



**October 2017**

**DIVISION OF ARTS & HUMANITIES  
GENERAL CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND ADVANCEMENT**

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 Division expects all departments to provide sound, objective, and expert evaluations of all candidates' files. These evaluations will:

- Explicitly state the Departmental standards for the relevant action
- Cover in detail and in 4 separate sections the distinct areas of (a) Scholarship/Creative Work; (b) Teaching; (c) Service and Professional Contributions; and (d) Contributions to Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
- Provide analytical, and not merely cursory or descriptive, assessments of each one of the scholarly and artistic contributions submitted for the review period, engaging fully with each specific item
- Provide evaluative information about less known publication or exhibition/performance venues when warranted (such as, for example, international sites; non-flagship specialized venues; etc.)
- Provide an assessment that is respectful and impartial in both content and tone
- Use language that is free of jargon to engage a broad audience of academic evaluators from a variety of disciplines
- Provide an assessment where value judgments are defended with relevant metrics and/or informed narrative justifications
- Provide a detailed discussion of teaching contributions, which include specific courses taught, interpretation of CAPE evaluations, and analysis of all relevant materials submitted with the file
- Provide a detailed discussion of service contributions, which include information about the nature of service in program, department, and community-specific areas that may not be immediately familiar to CAP evaluators
- 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
- For appointment and promotion files, discuss independent outside evaluations
- For junior appointment files, detail mentoring plan
- For 4<sup>th</sup> year appraisals, provide specific recommendations to assist the candidate as s/he builds a solid tenure case

In the very rare cases in which departmental evaluators feel unequipped to evaluate 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.

Evaluations of teaching should include interpretations of CAPE scores and student narrative comments but should also go beyond those obvious elements. Size and variety of courses, pedagogical risks and innovations, effective use of technology in the classroom, quality of syllabi, peer-assessments, and teaching portfolios, among other things, should be considered together with comprehensive discussions of graduate work, such as engagement with M.A. theses and Ph.D. dissertations, mentoring of post-docs, professional training of TAs, and other relevant contributions.

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.

## **I. SCHOLAR SERIES**

While the original single-authored scholarly monograph is the most recognized form of scholarship in many disciplines in Arts & Humanities, and typically constitutes the basis for promotion, some fields and subfields favor peer-reviewed articles (for example, certain areas of philosophy). Additionally, the weight of other forms of scholarship such as translations, critical editions of original texts, co-authored and edited volumes, and digital projects will need to be assessed on a case-to-case basis.

### **A. Normal Merit Reviews:**

#### **I. Scholarship**

A record of increasingly significant original scholarship that shows:

- Measurable progress on single authored book manuscript and/or other discipline-specific publications such as major articles in peer-reviewed journals (see individual departments for suggested numbers at relevant career stages). Other contributions may typically include:
  - Annotated translations or collections
  - Peer-reviewed digital projects
  - Essays in edited volumes
  - Edited or co-edited volumes
  - Chapters in multi-authored books
  - Co-authored articles
  - Other field-specific contributions

#### **II. Teaching**

An increasingly substantial teaching portfolio that includes:

- Lower division and upper division lecture classes
- Graduate and/or undergraduate colloquia or seminars
- College core courses, as appropriate

- Other teaching modules, optional (team taught courses; telepresented seminars; etc.)

Successful teaching will be measured through some or all of these elements:

- CAPE scores (required)
- Syllabi (required)
- Evidence of participation in professional development workshops
- Personal teaching statements
- Design of new curricula, application of new methodologies, creation of textbooks, and teaching tools
- Student testimonials
- Evaluations by colleagues (including report of class observations; peer-mentoring and assessments, etc.).

### III. Service:

In pre-tenure cases, service will be light and will be assigned to facilitate the junior faculty's introduction to and involvement with the University's community. Service component will increase with advancement and will typically include:

- Department committees
- University committees
- Service to the profession
- Relevant service to the community

## **B. Fourth Year Appraisal**

### I. Scholarship

A record of original scholarship that shows:

- Progress on a first book-length manuscript and one or two published articles, or a number of articles in peer-reviewed journals (see individual departments for suggested amount). Other materials may include:
  - Progress on annotated translations or collections
  - Progress on peer-reviewed digital projects
  - Essays in edited volumes
  - Progress on edited or co-edited volumes
  - Chapters in multi-authored books
  - Co-authored articles
  - Other field-specific contributions

### II. Teaching

- Lower division and upper division lecture classes
- Graduate and/or undergraduate colloquia or seminars
- College core courses, as appropriate
- Other teaching modules, optional (team taught courses; telepresented seminars; etc.

