# APPOINTMENT AND ADVANCEMENT
(Revised 4/24)

This compilation is intended as an aid for the use of Departmental Chairs, reviewing agencies, and Senate faculty. It is not a substitute for the official documents governing appointment and advancement at UCSB, the Academic Personnel Manual and Red Binder, which are authoritative and must be carefully adhered to in personnel actions. Rather it is intended to provide a comprehensive overview of the policies and procedures governing appointment and advancement and the application of criteria in reviews.

The official manual governing personnel actions is the Academic Personnel Manual (APM), issued and revised by the Office of the President of the University of California. UCSB campus policies and procedures are contained in the Red Binder. The Office of the President also issues an annual list of salary scales. These documents are available for reference at https://ap.ucsb.edu/

<table>
<tr><td><strong>CONTENTS</strong></td><td><strong>Section</strong></td></tr>
<tr><td>Ranks, Steps, and Normal Periods of Service within Steps</td><td>I</td></tr>
<tr><td>Materials Required for Personnel Actions</td><td>II</td></tr>
<tr><td>The Review Process</td><td>III</td></tr>
<tr><td>Some Procedural Matters</td><td>IV</td></tr>
<tr><td>Criteria for Evaluations</td><td>V</td></tr>
<tr><td>Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Contributions</td><td>VI</td></tr>
<tr><td>Confidentiality and Personnel Safeguards</td><td>VII</td></tr>
<tr><td>Departmental Voting on Personnel Cases</td><td>VIII</td></tr>
</table>

## I. RANKS, STEPS, AND NORMAL PERIODS OF SERVICE WITHIN STEPS

The information in this summary primarily concerns the faculty in Professor and Teaching Professor series: Assistant Professor/Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Professor/Associate Teaching Professor, and Professor/Teaching Professor.

Information contained within this document applies equally to both series unless otherwise noted. For ease of use, only the professorial series ranks are listed in the table below.

There is a normal period of service for most steps within these ranks, as indicated in the following table. However, movement between ranks (promotion) or from one step to another within a rank (merit advancement) depends upon merit. Advancement in rank and/or step is never automatic, and it can be faster than normal in recognition of outstanding performance (an acceleration) or delayed when performance does not meet normal expectations (a deceleration).

| ASSISTANT PROFESSOR | | ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR | | PROFESSOR | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (8 year limit, non-tenured/PSOE) | | (6 years normal, tenured/SOE) | | (indefinite, tenured/SOE) | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Step | Normal period of service | Step | Normal period of service | Step | Normal period of service | |
| | | | | | | |
| I | 2 (not used at UCSB) | | | | | |
| II | 2 | | | | | |
| III | 2 | | | | | |
| IV | 2 | | | | | |
| V | 2 (overlapping step) | I | 2 | | | |
| VI | 2 (overlapping step) | II | 2 | | | |
| | | III | 2 | | | |
| | | IV | 3 (overlapping step) | I | 3 | |
| | | V | 3 (overlapping step) | II | 3 | |
| | | | | III | 3 | |
| | | | | IV | 3 | |
| | | | | V | 3 | |
| | | | | VI | 3 | V+ 3 (overlapping step) |
| | | | | VII | 3 | |
| | | | | VIII | 3 | |
| | | | | IX | 4 | |
| | | | | Above Scale | 4 | IX+ 4 (overlapping step) |

Assistant Professor V and VI, Associate Professor IV and V, and Professor V+ and IX+ are overlapping steps. Service at these steps may count as time-in-step in the related steps of the next higher rank; e.g., after two years as Associate Professor IV and one year as Professor I, a candidate may be reviewed for a normal merit increase to Professor II, just as would be done after three years at Professor I. See Red Binder I-37 for further information on the use of overlapping steps at UCSB. Normal advancement in rank occupies six years at the Assistant Professor rank with eight as the maximum before either promotion or termination; six years at the Associate Professor rank; and an indefinite time in the Professor rank. Senate faculty members will be formally evaluated at least once every five years (a mandatory review).

In addition to the regular steps, some appointments or advancements may be made at the Above Scale level, i.e., above Professor IX. These salaries are reserved for scholars of the highest distinction, whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed.

Off-scale salary supplements

An individual may be given an off-scale salary, consisting of a salary supplement added to the salary rate at the assigned step. A recommendation for such a salary increase must be in accordance with Red Binder guidance and fully justified by the department or reviewing agencies recommending it. At UCSB off-scale salaries are used to respond to external market conditions in recruitment and retention, as well as to provide a partial reward in merit cases when a full step advancement is not indicated.

