

Department of Ethnic Studies  
School of Social Sciences, University of California, San Diego  
AP Professor Series Review Criteria

*Updated January 9, 2026*

<b>Rank/Step Proposed</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>Teaching</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>Accelerations</b>
Appointment as Assistant Professor	Well-developed research focus, as evidenced by completed dissertation or MFA thesis. For appointment above Step I, publication(s) in peer-reviewed venues required.	Teaching experience not required at time of appointment, but candidate should have well-developed teaching plans evidenced by statement of teaching philosophy and draft course syllabi.	University service not required at time of appointment.	N/A
Assistant Professor, Steps II-VI	Established research focus and evidence of productivity, which may include publications, draft articles or book chapters, conference presentations, grant proposals, and similar materials. Candidate should be moving toward demonstrating greater leadership in scholarly endeavors.	With each review cycle, candidate should be developing an established teaching role within the department curriculum, including courses within and beyond candidate's research area.	Evidence of service on departmental committees.	3 or more peer-reviewed publications (e.g., articles, book chapters, artistic productions) in a single review period. Evidence of publications with demonstrated major impact on the specific field, and/or receipt of a major fellowship or award can also be considered (see narrative below for more detailed information).
4th Year Appraisal	Evidence of substantial progress and near-completion of major research project as appropriate to the candidate's field (see narrative below for more detailed information).	As above, with evidence of teaching proficiency in the form of (student and/or holistic evaluations).	As above.	As above.

Promotion to Associate Professor	Completion of major research project as appropriate to the candidate's field (see narrative below for more detailed information). Indication of progress on new research project(s).	As above, with evidence of teaching proficiency in courses beyond the candidate's specific research area.	As above. If the candidate has provided service at the divisional and/or university-wide level, or extensive disciplinary or community service, this may provide partial justification for a BOS or acceleration.	As above.
Associate Professor, Proposed Steps II-IV	Demonstrated progress beyond the major project evaluated for promotion to associate. Other evidence of research progress may also be considered (e.g., draft articles or book chapters, conference presentations, grant proposals, and similar materials).	As above, with evidence of increasing participation in undergraduate and graduate mentorship.	Service roles on departmental and/or divisional/university-wide committees. Evidence of participation in disciplinary service.	As above.
Associate Professor, Proposed Step V	2 peer-reviewed publications (e.g., articles, book chapters, artistic productions) in each review cycle. Other evidence of research progress may also be considered (e.g., draft articles or book chapters, conference presentations, grant proposals, and similar materials).	Evidence of continued teaching proficiency, and undergraduate and graduate mentorship.	As above.	4 or more peer-reviewed publications (e.g., articles, book chapters, artistic productions) in a single review period. Evidence of publications with demonstrated major impact on the specific field and/or receipt of a major fellowship or award can also be considered (see narrative below for more detailed information).

Promotion to Professor	Completion of additional major research project as appropriate to the candidate's field (see narrative below for more detailed information). Evidence of national reputation.	As above.	Evidence of major service (e.g., chairing departmental and/or divisional/university-wide committees; and/or serving in administrative roles such as chairing individual committees, serving as Director of Graduate/Undergraduate Studies, <i>et al.</i> ).	As above.
Professor, Steps II-V	2 peer-reviewed publications (e.g., articles, book chapters, artistic productions) in each review cycle. Other evidence of research progress may also be considered: draft articles or book chapters, conference presentations, grant proposals, and similar materials.	As above.	Evidence of service in departmental and university-wide roles during each review cycle.	As above.
Advancement to Professor, Step VI	Completion of additional major research project as appropriate to the candidate's field (see narrative below for more detailed information). Evidence of national and/or international reputation.	As above.	As above.	As above.
Professor, Steps VII-IX	2 peer-reviewed publications (e.g., articles, book chapters, artistic productions) in each review cycle. Other evidence of research progress may also be considered (e.g., draft articles or book chapters, conference presentations, grant proposals, and similar materials).	As above.	As above.	As above.

