Department of Cognitive Science

Merit and Promotion Review Standards

Faculty in the Department of Cognitive Science represent multiple disciplines in the behavioral, social, biological, and computational sciences. In addition, we have tenured and tenure-track faculty in both the Professor and Teaching Professor series. While this document covers general principles and practices of evaluation for merit and promotion, because of our diversity and breadth, a uniform rubric for evaluating all of our faculty is neither sensible nor fair. Thus, our merit and promotion review standards are separated into two sections, one for the Professor series and the second for the Teaching Professor series. We address field-specific publishing habits, outlets, and norms. In addition, faculty are expected to remain in Good Standing, as defined below (adapted from APM 672).

Professor Series

Individuals in the Professor (i.e., "ladder rank") series are evaluated for their performance along three core dimensions: 1) teaching excellence, 2) research and other creative works, 3) service to the department, university, profession, and public.

Research expectations

Across all Cognitive Science sub-disciplines, evaluation of scholarship prioritizes quality and impact over quantitative measures of productivity. Quality is assessed by discipline-specific experts within and beyond UC San Diego. Faculty are expected to produce and communicate innovative, rigorous, and high-quality scholarship that meets or exceeds state-of-the-science standards in theoretical grounding, methodological rigor, planning, and transparency, and that has the potential for broad empirical and/or theoretical impact.

Because impact is difficult to assess – particularly for recent work and across disciplines – promotion evaluations rely on expert reviewers to comment on both current and potential impact, using discipline-appropriate criteria. The department recognizes that high-quality scholarship takes diverse forms, including peer-reviewed conference proceedings, journal articles, scholarly books, and well-documented and demonstrably innovative products such as computational tools or methodological innovations that advance or transform scientific research. Peer-reviewed, academic book products published with reputable scholarly presses, can be weighed more strongly. Note that some conferences limit the number of submissions in a given year where an individual can be listed as first- or senior author. In such cases, faculty are encouraged to clearly define their contributions, and this will be noted in the chair's letter.

Volume of output is evaluated in light of quality, novelty, and potential impact, and scaled relative to the much higher teaching load for the Department of Cognitive Science relative to peer departments within UC San Diego, such as Biology, Computer Science, and Data Science, and at peer Universities and Institutions. Publication volume is evaluated with respect to the quality and

impact of the outlets, where substantive papers published in top-tier journals that have demonstrable impact are weighted more heavily.

Junior faculty in their first review cycle might have marginally lower productivity. Senior faculty are expected to show intellectual leadership in the form of substantial, discipline-impactful publications on which they are senior or first author. Rare events outside of the candidate's control that negatively, substantially, and inevitably impact productivity, such as building or construction problems that cause a prolonged pause in research, can be considered. In such cases the candidate's statement and the chair's letter should detail the circumstances and the extent to which productivity was impacted.

Faculty research often spans multiple disciplines, and CVs commonly reflect hybrid scholarly profiles. Understanding disciplinary norms is essential for meaningful evaluation of excellence across this diversity. To support fair assessment, the department relies on discipline-specific expert evaluation of publication venues and scholarly impact based on historical benchmarking efforts, as well as the nature of research methods used, with consideration for time-intensive methods such as use of animal models, electrophysiology, and ethnography. Individual faculty research projects may involve many different disciplines, and venues may include conference or journal publications, as appropriate. Some key areas are highlighted below, including typical (non-exclusive) publication venues and annual research expectations in each area:

Computational modeling

Conference proceedings and journals are primary venues for research products, with top-tier conferences in some areas having impact comparable to or exceeding that of journals. Normative expectations are approximately 2 high-quality conference publications per year, or technology-equivalent products. Scholarly products such as software, algorithms, or computational tools are evaluated alongside publications for quality, innovation, and impact, but are not required at any rank. Books and monographs are uncommon and not expected.