## II.  MATERIALS REQUIRED FOR PERSONNEL ACTIONS

Each time a recommendation for a personnel action is initiated, a dossier or file containing materials relevant to that recommendation is prepared by the Department Chair. The complete dossier includes the following:

1.  The UCSB Biography form supplied by the candidate at the time of appointment, which summarizes their professional career including salaries up to that time. (Needed only for appointments)

2.  The updated Bio-Bibliography prepared by the faculty member, including working links to publications and other creative works. (Red Binder I-27) (Not required for appointments)

3.  In certain cases, extramural letters of appraisal or recommendation from qualified experts evaluating the quality of a person's research or creative work and their professional reputation. Such letters are required in all cases of appointment and promotion, and for advancement to Professor Above Scale. A minimum of six analytical letters is required, and at least half should be chosen by the Chair in consultation with the department but independent of the candidate. The other half can be nominated by the candidate. The department's submission must include a coded list including a brief resume of the qualifications of each reviewer, indicating whether the reviewer was chosen by the candidate or by the department. This list should also indicate any relationships between the candidate and the reviewer (e.g. co-author, etc.) and if the reviewer has previously written for the candidate. (Red Binder I-46)

    The Chair should have minimum contact with the extramural evaluators beyond the letter soliciting the evaluation, because intended or unintended suggestions or hints to the evaluators may distort results and work unfairly either for or against the candidate.

4.  A letter of recommendation initiating the proposed appointment or advancement, normally written by the Department Chair (see Red Binder I-35). When a Chair is under consideration for advancement the case will be handled by a Vice-Chair or other senior faculty member. The Chair's letter should be accompanied by all relevant information, including particularly the signed Safeguard Statement in advancement cases.

5.  A thorough evaluation of teaching as described in Section V below.

6.  Electronic links in the bio-bib to all publications in the review period. Review period in cases for appointment and promotion means the complete record of the candidate.  In cases where this is impractical, a complete record of the most recent work and a sample of other significant works may be submitted. For merit review cases review period means years at step. If it is not possible to submit items via links, the department must work with the respective Dean's office to arrange alternate submission.

## III.  THE REVIEW PROCESS

Overview of the reviewing process (many of these steps are not applicable to appointment cases)

1.  In the spring, the Academic Personnel office provides departments with a list of faculty members eligible for normal advancement or promotion during the coming academic year.

2.  The Department Chair notifies each faculty member of their eligibility for personnel review.

3.  The faculty member either requests a deferral of action for one year or prepares evidence for the review, with the assistance of a departmental personnel committee, a case supervisor, or the Chair. Deadlines for submission of materials to departments should be set in line with College and Campus deadlines to allow timely processing of cases. The candidate has the right to augment the dossier with items relevant to the case, so long as the submission does not violate the privacy of third parties or other campus policies. Such materials may include self-assessments, award letters and other professional items.

4.  The candidate is given the opportunity to respond to the materials in the file.

5.  The case is presented and discussed. This is followed by a vote of eligible faculty in accordance with Senate By-Law 55 or other departmental voting procedures approved by CAP.

6.  The Chair writes a letter analyzing the case and summarizing the department's recommendation. The letter should provide a rigorous but succinct assessment of the candidate's qualifications together with detailed evidence to support the evaluation. The letter should also present a report of the Chair's consultation with the members of the department, including the vote tally and the basis for any dissent. The Chair should explain any apparent anomalies in the voting, e.g., a disproportionately small number of votes relative to departmental size, or excessive abstentions. The departmental letter should be a concise but complete professional evaluation (accurate and analytic), including both supportive and contrary evidence. Extended quotations from supporting documents and rhetorical statements are to be avoided, since overly long letters are a burden to all reviewing agencies. In career review cases the Chair should make clear which portions of the letter refer to the candidate's past accomplishments and which refer to accomplishments falling within the current review period.  See Red Binder I-35 for more details on writing a Department letter.

7.  This letter is available for inspection, amendment, or rebuttal by all eligible department members. Dissenting department members have the right to have a minority report included with the department letter. However, a minority report should not be submitted unless, after good-faith efforts by all parties, the minority believes that its views are not accurately represented in the Chair's letter.

8.  The Chair communicates the outcome of the case evaluation with the candidate, as required by Section 220-80 of the APM and outlined in "Departmental Checklist for Academic Advancement", Red Binder I-22. An oral summary or preferably a written copy of the departmental letter is given to the candidate as part of the review process and the candidate is provided the opportunity to comment.

9.  The candidate completes the Safeguard Statement.

10. A separate confidential letter from the Chair should not be submitted except on the rare occasions when evidence exists that could not be appropriately shared in the department letter.