Advancement to Distinguished Professor (Above Scale)	Continuing exemplary research productivity, and evidence of national and international reputation.	As above.	As above, with additional expectations for leadership in disciplinary service.	For accelerated advancement to Distinguished Professor (Above Scale), or advancement with an additional Further Above Scale component, exceptional research productivity within the review period, and/or receipt of a major fellowship or award (see narrative below for more detailed information).
Further Above Scale (FAS) Advancement (50% or 100%)	Continuing exemplary research productivity.	Evidence of continuing exemplary classroom performance and mentorship.	Evidence of continuing exemplary performance in service at all levels.	For advancements beyond 100% Further Above Scale, exceptional productivity beyond the number of publications expected for accelerations at Professor, and/or multiple publications with demonstrated extraordinary impact within the specific field, and/or receipt of major fellowship or award, and/or election to a National Academy or similar, and/or receipt of an Honorary Degree or similar (see narrative below for more detailed information).

Ethnic Studies is an interdisciplinary field of inquiry, blending and stretching across disciplines in the arts, humanities, and social sciences. As such, practitioners in the field may hold expertise and training in a wide range of formal academic disciplines, methodologies, and publication/production formats. This inherent variety presents numerous complexities in the review of faculty dossiers. With this document, we aim to provide guidelines, expectations, and benchmarks for departmental, divisional, campus, and

external reviewers tasked with evaluating Ethnic Studies faculty for appointment, advancement, and promotion at UC San Diego.

## **RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY**

**Assistant Rank:** Generally speaking, at each merit review, faculty are expected to provide evidence of research progress during the review period. For faculty at the Assistant rank, progress may be demonstrated by providing drafts of manuscripts-in-progress; transcripts of conference or invited lectures or presentations; field notes from ethnographic research-in-progress; storyboards, scripts, or other notations for artistic projects; book proposals; grant proposals; *et al.* The department does not expect any minimum number of completed publications for merit advancements at the Assistant rank.

**Fourth-Year Appraisal:** For the Fourth-Year Appraisal, faculty must include documentation of progress toward the completion of a major research project (see below for further details): for scholars in “book fields,” for example, this may include a draft manuscript, reader reports from expert reviewers on a book manuscript, pre-published articles and/or book chapters that will be included in the published book,<sup>1</sup> *et al.* For scholars in “article fields,” this may include a number of published articles and/or book chapters that partially represent what will later be used for the promotion review.

**Promotion to Associate and Tenure:** For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, faculty members in book fields are expected to have published at least two peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters in addition to their book. The department recognizes that in the humanities and social sciences, it is common practice for these publications to be early versions of chapters in the book. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure are also expected to include evidence of progress on a new research project in their dossiers. Although such evidence sometimes includes additional publications, more often it is documented with drafts of manuscripts-in-progress; transcripts of lectures or conference presentations; field notes from ethnographic research-in-progress; book proposals; grant proposals; *et al.*

**Associate and Full Ranks:** At the mid-Associate rank and above, the department has set general guidelines for productivity during each review cycle (2 peer-reviewed publications for 3-year cycles). However, the department does not treat these guidelines as absolute benchmarks: we recognize that during some review periods, faculty may be engaged in longer-duration research that may not result in publication until the research is complete (for example, ethnographic field work, large-scale data collection, archival research, durational artistic/performance development, *et al.*). In such cases, the faculty member should provide a narrative describing the research progression, and should provide supplementary material (e.g., grant proposals, manuscript drafts, conference presentations, field notes, partial data sets, *et al.*) to demonstrate research activity.

**Major Career Reviews:** For promotions and career reviews (to Associate Professor, to Professor, and to Step VI), faculty are expected to provide evidence of the completion of a major peer-reviewed research project:

1. For faculty in “book fields,” this means that a book manuscript has received final approval (post-revision) for publication by

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this document, we use “published” to refer to work that is accepted for publication and in press, as well as work that is officially released and in print.

the editorial/faculty board of a press after undergoing peer-review (This approval must be documented with formal, explicit correspondence from an official representative of the press).

2. For faculty in “article fields,” this means that a thematic cluster of peer-reviewed articles or chapters that have been published in disciplinary journals or edited anthologies. A project can be a single study or multiple related studies that advance knowledge in a thematic area of study. For each promotion, the department would generally expect a combination of 6 articles/book chapters to demonstrate the completion of a major research project. However, the department understands this number as a general guideline rather than as an absolute benchmark: in some cases, where a publication has had a demonstrably major impact on the field of research, a smaller number of articles/chapters may be acceptable.
3. For faculty in artistic fields, this may mean, for example, the completion of a curated and juried (or reviewed) exhibition at a gallery or museum; the screening of a feature-length film at a juried festival; the fully staged, professional production of an original performance or play at a LORT A theatre (or similar); the performance (at a large-scale venue) or professional recording (by a label appropriate to the genre) of a major composition; *et al.* In such fields, external reviewers who are expert practitioners in that particular genre of production will be solicited to evaluate the work.

