



ISAAC MARTIN, CHAIR  
URBAN STUDIES AND PLANNING, 0517  
(858) 246-5361  
<https://usp.ucsd.edu>

9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0517

January 30, 2023

To: Academic personnel services

Re: Urban Studies and Planning departmental standards for advancement in senate faculty series

This memo summarizes the departmental standards in the professor and teaching professor series, as they have been articulated in previous academic personnel actions. Where a quantitative standard is articulated, it is to be understood that the number is a norm to guide us rather than a rule to bind us; publications are not standardized widgets, and their quality must always guide our judgments. Actions with \* denote academic personnel actions that have not yet occurred in our department, and standards pertinent to such actions may be particularly subject to revision as a result of future faculty deliberation. In every case, these standards are intended to provide consistency, but they are also intended to summarize an approximate consensus of the faculty, and they must therefore be expected to change as the faculty changes, or as faculty deliberations result in the articulation of different or more specific standards.

## I. Professor series

### A. Assistant rank

#### 1. Second-year review

At this step, we look for evidence that an assistant professor is active in research and creative activity, with evidence of early progress on an independent research agenda that could eventually lead to a successful case for tenure. We hope to see peer-reviewed publications, but we acknowledge that the initial investments necessary to get an independent research program underway in the first year of an assistant professor appointment may mean that the quantity of publications might be low in the first review period; we might expect, perhaps, two peer-reviewed articles or book chapters in the initial two-year review period, or one along with evidence of progress on a book manuscript. Most important at this stage is that the file include sufficient written material to give us a sense of the quality and potential impact that we might expect from the research program in the future.

#### 2. Fourth-year review\*

At this stage, our assessment depends on whether an assistant professor is on track to meet the standards for tenure, as described below.

### B. Associate rank

#### 1. Promotion to tenure\*

The standards for tenure vary, depending on whether the tenure path proceeds primarily through a book, or through a series of articles. In the former case, we expect a high-quality

book published by a reputable university press with a rigorous peer review process. We expect the book to be “accepted” or “in press” at the time that the tenure decision is to be rendered—that is, a communication from the publisher recording binding acceptance of the entire corpus must be in hand. In addition to the book, we expect a few other peer-reviewed publications, and evidence of a new project, particularly if the book reports the results of dissertation research.

We expect evidence of teaching excellence, including advising undergraduate and graduate students, and teaching both undergraduate and graduate courses. Finally, we expect university and public service commensurate with rank. At the associate professor rank in USP, this means service at the department level, and may include contributions to public planning processes at local, regional, and state levels.

## **2. Advancement within associate rank\***

We expect an associate professor to continue an innovative research program. For scholars who primarily communicate research results via books and monographs, the standard for promotion might include at least some shorter peer-reviewed publications to provide evidence of ongoing progress within a review period. In a typical review period, for scholars who primarily communicate research results via articles, we might expect between one and two research publications (journal articles or book chapters) of high quality per year, on average, with more expected in the case of co-authored publications in which the candidate did not have a leading role, and with allowance for uneven pace of publication.

We expect evidence of teaching excellence, including advising undergraduate and graduate students, teaching both undergraduate and graduate courses, and contributing to curriculum development. Finally, we expect university and public service commensurate with rank. At the associate professor rank in USP, this means demanding service at the departmental level, and may include contributions to public planning processes at regional and state levels.

## **C. Full rank**

### **1. Promotion to full**

We expect a full professor to continue an innovative research program. For scholars who primarily communicate research results via books and monographs, the standard for promotion might include a second a high-quality book published by a reputable university press with a rigorous peer review process. For scholars who primarily communicate research results via articles, the standard might be approximately eight peer-reviewed post-tenure research publications (journal articles or book chapters) of high quality [since promotion to associate], with at least some published in top journals. For promotion to full professor, we will look for evidence that the candidate has achieved a national reputation for scholarly achievement.

We expect evidence of teaching excellence, including advising undergraduate and graduate students, teaching both undergraduate and graduate courses, and contributing to curriculum development. Finally, we expect university and public service commensurate with rank. At the full professor rank in USP, this means service at the university level, and may include contributions to public planning processes at regional, state, and national levels.