11. The case, including the department letter and other required materials, is uploaded into AP Folio and is sent forward to the Dean. The Dean of the appropriate college or division makes their analysis and recommendation without reference to the recommendation of any reviewing agency other than the Department. They have access only to the departmental file, to previous departmental letters, and to previous Dean's recommendations.

12. In cases where the Dean does not have final authority, the case, including the Dean's letter, is sent to the Office of Academic Personnel, which forwards it to the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). CAP assigns the case to two members, usually from as similar a field as possible, to serve as primary reviewers and to lead the discussion with the full committee. (Note: cases are never assigned to a CAP member who belongs to the candidate's own department; in fact, CAP members are never present during discussion of cases from their own departments.)

13. In appointments and promotions to tenure, terminations, and advancements to Above Scale, an ad hoc review committee is appointed by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel on nomination from CAP. CAP may elect to serve as their own internal ad hoc except in the case of a terminal appointment recommendation. If a separate ad hoc committee is formed, that review committee makes its recommendation independently of all other reviewing agencies; it has access only to the file as it comes from the department. It does not have access to the prior personnel review file, to the Dean's letter, or to a separate confidential letter from the Chair, if one was submitted.

14. CAP considers the case after the ad hoc committee and the Dean have submitted their letters. If no ad hoc review is required, CAP proceeds once the Dean's recommendation is received. CAP has access to the analyses and recommendations of all other reviewing agencies, and to previous recommendations concerning the candidate. A

draft letter is written by the assigned member, distributed to the whole committee, read aloud, and fully discussed. A vote is taken in the cases when a consensus recommendation cannot be reached.

15. CAP's recommendation is forwarded to the Office of Academic Personnel for the final decision. The final decision may be made by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, the Executive Vice Chancellor or the Chancellor, according to the delegation of authority. (Red Binder I-33) If the Chancellor's (or designee's) tentative decision differs from CAP's and/or the Dean's recommendation by one step/increment or more (in salary or step), it is sent back to that agency for further comment. When the recommendation differs by a one-half step increment, the Chancellor (or designee) will not be required to consult further.

16. The Chancellor's (or designee's) final decision is communicated to the department and the candidate. In certain cases a Chancellor's tentative decision must precede the final decision. (See Red Binder I-39)

## IV.    SOME PROCEDURAL MATTERS

1. Requests for Further Information: Any reviewing agency may request additional information or documentation. The Dean sometimes requests such information directly from the Chair; ad hoc review committees and CAP always make such requests through the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel. Such requests do not reflect on the merit of the candidate, nor do they imply that the departmental recommendation is not credible. They are meant to make the case file complete. The candidate should be informed of additional materials obtained (APM, Section 220-80-h).

   Chairs should take special care to prepare the case thoroughly and properly. Significant delays result from improper or inadequate preparation of cases at the departmental level. When a reviewing agency requests additional information, a deadline for submission of those materials will be included in the request. If the materials are not received by the stated deadline the case will proceed through the review process without the materials. Failure to submit requested materials may have an effect on the outcome of the review.

2. Reconsideration: In special circumstances, after a decision is made, the Department Chair may begin the process of review again by requesting reconsideration. Requests for reconsideration must include important additional evidence or documentation of previously mentioned work pertinent to the review period that was omitted in the original recommendation, such as a major publication, award, etc., or evidence that the decision was not based on a reasonable evaluation of the case. Sometimes departments may wish to request reconsideration without such evidence in order to show solidarity with the candidate or for similar reasons. Such requests should not be submitted.

3. Non-Reappointment: When it is decided that an Assistant Professor should not be reappointed (given a terminal appointment), or when a department recommendation for promotion to tenure may be denied, the Assistant Professor is given due notice, in accordance with APM Section 220-20-c. Terminal appointments, whether originated by the department or elsewhere, are always given a full review, including consideration by the Dean, ad hoc committee, and CAP. (See APM Section 220-84.)

4. Formal Appraisal: The APM requires that at a certain point in their career each Assistant Professor should be appraised. The purpose of the appraisal as stated in the APM (Section 220-83) is to arrive at preliminary assessments of the prospects of candidates for eventual promotion to tenure rank as well as to identify appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence desired for continued membership in the faculty.

   This appraisal is normally made during the fourth year of the Assistant Professor's career at the University. If promotion to Associate Professor occurs at year 4 or earlier, an appraisal will not occur.

   The departmental letter concerning an appraisal should contain:

   a.    A description and analysis of the candidate's total performance in each of the areas of evaluation.

   b.    An evaluation of that performance as progress toward eventual tenure.

c. A clear statement that the recommendation of the department is: (a) continued candidacy for eventual promotion, (b) continued candidacy with reservations (which should be specified), or (c) terminal appointment. An appraisal decision should never be interpreted as a promise of eventual promotion to tenure.