The department acknowledges that new forms of work, and new kinds of media (including digital formats), continue to emerge within scholarship. In cases that do not fit neatly within the previous categories, the department will clarify parameters for reviewing and making recommendations on a given file.

**Accelerations and Bonus Off-Scale Salary Components:** As indicated within Academic Policy, accelerations in the Professor series require research/creative productivity that exceeds normative expectations for a given review period. In the chart above, the department has provided general guidelines for acceleration expectations. However, the department understands that in some cases, when a given publication or creative project has resulted in major impact upon a specific area of the field (and when that impact can be documented), an acceleration may be considered for files that do not necessarily include a simple doubling of the standard expectations. Similarly, when the research/creative productivity only slightly exceeds expectations, an acceleration may be considered for files that also include extraordinary accomplishments or contributions in teaching or service (as appropriate to rank), and/or when a faculty member has received a major fellowship or award. In such cases, the department will justify a proposed acceleration by providing a clear description of the impact of a given work and/or the significance of the fellowship or award. As required by Academic Policy, an acceleration may only be proposed for files that contain no weakness in any area of review.

Similarly, the department may propose a Bonus Off-Scale Salary Component (BOS) for faculty members whose files include any of the following (among others):

1. research/creative productivity that slightly exceeds expectations at rank but does not rise to the level of an acceleration.
2. research/creative productivity that would otherwise qualify for an acceleration, but that is accompanied by teaching and service that does not meet merit expectations.
3. receipt of a major fellowship or award in a period when research/creative activity, teaching, and service meet merit expectations.

4. University, department, and/or disciplinary service well above and beyond what is expected for rank.
5. carrying a higher teaching load than is required, and/or the receipt of a teaching or mentorship award; or
6. extensive contributions to community/public service, and/or extraordinary contributions to the university's stated "Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion" mission.

**Edited Volumes:** Primary scholarship in Ethnic Studies often appears in edited anthologies and special thematic issues of academic journals. These publication formats are equal to standard journal articles in impact; and the work performed by editors of such books and special issues represents a significant editorial function that exceeds other kinds of editorial work (e.g., serving as an expert reader of manuscripts). The department acknowledges that edited books or special issues are not automatically equivalent to authored (or co-authored) books, but also acknowledges that scholars can invest significant intellectual leadership in facilitating the collective advancement of knowledge in their field through such projects. When a faculty member has published an edited book or has edited a special issue of an academic journal, without a clear explanation regarding how the edited work has made significant contributions to the field, the department will consider these publications as evidence of research progress.

There are at least two instances where edited volumes should count as a major publication. First, when edited books or special issues include an introduction written by the editor(s) and including significant commentary (beyond a description of contents) that demonstrate the value and impact of the edited work, it should be considered a major publication. Second, when an edited book or special issue includes a chapter or essay written by the editor(s), such materials will also be counted as stand-alone articles/chapters, similar to other chapters and articles.

**Hybrid Trajectories and Tracks:** As briefly described above, the field of Ethnic Studies includes different types of scholarly foci and trajectories. Ethnic Studies faculty may choose to change the nature of their work, such as changing from a book to article track or vice versa, and such changes are encouraged when they align with the faculty members' research trajectory and/or enhance the impact of their scholarship. For each review, faculty should indicate the model (e.g. "book model," "article model," "artistic model") most appropriate for assessing their work during the period under review and the respective standards will be used to evaluate their work. In such cases, for career reviews, the department will solicit letters from external reviewers who are expert practitioners in the relevant genre of production.

**Collaborative Research:** Collaborative research and co-authored publications are widely encouraged and highly valued within the field of Ethnic Studies. Faculty should document their role within such work: for example, as a PI or lead author, as an equal contributor, or as a contributing (*i.e.* minor) author. When contributions have been equal or greater within collaborative research, the department considers co-authored publications to be equal to solo-authored work in its assessment. In other words, the department does not attribute *fractional* credit to co-authors of a given collaborative work, except in cases where a faculty member has made a minor contribution.

