



## Appendix for Committee on Academic Personnel

### **1. NanoEngineering Department Standards for Normal Merit Advancement**

The NanoEngineering department has established general standards for its faculty's performance during a normal step advancement within the professorial series. In general terms, the requirement is a combination of impactful research and productive performance in all other facets of the candidate's record.

- In terms of research publications, a typical file would be expected to have four peer-reviewed journal papers for original research (i.e. not a review paper) per year. It is expected that these will include papers where the faculty is either a first author or a corresponding author, indicative of independent research conducted at UC San Diego. The faculty should also present his/her work in scientific meetings. Other outcomes such as patents/provisional patents maybe used to demonstrate research productivity.
- In terms of funding, we expect each faculty to generate sufficient funding to support a productive research group in her/his field.
- In terms of teaching, we expect our faculty to maintain CAPE evaluations above 70% on average (Instructor Recommendation Rating) or equivalent demonstrable teaching/mentoring competency (e.g. for graduate courses).
- In terms of service, we expect all of our faculty will serve as reviewers for journals, serve on at least one departmental committee, and serve on one other non-departmental service/professional committee each year.
- In terms of diversity contributions, we expect every faculty member makes some demonstrable efforts to increase or improve the diversity on campus and in her/his scientific society.

### **2. Promotion to Tenure**

For candidate being considered for promotion to tenure, the Department of NanoEngineering has additional expectations of the candidates. First, the candidate must have demonstrated academic achievements that are consistent with our Normal Merit Advancement standards while at UCSD. Second, and most importantly, the impact of the candidate's independent academic achievements must be recognized by the outside scholarly community as significant, documented through the external referee letters, citations, awards, and the ability to secure research funding.

### **3. Additional Step Accelerations**

Candidates with exceptionally strong academic files can be considered for accelerations in the NanoEngineering Department. The case for an acceleration can be made based on outstanding research productivity with impactful publications, significant honors and/or awards at the national or international level, a higher than normal funding track record, all while maintaining or excelling in the areas of teaching, service, and diversity efforts. Evidence that a candidate's productivity is double that which is expected for normal advancement in the review period is typically sufficient to demonstrate a candidate's performance is exceptional for purposes of a one-step acceleration. In cases in which research productivity is greater than that required for normal advancement, but falls short of twice the expected rate, extraordinary achievements in additional performance criteria are necessary to justify accelerated advancement. See PPM 230-220-80/APM 220-80 for more details on acceleration expectations.