The appraisal review will often occur at the same time as a merit review. The two actions may be addressed in a single case, but both actions need to be separately addressed in the departmental letter.

After the review is completed, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel will provide redacted copies of the review documents to the candidate.

5. <u>No Change Recommendations.</u> Like a recommendation for advancement, a departmental recommendation for no change in rank, step, or salary must include an evaluation of the case, a summary of the relevant evidence, a summary of departmental views, and a record of the departmental vote.

6. <u>Deferral Requests.</u> Sometimes a candidate asks not to be reviewed for advancement, i.e., to be granted a deferral. Except for Assistant Professors, deferrals are automatic if no case is submitted by the relevant deadline. For Assistant Professors, the Chair should determine whether the candidate's self-evaluation in their deferral request is accurate and should briefly review the available evidence in their letter. The request and Chair's letter are then forwarded to the Dean. No person at any rank may go more than five years without a formal evaluation. Mandatory reviews may not be deferred.

7. <u>Reviewing Agency Reports</u>: When the candidate signs their safeguard statement, they may request that reviewing agency reports be supplied to them at the close of the case. The reviewer reports will be automatically provided once the case is decided. If the candidate does not make the request at the time the safeguard statement is signed, they may do so at a later date via AP Folio. The candidate will already have been given an oral summary or written copy of the departmental letter and of any confidential materials submitted with the file. The candidate may also elect to have copies of the reviewing agency reports provided to the Department Chair.


## V. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATIONS

All Academic Senate faculty members are eligible for regular advancement based on academic performance, at scheduled intervals. In assessing cases for advancement, reviewing agencies should exercise flexibility in applying advancement criteria, taking contextual factors into account, and communicate those criteria to those being reviewed. Recommendations from reviewing agencies should stem from a comprehensive but concise analysis of the record within the pillars of faculty research/creative activity, teaching/mentoring, and service; with consideration of the body of accomplishments as a whole, rather than a tally of activities, and with consideration of the expectations and standards specific to the field or discipline. The goal should be to convey the justification for advancement without relying solely on quantitative assessments.

Chairs and reviewing agencies should articulate the grounds for advancement beyond simple numerical tabulations of papers/creative works, citations, courses, and committees: for example, by describing the special impact or significance of the scholarly work, the significance of prizes, fellowships, or professional recognition, or the scale and scope of campus or university service. In all cases, the departmental letter must articulate how the requirements for a normal, one-step advancement have been met, taking into account all review areas, prior to addressing any recommendation for acceleration. Departments should define standards and expectations for their field and apply them consistently.

The criteria for promotion and advancement in the Professor series are:

        (1)     Teaching and Mentoring
        (2)     Research and other Professional Creative Work
        (3)     University and Public Service


The criteria for promotion and advancement in the Teaching Professor series are:

        (1)     Teaching and Mentoring
        (2)     Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity
        (3)     University and Public Service

Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievements, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions in the Professor series. Clear evidence and documentation of consistent and sustained excellence in teaching is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to security of employment positions in the Teaching Professor series. Insistence upon these standards is necessary for maintenance of the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge. Teaching, research, professional and public service contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be given due recognition in the evaluation of the candidate's qualifications and accomplishments. An individual may not be arbitrarily disadvantaged if they elected to take a childbearing or parental leave, to stop the clock, or to defer a personnel review.


## Teaching and Mentoring (Professor series and Teaching Professor series)

According to University policy and the APM, professors at all ranks must have a current teaching record in order to be advanced.

In the Professor series, "Clearly demonstrated evidence of high quality in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion" (APM 210-1-d-1). This includes both formal coursework instruction as well as mentoring of students and University-affiliated trainees, such as postdoctoral scholars. Mentoring focused on scholarly activity is considered Teaching, whereas mentoring activities focused on non-scholarly support (e.g., life skills, social-emotional development) as well as mentoring of faculty are considered Service.

It is expected that faculty in the Professor series will create an instructional environment that, among other things (APM 210-1-d-1) is open and encouraging to all students, including students from historically excluded groups; provides expertise in the subject matter; is presented in an effective manner that promotes student learning, critical thinking, and growth; encourages high standards; and inspires creative work.

In the Teaching Professor series, demonstrated teaching of truly exceptional quality is a fundamental expectation for advancement. Effective mentoring focused on disciplinary expertise is also expected. Faculty in the Teaching Professor Series are also typically expected to provide educational leadership and contributions to instruction-related activities (e.g., discipline-specific pedagogical development, curriculum development, TA training, development of instructional materials/multimedia, etc.).