**Peer Review:** The department recognizes that peer review may take different forms in different fields (and with different forms of production/media). The term "peer-review" is used herein to refer to scholarly work that has undergone a peer-review process

and is based on the author(s) original ideas; it does not include work that has undergone peer-review processes but primarily constitutes a summary or review of others work (e.g., book reviews). Generally speaking, the department expects scholars in “book fields” and “article fields” to publish work that receives pre-publication review from expert readers within that particular discipline. In some cases, when work has been published with a press or venue that does not provide this kind of pre-publication peer review, the department may accept post-publication reviews, commentaries, and/or other citations as indicative of assessment from colleagues within that particular field. Faculty members who submit such work as part of their dossiers should include evidence of this kind of assessment, as appropriate to their particular field/research format, in order for the work to be formally considered as part of a merit or promotion review.

Similarly, for faculty in artistic fields, peer review may take the form of work included in juried film festivals or exhibitions, work produced as part of curated production or performance seasons at LORT A theatres (or similar) or other major venues, or composition work recorded by professional labels appropriate to the genre. However, the department recognizes that current trends in artistic fields have increased the visibility and importance of venues, publishing houses, and recording studios that may not provide formal pre-performance assessment. In such cases, the department may accept post-performance reviews, commentaries, and/or other citations as indicative of assessment from colleagues within that particular field. In all fields, major grants, fellowships, and/or awards received for, or on the basis of, a completed project would serve as evidence of assessment equivalent to (and in some cases, greater than) traditional forms of pre-publication/performance peer review.

It is important to note that there are reasons to consider non-peer-reviewed article or book chapter as equally valuable to peer-reviewed work. For example, if a faculty member publishes a non-peer-reviewed piece that receives widespread acclaim in public spheres to indicate substantial impact, the department might consider such work equivalent to a peer-reviewed article or book chapter.

**Publication Length:** The department recognizes that publications vary significantly in length. Whether publications are standard length should be understood in the context of the faculty members’ respective fields and projects. We also acknowledge that publication length is only one factor among many in determining the value, quality, and impact of research output. Therefore, publication length should be considered in combination with other factors, such as the intended audience, publication venue, and other measures of impact (e.g., whether the publication can be considered exceptionally innovative or groundbreaking). Where there might be questions about whether a piece of work constitutes a full publication, it is important for faculty members to provide sufficient context for reviewers to understand it.

## **TEACHING**

Evaluation of teaching in the Department of Ethnic Studies includes the following four modalities.

1. Formal Course instruction, which includes classroom or online instruction; organizing and facilitating seminars and workshops that are related to curriculum needs; independent instruction involving one or more students; and supervision of graduate teaching assistants. Specific sources of information to evaluate the candidate’s course instruction may include: the candidate’s



statement of teaching philosophy; peer review of the candidate's syllabi, assignments, and other teaching materials; observation of the candidate's course instruction, seminars, workshops, and guest presentations; and qualitative and quantitative data from student evaluations. Reviewers also consider teaching portfolios, teaching awards, and/or letters from students, teaching assistants, and community partners. The department recognizes the difficulty of teaching Ethnic Studies courses that often challenge students' inherited paradigms and assumptions about race and ethnicity, gender and sexuality, and class/caste. The department also acknowledges demonstrated biases in student evaluations that impact faculty of color, women and nonbinary faculty, international faculty, and LGBTQ faculty. (For this reason, the department does not set a minimum threshold for student responses to "recommend" questions on surveys and evaluations.)

2. Curriculum and program development, which includes the development and teaching of new courses, publication of textbooks or other teaching materials, and development of professional training programs. Funded training grants and research grants that include support for students are valued contributions in this area.
3. Student advising and mentoring, which includes general student advising and mentoring; chairing and serving on undergraduate and graduate student committees; and including students in research and as co-authors in scholarly work. At the undergraduate level, indicators of quality include retention of students of color; intensive informal advising; recruiting students to major/minor in Ethnic Studies; advising student groups/organizations; and sending students of color to graduate/professional schools. At the graduate level, indicators of quality include professional awards and publication of dissertations chaired, and placement of students.
4. Community-Engaged Pedagogy, which develops, transfers, and transforms knowledge by drawing on both academic and community knowledge, and builds the capacity of both students and community members. The Department recognizes that these endeavors are labor-intensive and, at times, nontraditional in their structure. In evaluating these kinds of activities, the department relies on faculty member's self-statements to gauge their context, and welcomes assessments from community members who have participated in them.

