

SCHOOL OF ARTS & HUMANITIES
CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND ADVANCEMENT
August 2024

A. General Criteria

Meticulous, skilled, and timely assessment of AP files is one of the fundamental duties of a departmental chair and relevant appointed committees. This exercise is founded upon principles of uncompromising academic integrity as it defines the crucial moment in which a professional judgment is rendered about the significance of our colleagues' work. The School of Arts & Humanities expects all departments to provide sound, objective, and expert evaluations of all candidates' files. These evaluations will:

1. Explicitly state the Departmental standards for the relevant action at the beginning of your letter.
2. Cover in detail and in 4 separate sections the distinct areas of (a) Scholarship/Creative work.
 - a. (b) Teaching. (c) Service and Professional Contributions. (d) Contributions to Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion.
3. Provide analytical, and not merely cursory or descriptive, assessments of each of the scholarly and creative contributions submitted for the review period or the career review, engaging fully with each specific item.
4. Provide an assessment where value judgments are defended with relevant metrics and/or informed narrative justifications.
5. Provide evaluative information about less known publication or exhibition/performance venues when warranted (such as, for example, international sites; non-flagship specialized venues; etc.).
6. Provide an assessment that is respectful and impartial in both content and tone.
7. Use language that is free of jargon to engage a broad audience of academic evaluators from a variety of disciplines.
8. Provide a detailed discussion of teaching contributions, which include:
 - list of courses taught (including number of students, type of course)
 - interpretation of CAPE/SET evaluations
 - analysis of all relevant materials submitted in the candidate's Teaching Portfolio
[Teaching and Mentoring Statement and Portfolio Instructions PUBLIC - Google Docs](#), such as
 - the candidate's Teaching Statement,
 - reports of class observations by peers and staff from the TLC,
 - sample syllabi,
 - T.A. mentoring and training,
 - participation in professional development workshops relative to teaching,
 - examples of curricular innovation,
 - variety of offerings (the School expects candidates to teach a mix of graduate seminars, undergraduate courses tied to relevant majors and minors as well as large-enrollment G.E. courses).

9. Provide a detailed discussion of service contributions, which include information about the nature of service in a program, department, campus community, and the profession. Explain service areas that may not be immediately familiar to CAP evaluators.
10. Discuss contributions to EDI. Focus on specific, concrete contributions and not on the candidate's sentiments about EDI.
11. Limits itself to materials submitted in the file. References to external materials (for example, newspaper and magazine reviews, citation of artistic works in academic articles, on-line references, interviews, etc.) will be relevant only when those documents are part of the file.
12. For appointment and promotion files, discuss external evaluators' letters, paying special attention to the independence of the reviewer.
13. For junior appointment files, detail mentoring plan.
14. For 4th year appraisals, provide specific recommendations to assist the candidate as they build a solid tenure case. In the very rare cases in which departmental evaluators feel unequipped to assess the contents of a file during a regular review cycle, it will be their duty to seek out and include expert evaluations from other areas of the University or relevant professional fields in the UC system and beyond.
15. Service is expected to increase as one moves through the ranks. Junior colleagues are not expected to engage in onerous service, while senior professors are required to take on more service activities and have greater visibility in the department, campus, and profession
16. Accelerations across two merit steps require **double** the number of outstanding items required for a single step, **plus** excellent service and teaching. *Accelerations are not the norm in either individual departments or the division.* Departmental standards are built on the requirements for normal merits, and departments should make the case for accelerations in defensible cases only. Deficits in service and teaching typically preclude successful accelerations. Extraordinary teaching and service may be used to bolster a request for a research-based acceleration but in and by themselves do not justify accelerations. Besides excellent classroom teaching, a record of exceptional teaching may include involvement in a larger-than-standard number of M.A. and Ph.D. committees, commitment to directed reading courses and freshman seminars, etc. A record of outstanding service may include particularly onerous assignments, such as chairing a department or serving on CAP, or serving as the President of a major professional association.
17. Advancement to Above Scale requires another major research publication, such as a new completed monograph, accepted with no further revisions by a reputable press and /or a record of outstanding peer-reviewed articles and other relevant publications as described in the other post-tenure career reviews. The candidate must demonstrate excellence in all three areas, and show evidence of international professional reputation. Per the PPM: "Advancement to Above Scale is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed and whose performance in all areas is excellent..... Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at the top of the salary scale are not a justification for

further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step IX was based.”

18. If a bonus is recommended, tie the recommendation to the relevant item in the BOS list provided by the School of Arts & Humanities and available here.

1) a faculty member has combined nearly double the amount of research with a full teaching and service load in which they perform well.

2) a faculty member has won a research, teaching, or service prize from the campus, the UC system or a major national or international organization.

3) a faculty member has completed a term of service as the director of an institute or a center: Program directors may be considered for a BOS upon completion of their term, if they demonstrated outstanding leadership in creating and/or advancing the relevant program. Standard progress benchmarks will have to be exceeded and outcomes will need to have surpassed the norm. Annual Evaluation Standards for IAH Directors are used as divisional models to define these metrics.

4) a faculty member has successfully completed a term of service as department chair.

5) a faculty member has successfully completed a term of service as a member of CAP or the CoC, has chaired a major academic senate committee (like UGC, GC, or similar), or served as an elected member of the Academic Senate Leadership.

6) a faculty member has successfully taught an overload equivalent to 1.5 times the regular teaching load (not including any thesis supervision, directed readings, and similar).

7) a faculty member does not have the research for a normal merit or because they are at a barrier step, but teaching and service are excellent – No change with BOS.

8) a faculty member provided extraordinary contributions to EDI in service, teaching, and/or research.