### How should teaching and mentoring be evaluated?

In judging the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching and mentoring, multiple dimensions should be considered. Possible areas for consideration include: the candidate's command of the subject; continuous growth in the subject field; current expertise in the subject; ability to organize material and to present it in a manner that effectively promotes student learning; capacity to relate the subject matter in one course to other fields; fostering of student independence and capability to think critically; ability to arouse curiosity in students, to encourage high standards, and to inspire students in research and creative work; extent and skill of the candidate's participation in the general guidance, outreach, mentoring, and advising of students; effectiveness in creating an academic environment that is open and encouraging to all students; use of evidence-based teaching practices for course design and delivery; engagement in professional development for teaching; involvement in departmental or campus-wide educational equity or student success initiatives.

Variations in expectations based on disciplines, departments, the type of teaching and mentoring, and the level of the candidate all should be taken into consideration when evaluating teaching and mentoring performance; with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities. (APM 210-1-d-1). Departments should clearly specify these expectations, as well as expectations for teaching load and mentoring load.

The principle in evaluating teaching is that consistency be applied across the campus in order to facilitate appropriate comparisons. However, to accommodate varying departmental needs, the requirement for consistency in reporting is held to a minimum number of items. Beyond that minimum, departments must determine which aspects of evaluation are the most appropriate for them and then must apply these standards consistently in all personnel cases at all levels.

The information used in assessing teaching must be summarized for each case and should include:

a. Nominal information tabulating the teaching record of the candidate during the review period, including:

    i. A listing (by course name and catalog number) of the candidate's teaching load, the academic quarters during which the courses were taught, a class-by-class enumeration of the number of students enrolled, and the number completing the campus wide student survey items (see section b. i)

    ii. Enumeration of the M.A. and Ph.D. candidates they are supervising or directed to completion of their degrees, the M.A. and Ph.D. committees on which they have served, and other contributions to the graduate program.

This nominal information is summarized using the standardized format contained in the bio-bib.

b. Evaluative information assessing the teaching record of the individual during the review period must be presented. In order for the numerical scores on the student evaluation forms to not assume disproportionate weight, departments are urged to include as many other criteria as appropriate.

    i. *Student respondents*: UCSB's campus course evaluations are required for all classes taught by the candidate. These evaluations must be part of the record and must be supplied for each course taught. The departmental letter must compare the candidate's scores with departmental scores for comparable classes and provide necessary context. It is understood that it may not be appropriate to conduct student evaluations in very small classes. In cases where evaluations are not available for the majority of classes due to small class size, the departmental letter must indicate the reason surveys were not conducted and an additional, alternate source of teaching evaluation (other than the overall departmental assessment) must be included in the case.

Departments may include whatever questions they like, except that:

All student evaluations *must* include at a minimum the following two standard campus wide survey items: (1) *Please rate the overall quality of the instructor's teaching:* (2) *Please rate the overall quality of the course, including its material or content, independent of the instructor's teaching*.

These evaluations must be part of the record and must be supplied for each course taught. To enable and strengthen comparative ratings on a campus wide basis, all student evaluations based on the two campus wide survey items must use the accompanying 1-5 scale, from: (5) Excellent; (4) Very Good; (3) Good; (2) Fair; (1) Poor.

        Reviewing agencies will return cases to the departments if they do not conform to these guidelines.

    ii. Departments must also provide other items they judge appropriate for determining the effectiveness of teaching. Typically, the expectation is that, at minimum, the written student feedback from campus wide course evaluations will be provided.

Many forms of evidence may be used to evaluate teaching practices and accomplishments. Although no single form of evidence should be expected to be sufficient or appropriate to demonstrate teaching excellence, it is also unnecessary to draw upon every form of evidence. Assessment tools that may be used to evaluate teaching practices include but are not limited to:

- *Student/TA evaluations: when viewed in appropriate context.* Open-ended questions asked of graduating seniors, graduate students, or alumni can be extremely effective when compiled over time. Graduate student and/or teaching assistant ratings are useful, particularly when these ratings are collected over time and then summarized by a disinterested third party so as to guarantee student anonymity.
- *Placement of graduate students* is one of the best measures of success in graduate teaching.
- *Peer evaluations conducted by faculty familiar with discipline and/or pedagogy.* On-campus and/or off-campus peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching effectiveness may also be included in the teaching dossier. These assessments may be based on evaluations of syllabi, reading lists, examinations, laboratory reports, class notes, or in-class visitations. If a

department chooses such methods, they must be consistently applied at all ranks and steps with regard to principles of academic fairness.