Human-computer interaction (HCI) and design

Faculty in HCI and design publish primarily in highly selective conference proceedings, which often represent the field's most prestigious outlets. Normative expectations are approximately 2 high-quality conference publications per year, or technology-equivalent products. Publishing in journals is less common, as they are often much longer and represent longer-term work; as such journal publications for HCI and design faculty can be given more weight. Productivity expectations take into account field-specific constraints, such as intensive fieldwork or site-based data collection. Conference paper acceptance rates, best-paper awards, and similar indicators are relevant signals of quality and expected impact. Indicators such as system use, downloads, or engagement may inform assessments of impact.

Developmental Science

Peer-reviewed journals are the primary venue for research products, with occasional conference publications. Normative expectations are approximately 1-2 high-quality journal publications per year, because research with infants or children often proceeds more slowly due to recruitment

challenges, data variability, and frequent reliance on longitudinal designs. Short-term productivity and citation-based metrics are therefore weaker indicators of impact in this area. While books and monographs are occasionally produced, they are not expected at any career stage, though well-regarded volumes can represent substantial contributions.

Linguistics, anthropology, and philosophy

Primary publication venues include specialized journals, competitive conference proceedings, and – depending on subfield – scholarly books, chapters in edited volumes, and monographs. Normative expectations vary substantially across subfields and publication models, ranging from empirically driven social or biological science traditions to more theoretical or humanities-aligned scholarship. Productivity expectations take into account field-specific constraints, such as intensive fieldwork or site-based data collection. In subfields where books are a primary scholarly output, contracts and documented progress are considered during review cycles, and formal scholarly reviews are relevant indicators of impact. Across the department, books are evaluated on scholarly merit and potential impact, particularly when they advance interdisciplinary perspectives.

Neuroscience and Cognitive Psychology

Peer-reviewed journals are the primary venue for research products, with additional contributions appearing in conference proceedings, books, or chapters. Normative expectations are approximately 2 high-quality journal publications per year, except for faculty whose research involves more time-consuming data collection efforts. For example, research that is primarily focused on collecting human neuroimaging can take much longer due to increasing demands for much larger sample sizes (50+ participants) than were required even a decade ago, when 15-20 participants were sufficient. In addition, research involving non-human, model organisms where animal training and data collection can be very time consuming, in which case expectations are approximately 1-2 publications per year, or even less when the research involves animal models where behavioral research is performed in conjunction with invasive neural recordings and/or (opto)genetic and/or pharmacological manipulations.

Teaching and mentorship expectations

Teaching

Pedagogical excellence is expected at both the undergraduate and graduate level. Faculty courses are evaluated by other faculty for intellectual rigor, importance for training future scientists where relevant, innovation (of content and of effective pedagogical approaches), and effectiveness. Quality and appropriateness of content are considered.

To evaluate teaching, classroom observations and teaching portfolios will be used whenever possible. Student evaluations are considered, but primarily for *consistent* positive or negative comments. The Holistic Teaching Portfolio should demonstrate that the faculty member uses best practices in course design, course management, and student engagement. Faculty are expected to read comments and narratives, and to address repeated, substantive complaints about objective

and correctable practices by refining one's teaching in response to feedback from students, colleagues, and experts in pedagogy (including, but not limited to, the Teaching & Learning Commons). We explicitly do not set numeric requirements for student evaluation ratings (given the many challenges with such ratings), but we do recognize their value in signaling areas in which a faculty's teaching might require improvement. In evaluation of teaching performance, additional (positive) weight shall be given to significant pedagogical innovation by the faculty member, including development of new courses or other curricular modules.

Because Cognitive Science is not a traditional discipline, there is no standard curriculum across programs in North America where undergraduate degrees are granted. Rather, our department has developed undergraduate and graduate curricula that are high-quality, forward-thinking, and tailored to our strengths. But this process carries additional challenges: most faculty invent their classes or reinvent more traditional classes. Many cannot use textbooks or other existing course materials because none exist. Some faculty have invested extraordinary effort – usually without credit or reward – in developing, piloting, and refining novel and forward-looking courses. Our approach is to constantly imagine and re-imagine what the next generation of interdisciplinary scholars will need to know. This process of imagining, re-imagining, and refining inevitably is realized as an unpredictable, changeable, and quirky process. We have learned that innovation requires some trial and error before uniform success is achieved. Faculty are therefore given reasonable opportunities to address shortcomings identified in early efforts, as they develop or revise a course. Attempts to improve teaching should be described and documented by the candidate, along with any evidence of success (or, if ongoing, plans to evaluate success).