The department values the teaching of core and high-enrollment courses as well as specialized and emergent topics. The department recognizes efforts to remain engaged with critical pedagogies and technologies at various stages of a faculty member's career, which often impacts students well beyond their classroom experience. The department equally values faculty members' commitment to graduate mentorship and training, especially in modeling best practices for their own academic and scholarly careers. The department acknowledges that mentorship may take many forms, which mirrors the field's focus on building bridges, shared vocabularies, and interdisciplinary collaborations on campus, with local communities, and in regional, national, and global contexts.

For faculty at the Assistant rank, the department expects evidence of ongoing development in their areas of research as well as consistent engagement with the broader curriculum, particularly in the department's core courses. As part of the tenure review, the department expects to see engagement with teaching assessments and reflective pedagogy, which candidates should describe in their teaching statements. Evidence indicating extraordinary contributions to teaching and mentoring by faculty at the Assistant rank, or receiving teaching/mentorship awards, may be considered as justification for a BOS or as partial justification for an acceleration.

As faculty move through and beyond the Associate rank, expectations for graduate mentorship, as well as broader contributions to the department's graduate and undergraduate curriculum, increase. Extensive teaching beyond these expectations, and/or receiving

teaching/mentorship awards, may be considered as justification for a BOS or as partial justification for an acceleration.

## **SERVICE**

The department recognizes that contributions to service may take many forms, and vary widely in their level of compensation and demands. The department also recognizes that women, nonbinary people, people of color, indigenous people, and LGBTQ+ people tend to provide more intensive and extensive contributions to service, and tend to receive less acknowledgement and less compensation or consideration for such work. Finally, the department recognizes that faculty in Ethnic Studies (and cognate fields) often contribute extreme levels of service generally related to the university's stated "Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion" mission. The department is committed to recognizing and valuing the many forms of service in which faculty engage.

Depending on rank, the department has minimum expectations for university service, including engagement on departmental and divisional/university-wide committees, and for disciplinary service. Disciplinary service includes tenure and promotion review; manuscript, fellowship, and prize review; program and department reviews; journal editing; conference planning; and service to professional associations (among others). The department weighs community service, which includes local review panels; service to K-12 education; government testimony, advising, and review; and service to non-governmental organizations (among others).

For faculty at the Assistant rank, the department expects minimal service: generally speaking, participation on a departmental committee will satisfy that expectation – additional service on divisional, university-wide, or system-wide committees, or to the discipline, or with communities outside the university, may be considered as justification for a BOS or as partial justification for an acceleration.

As faculty move through the Associate rank, expectations for service increase. In addition to membership on (and, at higher steps, leadership of) departmental committees and director roles such as Director of Undergraduate or Graduate Studies, faculty should begin to seek out roles at the divisional and university-wide levels. Extensive service beyond these expectations may be considered as justification for a BOS or as partial justification for an acceleration.

In the early steps of the Professor rank, faculty are expected to fill leadership roles on departmental or divisional committees, and are expected to begin contributing to university-wide or system-wide service. In accordance with Academic Policy, once advanced to Step VI, faculty are expected to provide service both within the department/division and in university-wide capacities during every review period. Leadership on departmental, divisional, university-wide, and/or system-wide committees (or in specific roles) is expected for faculty at the upper steps of the Professor rank and at the Above Scale level. Extensive service beyond these expectations may be considered as justification for a BOS or as partial justification for an acceleration.

At all ranks, faculty members should identify any compensation or consideration received for service roles in their narratives. (Such compensation may include course releases, stipends, research funds, *et al.*)

## **CONTRIBUTIONS TO EQUITY, DIVERSITY, AND INCLUSION**

The department is committed to recognizing and rewarding faculty contributions to equity and diversity. As per policy, the mentoring and advising of students and faculty members, particularly from underserved and under-represented groups, is recognized under teaching and service. Distinct from contributions to teaching and service, “contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of California’s diverse population, or research in a scholar’s area of expertise that highlights inequalities,” among others (APM 210). Extensive diversity contributions may be considered as justification for a BOS or as a partial justification for an acceleration.