the identity of the letter writers is strictly confidential, **you will not be told which letter writers were selected.**

11) Do we have any recourse if a faculty member votes against or abstains on a merit or promotion case?

If a case can be made that rules or ethics have been violated, a candidate can appeal through Rules and Jurisdiction or Privilege and Tenure. Matters of purely academic judgment are rarely considered actionable. Appeal to the voting unit or CAP might be considered if the candidate has additional information pertinent to his or her case.

REMEMBER, A FACULTY MEMBER'S VOTE IS JUST ONE VOTE AT ONE LEVEL OF REVIEW. FACULTY HAVE THE RIGHT TO GRIEVE THE OUTCOME OF THEIR CASE "IF" THERE IS EVIDENCE THAT THEIR RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES HAVE BEEN VIOLATED. THIS IS THE P&T PROCESS. FACULTY SHOULD SEEK ADMINISTRATIVE REDRESS FIRST.

SUPPORT:

1) "Other UC campuses routinely offer faculty staff support, for instance, to help complete time-consuming materials, such as bio-bibliographies. Will the lack of this support be considered by CAP? Completing forms and amassing materials for merit increases and tenure is a tremendous time sink."

After the first Bio-bib is submitted, it is relatively easy to keep track of all relevant information for the next review. Do not wait for two years to begin assembling the record, and be sure to include only what is new for the next time. This is an often disregarded caution.