Junior faculty with some exceptions do not develop new courses in their first review cycle, and this is not a rigid expectation for tenure. In addition, junior faculty are given course relief in their first year and occasionally as they approach tenure.

Some faculty teach courses that are labor-intensive (e.g., project-based courses); if such courses are not given added teaching credit, that fact will be acknowledged and considered in evaluating total teaching effort during a review period. Except for such courses and formal teaching-release agreements (first year, fellowship/grant constraints, university-committee leadership, departmental teaching needs) all faculty are expected to carry an equivalent teaching load, which is 3 undergraduate and 1 graduate course annually. Exceptionally large courses can count as more than one course, per department standards, which will be clarified in letters.

Mentorship

Effective research mentoring of junior scholars – graduate students and postdoctoral scholars – is also evaluated for its impact on academia and industry. Evaluations will be solicited from current and former scholars who were mentored by the candidate. Comments or narratives from graduate students (both mentees and students in graduate seminars) can be included in the file. Mentoring is defined to include students from other departments and programs who, for some faculty, represent significant effort and substantial impact in the form of new PhDs with unique interdisciplinary training and expertise.

Effective graduate and postdoctoral mentorship is a necessary metric of teaching effectiveness, with the following caveats:

First, junior faculty, especially in their first review or two, might have little evidence of mentorship.

Second, by virtue of the area of research and funding trends, some faculty members mentor more graduates and postdocs than others. Thus, although all faculty, especially senior faculty, are expected to be effective, consistent, and supportive mentors, expectations about the *amount* of mentorship is not uniform across areas.

Third, it is recognized that junior scholars are in a vulnerable position when providing negative feedback about a mentor, and so ancillary information about problems in mentorship (that do not breach confidentiality) can be added to the file. Related to this, the department recognizes that effective mentorship includes creating an environment – within the seminar room, the lab, and department functions – where *all* junior scholars, regardless of gender, ethnicity, or other factors, feel safe, supported, and equally valued. Documented behaviors that degrade such an environment are not tolerated in the department, and will be considered to negatively impact a candidate's mentorship effectiveness.

Fourth, it is recognized that when the number of former mentees is small, feedback might be sparse, especially because busy junior scholars do not always respond to our requests for evaluations, and because anonymity of responses is nigh impossible. Therefore, in cases where there is minimal information about mentorship, the letter will describe the circumstances and indicate whether any meaningful inferences can be drawn concerning mentoring effectiveness. Mentorship need not be limited to a primary research advisor.

In both undergraduate teaching and graduate/postgraduate mentorship, identified areas of weakness in previous reviews should be addressed in at least the next review. Efforts to remediate weaknesses should be explained by the candidate and evaluated in the department letter.

Because Cognitive Science is interdisciplinary, team-teaching – though historically atypical – is acknowledged as a potentially unique and engaging pedagogical experience. In team-taught courses, it is presumed that all faculty will participate fully and interact extensively with all students. The agreement regarding teaching credit should be documented. Team-teaching arrangements are at the chair's discretion.

Service

Cognitive Science faculty are expected to fulfill minimal departmental service obligations, including participation in voting on changes in departmental processes and bylaws, hiring and promotion cases, as well as annual service to the department, the university, and their discipline(s).

Regarding departmental committees, the department has several standing and ad hoc committees. Chairing a departmental committee counts as two points of service while serving on a committee counts as one point of service. Committee composition is reviewed annually. Assistant Professors are expected to fulfill one point of service, Associate Professors two points of service, and Full Professors three points of service, per year.