Successful teaching will be measured by the analysis of some or all of these elements:

- CAPE scores (required)
- Syllabi (required)
- Evidence of participation in professional development workshops
- Personal teaching statements
- Design of new curricula, application of new methodologies, creation of textbooks, and teaching tools
- Student testimonials
- Evaluations by colleagues (including report of class observations; peer-mentoring and assessments, etc.).

### III. Service

In pre-tenure cases, service will be light and assigned to facilitate the junior faculty's introduction to and involvement with the home department and University's community.

## C. Assistant to Associate:

### I. Scholarship

Successful scholarship at this stage includes:

- A completed monograph, accepted with no further revisions by a reputable press and / or a record of published peer-reviewed articles (see individual departments for suggested amounts). Other materials may include:
  - Annotated translations or collections
  - Peer-reviewed digital projects
  - Essays in edited volumes
  - Edited or co-edited volumes
  - Chapters in multi-authored books
  - Co-authored articles
  - Other field-specific contributions
- Evidence of growing professional visibility and recognition such as: Fellowships and grants
  - Fellowships, grants, and awards
  - Invited review essays and book reviews in major journals
  - Scholarly conference presentations
  - Invited lectures
  - Encyclopedia entries
- Demonstration of scholarly trajectory as evidenced by work on a second major project (prospectus, grant proposal, conference papers, and/or articles).

### II. Teaching

Demonstrated ability to teach:

- Lower division and upper division lecture classes
- Graduate and/or undergraduate colloquia or seminars

- College core courses as appropriate
- Other teaching modules are optional (team taught courses; telepresented seminars)

Successful teaching will be measured by the analysis of some or all of these elements:

- CAPE scores (required)
- Syllabi (required)
- Evidence or participation in professional development workshops
- Personal teaching statements
- Design of new curricula, application of new methodologies, creation of textbooks, and teaching tools
- Student testimonials
- Evaluations by colleagues (including report of class observations; peer-mentoring and assessments, etc).

### III. Service

While assigned sparingly, service expectations at this stage include participation in

- Departmental and campus committees
- Some professional activities (such as but not limited to book review editor for a peer-reviewed journal; session organizer at major national and international conferences etc.; light participation in professional societies and associations; etc.)

## **D. Associate To Full**

### I. Scholarship

Successful scholarship at this stage includes:

- A new (typically a second) completed monograph, accepted with no further revisions by a reputable press and/or solid record of published peer-reviewed articles. Other materials may include:
  - Annotated translations or collections
  - Peer-reviewed digital projects
  - Essays in edited volumes
  - Edited or co-edited volumes
  - Chapters in multi-authored books
  - Co-authored articles
  - Other field-specific contributions
- Evidence of professional visibility and recognition such as:
  - Fellowships, grants, awards
  - Invited review essays and book reviews in major journals
  - Scholarly conference presentations
  - Invited lectures
  - Keynote addresses
  - Encyclopedia entries
- Continued evidence of scholarly trajectory as demonstrated by work on a new project, grant proposals, conference papers, and/or articles).

## II. Teaching

At this stage the candidate is expected to have built a well-balanced portfolio of:

- Lower division and upper division lecture classes
- Graduate and/or undergraduate colloquia or seminars
- College core courses, as appropriate
- Other teaching modules, optional (team taught courses; telepresented seminars)

Successful teaching will be measured by the analysis of some or all of these elements:

- CAPE scores (required)
- Syllabi (required)
- Evidence or participation in professional development workshops
- Personal teaching statements
- Design of new curricula, application of new methodologies, creation of textbooks, and teaching tools
- Student testimonials
- Evaluations by colleagues (including report of class observations; peer-mentoring and assessments, etc).

## III. Service

A sustained amount of service is expected at this stage, including participation in:

- Department committees
- Academic Senate or other university-wide committee; UC system-wide committees
- Professional activities such as chairing panels at professional meetings; memberships in editorial boards; peer-evaluations of articles and manuscripts; etc.

## **E. Professor Step VI**

### IV. Scholarship

- A new (usually a third) completed monograph, accepted with no further revisions by a reputable press and /or
- Record of published peer-reviewed articles
- Book chapters/essays in edited collections
- Evidence of increased national and international professional visibility such as:
  - Fellowships, grants, awards
  - Book reviews in major journals
  - Scholarly conference papers, keynotes,
  - Invited lectures
  - Encyclopedia entries
- Demonstrated scholarly trajectory as evidenced by work on a new project, grant proposals, conference papers, and/or articles.