- *Self-statement:* statement of teaching philosophy, course learning goals and outcomes, tools used to achieve goals, efforts to address ongoing challenges, engagement in professional development of teaching, and reflection on growth toward improved teaching practices. Department Chairs should encourage the submission of teaching self-statements.
- *Evidence of teaching and/or mentoring with a demonstrated impact* on learning and productivity of students
- *Evidence of external impact* (e.g., textbooks)
- *Number of students and mentees in guided research and teaching* alongside evidence of achievement of learning outcomes
- *Materials pertaining to the development of new and effective instructional techniques*, technologies, or modalities of instruction
- *Significant awards* for teaching or mentoring: including description of nomination/selection practice, intramural, extramural, etc.
- *Other evidence:* consisting of individual items and/or an organized teaching portfolio that supports the reflective teaching statement or showcases undertakings and practices that support excellence in teaching. For example:
  - annotated course syllabi
  - examples of assignments or teaching tools
  - materials pertaining to the development of new and effective instructional techniques
  - evidence of student learning gains

## Research and Creative Work (Professor series):

As addressed in APM 210-1-d-2, it is expected that faculty in the Professor series will be "continuously and effectively engaged in [research or] creative activity of high quality and significance." The activities that constitute research and creative work may vary, for example, by department, discipline, or even a candidate's specialty. Irrespective of these variations, most activities that count toward research/creative activity will typically meet the following criteria:

(a) Represent new knowledge, innovation, and/or analysis in the discipline/field, as judged by peer or other external review

(b) Be published/disseminated in publicly accessible forums beyond the University

(c) Have impact and influence on the field, the academy, communities outside the academy and/or the wider community/society

### What types of achievements and activities constitute research/creative activity?

Both core research/creative works as well as professional activities related to scholarly endeavors may meet these criteria and, accordingly, would be recognized in the review process. Examples of research/creative activity include, but are not limited to: peer-reviewed scholarly publications or externally reviewed publications of creative writing (e.g., journal articles, books, essays, chapters, conference proceedings, poetry, etc.); art curation or media exhibits at galleries or important venues; film and media production; academic reports in the discipline; policy papers and reports, submitted to agencies and generally accessible to the public; expert commentary in the press or online publications; community-based participatory research products; blogs that fulfill obligations to non-academic community partners; public presentations at professional societies or conferences; invited seminars or lectures at other institutions or professional societies; grants to support scholarly activities; scholarly awards or prizes; development of software tools; patents; visibility as an expert/leader in research/creative activity; and/or evidence of external impact (e.g., adoption of research findings).

### How should research/creative activities be evaluated?

Although numerous scholarly and professional accomplishments can be considered research/creative activities, this does not imply that all activities hold equal weight or warrant equal recognition. As such, achievements that meet the above criteria (a, b, & c) or otherwise constitute research or creative work should not merely be enumerated. Instead, assessments of the record should consider factors such as: (i) discipline-associated or other important indicators of quality and productivity (e.g., selectivity of peer reviewed journals or conferences, prestigious of artistic venues); (ii) discipline-associated or other metrics of impact and/or influence; (iii) evaluation of quality and impact by external

experts especially in cases of career review; and (iv) development of a cohesive body of scholarly work. For example, presentations at meetings of disciplinary associations and talks at peer universities, while meaningful research-related professional activities, would not be equivalent to articles appearing in peer-reviewed journals or monographs published by scholarly presses. Similarly, non-peer-reviewed reports or policy papers would typically not be treated with the same weight as peer-reviewed contributions. At the same time, when taken together, this body of activities suggests a profile of a faculty member who is both productive in knowledge-generation and active in the field and/or community. Accordingly, Departments must make clear the range and types of accomplishments that are recognized, the value of these activities, and the expected balance between core research/creative activities and scholarly professional activities. Although professional accomplishments in the field/discipline cannot permanently replace expectations for scholarly publications and creative activity, such efforts can reasonably account for variations in typical expectations for principal research/creative activities in the short term. Similarly, core research and creative activities cannot consistently substitute for engagement with and leadership in one's discipline but can explain short-term variations in broader professional service.

Classifying works is not always easy, but this specification should be as precise as possible, and should refer to intellectual content rather than to physical format. For example, in literature and history a "book" may be an extended piece of research reviewed for publication by expert referees; such a work should be distinguished from editions, anthologies, translations, or collections of other scholars' work. An "article" is normally a piece of research published in a refereed scholarly journal; it should be distinguished from popular pieces, preliminary research reports, reports for industrial or governmental agencies, and chapters (i.e., solicited pieces of an interpretative and summarizing nature). Similarly, in many disciplines, a review-article is normally a survey of current research in the field, not a lengthy book-review; while "editions" may be mere reprints with brief introductions, or they may be major works of historical reconstruction and critical interpretation. In different disciplines the standard terms (and the possibilities of ambiguity) are different; but in every case the classification and significance should be made as clear and helpful as possible.