Tenured faculty are also expected to serve in a university or system as well. These service expectations can be modified, by agreement with the chair (as specified in an MOU), if a faculty member is committed to one or more highly demanding roles in a professional, campus-level, or system-wide service capacity (e.g., president of a large academic society; chair of campus Academic Senate). In such cases, the negotiated relaxation of other service expectations will take into account any other accommodations (e.g., teaching release).

Because our faculty are interdisciplinary scholars, often with unique interdisciplinary expertise, they often receive many service requests and end up with greater than normal service commitments. These efforts can have a disproportionate impact on research and scholarship. Exceptional efforts to build scholarship, among other exceptional efforts (e.g., leadership roles in Academic Senate or the UC system) are given special consideration in promotion and evaluation.

Community engagement and leadership

Faculty service can include efforts to promote STEM education, and formalized efforts to increase participation in, and education about, Cognitive Science in the broader community are recognized as substantial service. The forms of this commitment vary considerably, and might include – but are not limited to – outreach efforts, mentoring non-traditional students, or other community STEM engagement activities.

Merit review standards

Faculty are expected to demonstrate satisfactory performance in all three dimensions, including meeting (at least) the discipline-specific annual research expectations for their current research program(s). We recognize that research directions and focuses can shift over time, and so the exact annual research expectations can shift as well. We encourage faculty to explicitly describe the areas in which they are working for their current research in order to help determine proper expectations. As appropriate, ad hoc committees should also provide their judgments and evaluations about the disciplinary "homes" of faculty research efforts.

Bonus off-scale standards

Bonus off-scale (BOS) recommendations may be considered for a variety of reasons, most typically for unusually strong performance that falls short of an acceleration. This strong performance could be in any of research, teaching, or service, and should be (approximately) 1.5x or more than the normal expectations along that dimension. BOS recommendations may also be made when the faculty member receives a significant professional or university award.

Accelerations

One-step accelerations (resulting in a two-step advancement) require at least double normal expectations along one dimension, along with continued excellence along the other two dimensions. Note that "double performance" must be established both qualitatively and quantitatively; in particular, simply publishing double the normal expectations for that review

period is not sufficient to warrant a one-step acceleration. Accelerations will not be recommended if a faculty member exhibits problematic or bare minimum performance on any single dimension.

Two-step accelerations (resulting in a three-step advancement) require truly exceptional performance during the review period, including at least three times the normal expectations along one dimension. If a two-step acceleration is considered for research productivity, then the evaluation must include significant evidence of demonstrated impact of the research that extends beyond the quantity of research products.

Fourth-year appraisal

The fourth-year appraisal provides a valuable opportunity to help junior faculty assess their progress towards promotion to Associate Professor (with tenure), including potential weaknesses or areas that require further work in order to secure a successful promotion decision in the future (see below). A series of successful merit reviews is not sufficient for promotion to Associate Professor, so the feedback from this career evaluation is particularly important if the outcomes of prior reviews might provide the faculty member with a misleading impression of their career performance and likelihood of promotion.

Promotion to Associate Professor (with tenure)

Successful promotion to Associate Professor (with tenure) requires a sustained record of impactful, high-quality research. Because of the multidisciplinary nature of Cognitive Science, we cannot provide quantitative targets, but the number of research products should typically be at the upper end of the relevant annual expectations, taken over the faculty member's time at UC San Diego. The faculty member should have demonstrated intellectual leadership in (at least) one extended, coherent research program that includes multiple research products and has had demonstrable academic and/or real-world impact. This leadership should be evaluated partly on the basis of letters from external evaluators. Research quantity alone is insufficient for promotion to Associate Professor; the faculty member must have demonstrated impact and leadership in one or more areas. In particular, we note that a series of successful merit reviews does not guarantee promotion to Associate Professor, as the latter depends on the cumulative impact of the faculty member's research program(s). When evaluating the impact of collaborative work, special care should be taken to assess the faculty member's contributions and importance in those efforts.