### II. Teaching

At this stage the candidate is expected to have a record of excellence in teaching a well-balanced portfolio of:

- Lower division and upper division lecture classes
- Graduate and/or undergraduate colloquia or seminars
- College core courses, as appropriate
- Other teaching modules, optional (team taught courses; telepresented seminars)

Successful teaching will be measured by the analysis of some or all of these elements:

- CAPE scores (required)
- Syllabi (required)
- Evidence or participation in professional development workshops
- Personal teaching statements
- Design of new curricula, application of new methodologies, creation of textbooks, and teaching tools
- Student testimonials
- Evaluations by colleagues (including report of class observations; peer-mentoring and assessments, etc).

### III. Service

Notable service is expected at this stage include participation in

- Department committees
- Academic Senate or other university-wide, UC system-wide committees, with increased leadership roles
- Professional activities such as such as chairing panels at professional meetings; memberships and leadership positions in editorial boards; peer-evaluations of articles and manuscripts; leadership roles in professional organizations; participation in external review panels for departments and programs at other institutions; etc.

### **F. Professor Above Scale**

This promotion 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.

In this promotion, 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.”

### **G. Accelerations**

Accelerations across two merit steps require **double** the amount of outstanding publications 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.

## **H. Above Scale Merits**

The normal salary increase for a person in the Above Scale category is 100% of the difference between the top two steps of the salary scale. CAP describes the 100% step as a “super step”, requiring as much productivity as it took to get from Step IX to Above Scale. Files must demonstrate exemplary performance in all areas (research and creative activity, teaching, service, and professional competence and activity). Files proposing more than 100% of the difference between the top two steps will be considered acceleration files and will only occur in rare and compelling cases.

## **II. ARTIST SERIES**

Our faculty artists produce creative work in both traditional and experimental modalities in and across the numerous fields and disciplines represented in our Arts Departments (Music, Theatre & Dance, Visual Arts, and The Creative Writing Program in the Literature Department). The diversity of artistic activities necessitates that we establish criteria for promotion and advancement that can adequately measure the scope and value of these varying practices, while simultaneously providing rigorous and legible standards that assess innovative contributions in both established and non-traditional fields.

The Division applies its criteria for advancement in ways that (a) support established field-specific standards and norms; (b) account for the intersections among artistic practices across disciplines and fields; and (c) respond to experimentation and innovation as fundamental characteristics of contemporary art.

In general, artistic productivity is defined by sustained production and national and international impact as measured not only by the *number* of works completed but, rather, by the nuanced assessment of a series of interlocking factors:

- **Scope, scale, size and/or duration and/or materials of the creative activity** (for example, large format photography, evening-long performances, animated short films, workshop readings, published artistic volumes)
- **Status of the venue and/or publisher and/or distributor and/or curator** (for example, museums, galleries, performing arts houses, music labels, online literary journals.) It is important to note that many celebrated creative activities had their beginnings in smaller venues and/or in venues dedicated to promoting diversity
- **Standing of collaborators**, if any (for example, performing with other musicians, designing for directors, co-authoring a book of poetry)
- **Proportion of new and old work** exhibited/performed/published



- **Technical complexity or technique involved in the production of research** (for example, serving as both musical performer and sound engineer, authoring a piece of software) and may be presented for evaluation separately if appropriate
- **Impact of the research with a variety of metrics:** impact *within* the subfield, impact *across* fields (for example, a dance performance that is reviewed by both dance critics and *Rolling Stone* magazine, a sound work installed in both a museum and a music hall), cross-cultural works, works displayed in permanent public and private collections, works that are published in or translated into languages other than English, works that capture an international audience, as well as recognizing a spectrum of intended audiences, from commercial to more avant-garde/experimental/ emerging modes of activity (for example, from major recording labels, Broadway, and Netflix distribution to independent music labels, independent presses, “fringe” art festivals, pop-up galleries, salons). Creative work may be reviewed in established venues as well as alternative and non-traditional venues; Creative works may be published within one review period and yet their impact may be better measured in subsequent review periods (for example, new exhibitions at prestigious venues, restaged productions, new performance of musical scores)
- **Innovative qualities** of the research as situated within a spectrum of established traditions through emerging fields, with recognition for research that extends beyond what might be considered “normative” (for example, a revival production of Shakespeare, algorithm-based artworks, a world-premiere of post-colonial responses to Shakespeare using algorithm-based language).

In areas where a professional’s work remains difficult to directly assess (for example, in some areas of theatre such as stage management), it is the department’s duty to provide relevant documentation to support the proposed action and assist campus evaluators (for example, analysis of market demand for the faculty member’s work in the review period; detailed consideration of the challenges, complexity, innovation of the work in question; testimonials of professionals involved in the specific work, as appropriate, etc.).