When published work is jointly authored or when creative work is a product of joint effort, the role/contribution of the candidate should be clearly established. It will help reviewing agencies to accurately evaluate the record if departments comment upon the prestige and significance of journals, publishers, or exhibition or performance venues in particular fields, along with other accepted measures or impact in a discipline (such as citation indexes or reviews).

Textbooks are normally considered evidence of teaching ability in the Professor series. However, contributions by faculty members to the professional literature or to the advancement of professional practice or professional education, should be judged creative work when they present new ideas or incorporate original scholarly research. (APM 210.1.d(2)).

In certain fields such as art, architecture, dance, music, literature, and drama, distinguished creativity should receive consideration equivalent to that accorded to distinction attained in research. In evaluating artistic creativity, an attempt should be made to define the candidate's merit in the light of such criteria as originality, scope, richness, and depth of creative expression. An important element of distinction is the extent of regional, national, or international recognition.

Research and creative accomplishments should be evaluated in the context of the faculty member's overall record of their intellectual growth, and of the contribution their work makes to the discipline. There should be evidence of continued and effective engagement in work of high quality and significance. No appointment or promotion to a tenured position will be made without evidence of intellectual distinction in research or creative activity. The research record should show growth, direction, and promise for the future.

A work once counted for an advancement cannot be counted again. The case must present the publication record for the current review period according to the following delineation outlined in Red Binder I-27: Published work; Work in press; Work submitted; Work in progress. "Work in press" means work that has been formally accepted, completed, and is in the process of being published. In-Press work is counted toward advancement and evidence should be supplied documenting the In Press status. "Work submitted" is work that has been submitted but not yet accepted. This work is not usually counted for the advancement, but it is used as evidence of continuing scholarly productivity. "Work in progress" is work that has not been completed and is available for review. Such work is not counted for the advancement, but it can be used as evidence of continuing research activity. Departmental practice will dictate if work in progress is included in the case. If nonstandard terms such as "forthcoming" are also used in the departmental letter or candidate's self-assessment, the department must define them carefully and state how they relate to the four categories above. Not doing this may prevent a candidate from receiving proper credit or cause other anomalies in the review process.

**Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity (Teaching Professor series)**

Professional and/or scholarly activities may be related to the underlying discipline itself or to pedagogy, including activities that reflect the faculty member's growth in content knowledge or pedagogical content knowledge. Because faculty in the Teaching Professor Series are expected to maintain currency in the profession and pedagogy, professional and/or scholarly activities should provide evidence of achievement, leadership, and/or influence on the campus or beyond. Evidence may include:

- Pedagogically-related administrative work (e.g., of learning centers and teaching programs) or community outreach.

- Creative activities or participation in scholarly activities designed to enhance scholarly expertise in relevant fields.

- Evidence-based design and evaluation of educational curricula or pedagogy

- Development of pedagogical innovations that support and enable teaching or learning in the discipline

- Writing textbooks or ancillary materials

- Securing external grants for educational/instructional initiatives or scholarly activities

- Accomplishments/activities that represent new knowledge, innovation, and/or analysis in the discipline or in pedagogy, as evidenced by peer or external review or by other metrics which reflect the impact of the work, e.g.:
    o First, senior, or collaborative authorship of scholarly or professional publications in leading journals/outlets
    o Presentations of seminars or lectures at other institutions or professional societies
    o Publication/dissemination and public accessibility of work beyond the university
    o Accomplished performance, artistic, or literary creation with visibility outside of UCSB

- Leadership, impact, influence on and service to the field, the academy, or the wider society, e.g.:
    o Participation and/or leadership in professional organizations
    o Professional reviewing of scholarly work and editorial board membership
    o Review of grants for funding agencies
    o Develop novel course materials which are submitted to a peer reviewed process leading to adoption at other universities.


**University and Public Service (Professor series and Teaching Professor series):**

"The faculty plays an important role in the administration of the University and in the formulation of its policies" (APM 210-1-d-4). Therefore, effective and high-quality Service is expected of all Senate faculty. Service activities vary in kind and significance, with the degree, scope, and impact of service expected to increase with rank and step. Scope may range from the level of the department to the division/college/school; to the broader campus and Senate; to disciplinary/professional service; to efforts in service of the local community, state, nation, or international community.

Teaching Professors frequently specialize in service roles related to teaching and pedagogy, such as committees related to undergraduate or graduate education. Service activities and roles associated with professional and scholarly organizations will typically be considered Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity for Teaching Professors.