Many Cognitive Science faculty arrive with limited-to-no teaching experience. As a result, courses taught closer to the Associate Professor promotion decision may receive greater weight, as they likely provide more accurate evidence of the faculty member's teaching expertise and contributions. As appropriate, faculty are expected to provide mentorship and advising to undergraduate and graduate students. Advising opportunities vary across disciplines, and so we do not set specific quantitative expectations for promotion to Associate Professor. However, successful promotion requires appropriate engagement and support of undergraduate and graduate student research relative to the individual's mentorship opportunities.

The faculty member should demonstrate evidence of impactful service and (perhaps limited) leadership to Cognitive Science and the profession. University-level service should be rewarded, but is not required at this step.

Promotion to Full Professor

Successful promotion to Full Professor requires continued sustained research excellence, leading to the individual being recognized nationally as a leader in their field(s). Faculty are expected to have been the intellectual leader of at least one new, substantive (multi-year, multi-product) research program since promotion to Associate Professor. This leadership and new research program should be evaluated partly on the basis of letters from external evaluators. Intellectual leadership in their field(s) will also typically include awards, keynote addresses, and other markers of the faculty member's scholarly reputation. A successful series of merit reviews as an Associate Professor does not guarantee promotion to Full Professor, as this advancement involves a career review that demonstrates national leadership and recognition.

Teaching should show continued growth, whether through course improvements, curricular or pedagogical innovations, or sustained teaching excellence since promotion to Associate Professor. Faculty should play a larger role in undergraduate and graduate student mentorship, even if they do not (for disciplinary reasons) have significant numbers of graduate student advisees.

The faculty member should provide leadership (not only service) within both Cognitive Science and the profession, as well as increased service at the campus- and/or system-wide level.

Advancement to Professor, Step VI

Step 6 advancement involves a career review. The faculty member should have continued excellence in research, teaching, and service, including leadership in one or more new, significant research program(s) since promotion to Full Professor. The faculty member should be an internationally recognized leader in their field(s) with multiple indicators of their standing, such as major lectures, leadership positions at research centers or professional societies, or other evidence of the cumulative impact of their research career. Student mentorship should be strong and sustained, though it may take several different forms. Solicitation of external letters is not required for Step VI, though they may be useful as further evidence that the faculty member is an internationally recognized leader. Per UC San Diego standards, advancement through Professor Steps I-V, followed by a review period that meets expectations, is not sufficient to justify advancement to Step VI.

Teaching and service should be commensurate with other leaders in the faculty member's field(s), including significant contributions and leadership at Cognitive Science, the university, and the profession more generally. For advancement to Step VI, and in every review period after, some university-wide service is expected during the review period. Exceptions are made in some cases for other forms of service with extraordinary obligations or time demands (e.g., serving a multi-year term as President of a major disciplinary organization).

Advancement to Professor, Above Scale (Distinguished Professor)

This rank is reserved for faculty who demonstrate excellence in all three areas – research, teaching, and service – and are internationally recognized for their ground-breaking, high-impact contributions in at least one of those. External letters provide particularly important evidence of the faculty member's international stature. A faculty member should not be considered for Above Scale if they exhibit merely satisfactory performance on any dimension, even if they are an international leader on another. In particular, substantial service and leadership for Cognitive Science and the University is required, extending beyond service that directly supports the faculty member's research or teaching interests. Mere length of time at UC San Diego, even including successful advancement to Step IX, does not justify nomination or promotion to Professor, Above Scale. Because of the high expectations for this rank, there are likely to be many Full Professors who are not considered for Above Scale.

No Change

Faculty who are not in Good Standing, and / or who demonstrate sustained, below-normative research productivity throughout the review period, may be recommended for a No Change action.

Teaching Professor Series

Individuals in the Teaching Professor series are evaluated for their performance along three core dimensions: 1) teaching excellence, 2) research and other creative works, 3) service to the department, university, profession, and public.

Teaching

UC policy APM 285-9 defines "teaching excellence" as the primary evaluation criterion for Teaching Professors. Teaching Professors in Cognitive Science have a wide range of interests and approaches to teaching, and we recognize that teaching excellence can be demonstrated in many different ways. No single set of standards defines excellent teaching but we have identified a number of criteria that all contribute to excellent teaching.