In the very rare cases in which departmental evaluators feel unequipped to evaluate the contents of a file during a regular merit 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.

Creative research activities can be evaluated through multiple formats included in the evaluation file, such as, but not limited to:

- Published CD, DVD, book of poetry or creative prose, photographs
- Sonic, photographic, or video documentation
- Solicited reviews of an event by experts in the field, and/or published reviews.

It is important to note, in our shifting digital publication landscape, that published reviews of all forms of artwork have diminished in recent years. For music, video, and other emerging disciplines, self-publishing works online is increasingly common. The absence of a professional publisher should not necessarily negatively impact evaluation. Rather it should place heightened responsibility on the artist to accomplish a high level of professionalism, and on the evaluators to engage in great detail with the work in question and provide a thorough assessment of its value.

For creative artists in the division, academic writing (articles, books) and curatorial work is *not necessarily* criteria for advancement, but, when available, may be included in files and should be evaluated through the same metrics as other academic publications and exhibitions.

*Teaching and service requirements in the Artist Series are analogous to those in the Scholar Series, therefore they will not be repeated here.*

#### **A. Normal Merit Reviews**

A record of increasingly significant original contributions that shows:

Measurable progress in the creation of significant individual and collaborative creative work at recognized professional venues or alternative sites of recognized standing in a particular field.

The quantity of works may differ based on the work's qualities (technological innovation; production scale; organizational complexity). In the case of large projects spanning over review periods the Division expects to see concrete evidence of progress and analytical discussion of work accomplished.

#### **B. Fourth Year Appraisal**

Evidence of new work in progress or completed since being hired; if in progress, well-advanced major project as demonstrated by large completed portions, or success in production of series of smaller projects that are demonstrating external validation.

#### **C. Assistant to Associate**

New major work exhibited/performed/published in a recognized venue or relevant platform, or a body of smaller significant projects that together are evidence of the artist's standing in the field, and show the scope of the artist's vision and command of craft. Reviews/recognition by journals or other media are an important condition to demonstrate aesthetic value and relevant social presence.

#### **D. Associate to Full**

The exhibition/publication/performance of new work, demonstrated achievement of a higher level of critical recognition in the field, supported by ongoing relevance of work over time. New work can take the form of a major new project whose scope of production takes multiple years, or a body of smaller projects, all of which demonstrate external validation.

#### **E. Professor Step VI**

A body of sustained significant work marked by national/international recognition and impact. Artists at this level have demonstrated mature established careers.

#### **F. Professor Above Scale**

Sustained high artistic distinction, nationally and internationally. Consensus that the artist is a leader in the field.

### **III. SCHOLAR/ARTIST SERIES**

Faculty within the Literature, Music, Theatre and Dance, and Visual Arts departments are often hybrid artist/scholars involved in pure, applied, and interpretive research. A faculty member's artistic and scholarly activity within a given period may be more focused in one of these areas, or it may reflect a constellation of professional output and engagement.

It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member, the department, and the chair to make a compelling case during each advancement period, and especially during career reviews, for how faculty research should be evaluated.

For researchers in the division whose work represents a hybrid of creative and scholarly activities, it is the responsibility of the candidate and department to make a case that:

- Clarifies the combination of and intersections among various strands of research
- Considers each aspect of research thoroughly and individually
- Provides the appropriate materials available to external referees for evaluation.

The diversity of activities within the division makes it challenging to arrive at a single set of criteria for advancement and promotion, yet there are common factors across artistic traditions, academic departments, and area-specific subfields. Our goal is to view the candidate's professional portfolio as a comprehensive series of contributions, and to not narrow down considerations to only one aspect of research. This does not mean that all aspects of a hybrid research portfolio need to be covered in each review period. For example, a hybrid artist/scholar need not publish a scholarly book *and* create a major artwork in a single review period.

External referees for a hybrid researcher may include scholars and artists as well as other experts, for instance engineers or curators. Non-academic evaluators may provide invaluable and unique interpretations of a colleague's contributions, but they may also be unfamiliar with the standards and conventions of academic letter writing. It is imperative that the department ensures that these standards and conventions are made explicit and appropriate assistance is offered to these evaluators as they complete their task.

### **IV. LSOE SERIES**

#### **Promotion to Lecturer With Security of Employment**

Evidence of excellence in teaching, and of educational leadership such as curricular development and innovation, educational initiatives on campus and beyond, etc.) Impact on a department's undergraduate and graduate programs. Evidence of professional activity that may include publications, leadership in professional organizations, on and off campus initiatives that impact the field.

#### **Promotion to Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment**

A body of educational, professional, and/or research activity as described above that has achieved recognition at the national and international level.