### **2. Advancement within full**

We expect a full professor to continue an innovative research program. For scholars who primarily communicate research results via books and monographs, the standard for

promotion might include at least some shorter peer-reviewed publications to provide evidence of ongoing progress within a review period. In a typical review period, for scholars who primarily communicate research results via articles, we might expect between one and two research publications (journal articles or book chapters) of high quality per year, on average, with more expected in the case of co-authored publications in which the candidate did not have a leading role, and with allowance for uneven pace of publication.

### **3. Advancement within higher steps**

We propose that normal expectations for the quantity of excellent, published, peer reviewed research required for merit advancement of full professors at Steps VI through IX of the salary scale might be either a book, or else approximately five articles or book chapters in a three-year review period. At this career stage, evidence of quality and intellectual leadership is paramount.

We expect evidence of teaching excellence, including advising undergraduate and graduate students, teaching both undergraduate and graduate courses, and contributing to curriculum development. Finally, we expect university and public service commensurate with rank. At the higher steps of full professor rank in USP, this means demanding departmental service and service at the university level as opportunities arise, and may include contributions to public planning processes at regional, state, national and international levels.

## **II. Teaching professor (Lecturer with security of employment) series**

### **A. Assistant rank**

#### **1. Second-year review\***

We expect an assistant teaching professor to prepare at least some new courses and teach them well. With respect to professional achievement and activity at this step, we look for evidence that an assistant professor is active in their discipline or interdisciplinary profession beyond the university. Peer-reviewed publications are sufficient but not necessary evidence of professional achievement and activity. We acknowledge that the initial investments necessary to get an independent instructional program underway in the first year of an assistant teaching professor appointment may mean that opportunities for professional achievement and activity may be limited.

#### **2. Fourth-year review\***

At this stage, our assessment depends on whether an assistant teaching professor is on track to meet the standards for security of employment, as described below.

### **B. Associate rank**

#### **1. Promotion to tenure**

The department standard for associate teaching professor (LSOE) requires continued excellence in teaching and pedagogical innovation; peer-reviewed publications such as a high-quality, peer-reviewed book from a university press, or several high-quality, peer-reviewed articles, including some in the most recent review period, would sufficient, but not necessary, evidence of professional and scholarly activity for appointment at this rank. At higher steps, one might expect additional peer-reviewed research publications or other evidence of ongoing professional achievement, along with progress toward the national profile that would be expected of a full Teaching Professor.

We expect university and public service commensurate with rank. For advancement to associate teaching professor in USP, this means some demanding service roles at the departmental level, and may include contributions to public planning processes at regional, state, and national levels.

## **2. Advancement within associate rank**

The department standard for associate teaching professor (LSOE) requires continued excellence in teaching and pedagogical innovation; at the associate rank, we look for consistently excellent teaching in existing courses, alongside evidence of contributions to curriculum development across the department

The department standard for associate teaching professor (LSOE) requires continued excellence in teaching and pedagogical innovation; at higher steps, we would look for progress toward the rank of full teaching professor, including consistently excellent teaching in existing courses, alongside some evidence of leadership in curriculum development across the department. For an acceleration, we would look for unambiguous evidence of more contributions to innovative and successful pedagogy and curriculum development than could reasonably be expected in a typical review period.

## **C. Full rank**

### **1. Promotion to full**

For promotion to Teaching Professor (Senior LSOE), the departmental assessment of teaching excellence will rest heavily on documentation of consistently excellent teaching in existing courses, alongside evidence of leadership in curriculum development across the department. With respect to professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, at this rank, we will look for evidence that the candidate has achieved a *national* reputation for professional or scholarly achievement.

We expect university and public service commensurate with rank. For advancement to full teaching professor in USP, this means service at the university level, as opportunities are available, and may include contributions to public planning processes at regional, state, and national levels.

### **2. Advancement within full**

At this rank, we ordinarily expect consistently excellent teaching, including some evidence of curricular leadership; professional achievement of substantial reach beyond the campus; and university and public service at very high levels.

### **3. Advancement within higher steps\***

At this rank, we ordinarily expect consistently excellent teaching, including evidence of curricular leadership beyond the department; professional achievement of substantial reach beyond the campus; and university and public service at very high levels.

Finally, we expect university and public service commensurate with rank. At the higher steps of the full teaching professor rank in USP, this means demanding departmental service and service at the university level, as opportunities are available, and may include contributions to public planning processes at regional, state, national and international levels.