Teaching Professors are expected to maintain consistently high-quality instruction across their courses. Teaching Professors are expected to take an active role in curriculum development and pedagogical improvement, especially in our undergraduate program. Such an "active role" might take on different forms, but it is expected that Teaching Professors will plan and coordinate these department-enhancing efforts with the chair and other department faculty, taking ongoing teaching needs into account.

Expected teaching load is 6 courses per calendar year. Candidates may be eligible to earn bonus or acceleration for teaching excellence in comparison to other L(P)SOEs and/or for regularly teaching an extraordinary workload. While excellence is typically demonstrated by earning a teaching award at the university level or above, other evidence may be possible. Extraordinary workload is based on the time and effort invested related to factors including:

- Teaching large numbers of students
- Having large number of student contact hours
- Giving personalized feedback
- Creating new methods and materials to more effectively teach and/or engage students
- Exhibiting creative effort
- Developing curriculum and course materials (i.e. textbooks)
- Mentoring undergraduate students in directed research projects (e.g., COGS 99 / 199 independent study)

Some possible examples of evidence of "teaching excellence" include but are not limited to:

- Strong or strongly improving student evaluations and/or departmental teaching evaluations
- Peer review assessments from other faculty members based on knowledge in the candidate's field
- Evaluations or comments solicited from students
- Outside observations of classroom teaching such as the Holistic Teaching Evaluation from the Teaching and Learning Commons
- Records of mentorship for graduate students and undergraduates (e.g., office hours, honors student advising, etc.)
- Creative curriculum/syllabi development and new course development
- Implementing innovative pedagogical strategies, techniques and resources (such as including innovative use of technology in the classroom) that get adopted in other classes at UC San Diego
- Teaching awards
- Training graduate TAs and IAs in teaching methods and skills
- Presentation at or participation in teaching-centric workshops, conferences and/or panels
- Evidence of teaching that has evolved and improved

Professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity

UC Policy APM 210-3 states that "clearly demonstrated evidence of professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, including creative activity, is one of the criteria for appointment or advancement for Teaching Professors. Professional and/or scholarly activities may be related to the underlying discipline or to pedagogical advances.

The normative expectation for Teaching Professors in Cognitive Science is that they will be continuously active in professional achievement and scholarship activities that influence the university or beyond. Due to a relatively high teaching load, Teaching Professors will be evaluated using differently calibrated criteria than those outlined in the general department standards. For

example, while peer-reviewed publications are the primary expectations for ladder-rank faculty, Teaching Professors can achieve recognition and impact through a variety of scholarly and professional activities as exemplified below.

Most of our successful Teaching Faculty historically have contributed at least one significant professional or scholarly activity per year within a normal merit review cycle. While these expectations generally increase with rank, candidates may improve their case for bonus or acceleration through exceptional scholarly impact or productivity during the review period.

Some possible examples of evidence of "professional or scholarly activity that makes impact beyond the university" include but are not limited to:

- Authoring peer-reviewed research publications (this includes collaborative projects where the candidate is a "middle" author).
- Creating non-peer reviewed publications, books, websites, videos, blog posts, podcasts, white papers, or any public resource that documents educational/pedagogical techniques, such that the candidate demonstrates leadership in, including but not limited to, pedagogy. Candidates may consider submitting evidence of page views, community adoption, or other analytics to demonstrate broader impact.
- Contributing to writing funding grants on collaborative research projects and/or pedagogical techniques.
- Being a PI or Co-PI on a grant.
- Developing curriculum, instructional methods or software, or other educational resources that are adopted at other universities or institutions.
- Delivering presentations, lectures, posters, workshops, etc. at conferences, professional societies, or other universities that enhance knowledge for a broader community.
- Participating in intensive programs of study to be a more effective teacher and scholar, with the goal of enhancing one's teaching and scholarly responsibilities.
- Doing creative activities (e.g., exhibits, art, literary creation) that receive outside recognition and/or where the merit can be assessed in light of the originality, scope, richness, and depth of creative expression.

University and public service

UC Policy APM 210-3 states that merit criteria for service should "evaluate both the amount and the quality of service by the candidate to the department, the school, the campus, the University, and the public."

Cognitive Science faculty are expected to fulfill minimal departmental service obligations, including participation in voting on changes in departmental processes and bylaws, hiring and promotion cases, as well as annual service to the department, the university, and their discipline(s).

Regarding departmental committees, the department has several standing and ad hoc committees. Chairing a departmental committee counts as two points of service while serving on a committee counts as one point of service. Committee composition is reviewed annually. Assistant Teaching

Professors are expected to fulfill one point of service, Associate Teaching Professors two points of service, and Full Teaching Professors three points of service, per year.

Teaching Professors are encouraged to focus on service activities directly related to education and student success, though high-quality service in other areas is perfectly acceptable. Exceptional service during the review period could be offered as part of the rationale for a bonus or acceleration case.

Some possible examples of evidence of "service activities" include but are not limited to:

- Providing leadership and/or participating in department, school, or university level committees (e.g., faculty searches, student admissions, etc.)
- Providing leadership and doing administration work (e.g., leading a learning center or teaching program, or organizing a conference or speaker series) that creates visibility within and beyond the university
- Participating in Academic Senate and campus committees and initiatives (e.g., campus working groups and learning communities focused on teaching and pedagogy)
- Serving as the department representative for campus-wide events (e.g., convocation and commencement)
- Serving on PhD thesis committees
- Advising for student organizations
- Writing recommendation letters for graduate school
- Improving educational offerings within the University (e.g., evaluating other teaching faculty, assessing educational tools, serving on pedagogy committees)
- Doing community/public outreach (e.g., improvement of elementary and secondary education, organizing community workshops, contributing to open source communities)
- Serving on an editorial board, as a manuscript and grant proposal reviewer, as a society president, or other activities deemed as an external service activity with a discipline
- Participation in recruitment, retention, and mentoring of scholars and students

Bonus off-scale standards

Teaching faculty at any rank may earn an accelerated advancement through outstanding achievements that significantly exceed the normal departmental expectations in one or more of the areas of review: research and other creative activities, teaching, professional competence and activities, and university and public service. A typical bonus case would be particularly strong in teaching, substantial curriculum development, or extraordinary teaching workload.

Accelerations

One-step accelerations (resulting in a two-step advancement) require at least double normal expectations along one dimension, along with continued excellence along the other two dimensions. Note that "double performance" in teaching load is effectively impossible, and as such, recognition of exceptional teaching performance such as through teaching awards, wide adoption of teaching materials, or other forms of major teaching impact and reach can count as "double

performance" for teaching. Accelerations will not be recommended if a faculty member exhibits problematic or bare minimum performance on any single dimension.

Two-step accelerations (resulting in a three-step advancement) require truly exceptional performance during the review period, including at least three times the normal expectations along one dimension.

Fourth-year appraisal

The fourth-year appraisal provides a valuable opportunity to help junior faculty assess their progress towards promotion to Associate Professor (with tenure), including potential weaknesses or areas that require further work in order to secure a successful promotion decision in the future (see below). A series of successful merit reviews is not sufficient for promotion to Associate Professor, so the feedback from this career evaluation is particularly important if the outcomes of prior reviews might provide the faculty member with a misleading impression of their career performance and likelihood of promotion.

Promotion to Associate Professor (with tenure)

Successful promotion to Associate Professor (with tenure) requires a sustained record of impactful, high-quality teaching. The faculty member should have demonstrated intellectual leadership and pedagogical innovation in creating at least one new course, or the substantial improvement of an existing course. This leadership should be evaluated partly on the basis of letters from external evaluators. Teaching quality alone is insufficient for promotion to Associate Professor. In particular, we note that a series of successful merit reviews does not guarantee promotion to Associate Professor, as the latter depends on the cumulative impact of the faculty member's pedagogical impact.

The faculty member should demonstrate evidence of impactful service and (perhaps limited) leadership to Cognitive Science and the profession. University-level service should be rewarded, but is not required at this step.

Promotion to Full Professor

Successful promotion to Full Professor requires continued sustained teaching excellence and pedagogical impact, leading to the individual being recognized as an educational leader in their field(s). Pedagogical leadership in their field(s) will also typically include awards, keynote addresses, and other markers of the faculty member's reputation. A successful series of merit reviews as an Associate Professor does not guarantee promotion to Full Professor, as this advancement involves a career review that demonstrates national leadership and recognition.

The faculty member should provide leadership (not only service) within both Cognitive Science and the profession, as well as increased service at the campus- and/or system-wide level.

Advancement to Professor, Step VI

Step 6 advancement involves a career review. The faculty member should have continued excellence in teaching and service, as well as evidence of some form of research impact (pedagogical or otherwise). The faculty member should be an internationally recognized pedagogical leader in their field(s) with multiple indicators of their standing, such as major lectures, leadership positions at professional societies, or other evidence of the cumulative impact of their career. Solicitation of external letters is not required for Step VI, though they may be useful as further evidence that the faculty member is an internationally recognized leader. Per UC San Diego standards, advancement through Professor Steps I-V, followed by a review period that meets expectations, is not sufficient to justify advancement to Step VI.

Service should be commensurate with other leaders in the faculty member's field(s), including significant contributions and leadership at Cognitive Science, the university, and the profession more generally. For advancement to Step VI, and in every review period after, some university-wide service is expected during the review period. Exceptions are made in some cases for other forms of service with extraordinary obligations or time demands (e.g., serving a multi-year term as President of a major disciplinary organization).

Advancement to Professor, Above Scale (Distinguished Professor)

This rank is reserved for faculty who demonstrate excellence in all three areas – teaching, service, and research – and are internationally recognized for their ground-breaking, high-impact contributions in at least one of those (usually teaching). External letters provide particularly important evidence of the faculty member's international stature. A faculty member should not be considered for Above Scale if they exhibit merely satisfactory performance on any dimension, even if they are an international leader on another. In particular, substantial service and leadership for Cognitive Science and the University is required, extending beyond service that directly supports the faculty member's research or teaching interests. Mere length of time at UC San Diego, even including successful advancement to Step IX, does not justify nomination or promotion to Professor, Above Scale. Because of the high expectations for this rank, there are likely to be many Full Professors who are not considered for Above Scale.

No Change

Faculty who are not in Good Standing may be recommended for a No Change action.

Requirements to remain in Good Standing

Faculty are required to meet minimum Good Standing criteria as follows:

- Fulfillment of approved teaching load and departmental and University service, commensurate with rank and step as outlined above
- All research contracts and grants are in good standing, (e.g. no outstanding agency reports or accounts in deficit)
- Fulfillment of graduate student support and training obligations

- Compliance with reporting and training requirements
- Compliance with all applicable University policies

Good Standing will be revoked if there has been a substantiated finding of misconduct as defined by Section 015 of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM - 015) or proposed/imposed discipline in the period since the faculty member was last determined to be in Good Standing or if the faculty member is currently under a disciplinary sanction imposed by a formal disciplinary process or an informal agreement with the University of California in lieu of formal disciplinary action.

If a faculty member is deemed to have fallen out of Good Standing and wishes to appeal that determination, see the process outlined in Section X of the Negotiated Salary Program (APM 672), which reads as follows:

> "If the proposal is not endorsed by the Chair because the faculty member does not meet the minimum Good Standing criteria, the Chair will inform the Dean and the Dean will review. If the Dean concurs, they will ask the faculty member to withdraw their application. If the faculty wants to appeal their ruling, the application, supporting materials, and all assessments will be forwarded to Academic Personnel Services. Good Standing cases will be reviewed by the Sr. AVC-AA. The Sr. AVC-AA will issue a final decision within fourteen (14) days of receiving a request from the Dean."