Additionally, mentoring activities that are non-scholarly in nature should be considered Service (e.g., mentoring other faculty members, helping trainees with general life issues, responding to requests outside of the faculty member's scholarly area). Impact may be measured by effectiveness, influence, quality, structural improvement, and/or transformational outcome, among others.

Examples of service to the university or the public may include (among others):

- Participation in and/or leadership on department, campus, and/or Academic Senate committees and

initiatives

- Service to student organizations

- Reviewing for journals or presses

- Service to scholarly associations such as leadership roles or membership on committees

- Conference planning for scholarly associations

- Expert consultation to a governmental agency or non-profit

- Administration of a teaching program or a learning center

- Service related to the improvement of elementary and secondary education

- Developing and conducting workshops or trainings related to teaching, pedagogy, teaching innovation, instructional technology

- Operational responsibilities to important student-serving programs that fall outside the standard departmental teaching obligations

- Leadership or participation in outreach programs for student recruitment

- Administrative roles at the department, college, university, or system level

- Leading significant positive changes in policy and or practice, particularly as they relate to matters of teaching, mentorship, student success, and issues of particular impact to instructional faculty.

- Mentoring other faculty

Maintaining an appropriate level of service activity without overburdening faculty requires thoughtful choices and sensible time management at each stage of a faculty member's career. Some meaningful service at the early stages of one's career is desirable, and typically consists of Department-level activities and disciplinary engagement, but should not occur at the expense of a faculty member's research and teaching responsibilities. However, it is not uncommon for women and members of historically excluded groups to experience numerous and time-consuming requests for service. To help mitigate this issue, departments and committees should take responsibility for ensuring equity in faculty workloads, and Assistant Professors should be careful not to overcommit to such activities. Given the importance of such activity to the campus, faculty should be duly acknowledged for this work.

**How is service evaluated?**

In general, service to UCSB carries greater weight than professional or public service although there are notable exceptions in which such service contributes significantly to the goals and mission of the University. Disciplinary service aimed at developing and maintaining a national/international scholarly profile, such as reviewing for journals or presses, holding committee or leadership positions in professional associations, etc., cannot consistently replace service to the campus; however, significant professional service can reasonably account for decreases in campus-level service on a temporary basis. Similarly, time-intensive and impactful campus service cannot permanently substitute for engagement with and leadership in one's discipline. Appropriate flexibility should be applied, taking contextual features into consideration, when accounting for variations in typical expectations for service in the short term.

Certain mentoring activity that is non-scholarly in nature and outside of the faculty member's scholarly area can be considered Service, including activities that contribute to colleagues', trainees', or community members' well-being, professional progress, and/or career development such as providing institutional knowledge, coaching to impact professional growth, or sponsoring professional opportunities, among others.

Departments should clearly communicate expectations for breadth, quality and impact of service activities, corresponding to the level of the professoriate. Meaningful service at the campus and/or on Senate councils and/or committees is an expectation for faculty at more advanced steps at the rank of Professor.

## VI.     CONTRIBUTIONS TO DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION

Substantial and impactful efforts and activities that advance diversity, equity, inclusion, justice, and belonging and/or that improve the academic success of students from historically excluded identities within the context of faculty areas of responsibility, are also valued considerations in the review process, reflecting a commitment to the mission of the University

and UC System. As articulated in APM 210-1-d, "Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote diversity, equity, inclusion, and equal opportunity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. These contributions to diversity, equity, inclusion, 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."

Although not a separate area of review, contributions to DEI that exceed expectations in any of the three pillars of review (research/creative activity, teaching/mentoring, & service), or across these areas, can be the impetus for acceleration. The extent of DEI recognition will depend on the assessment of impact, in keeping with general merit and promotion practices. Publishing scholarship that reports on the context of DEI issues, or research on minoritized communities in and of itself, would typically fall within expected activities for research/creative activity.  Examples of research or professional service that might surpass normative standards include (but are not limited to) activities that: improve and/or advance the outcomes or experiences of historically excluded or marginalized groups; engage socially/historically structured inequities with a demonstrable impact on the community or a transformative impact on the field/discipline; and/or help to understand how structural inequities are reproduced and remedy these barriers to success for members of historically excluded identities. Similarly, teaching that fosters equity and inclusion and that incorporates strategies for the educational advancement of students from various underrepresented groups are examples of activities that reflect normative expectations of teaching effectiveness. Examples of teaching and mentoring related activities that go beyond the norm might include (but are not limited to): designing and implementing significant pedagogical or curricular reforms to support DEI or other program-building initiatives in a department; the development of evidence-based practices that produce more equitable graduate admissions; significant engagement in culturally responsive mentoring at all levels. In terms of service, participating on a committee that addresses DEI or on a number of committees in this domain, falls within expected activities.  Service that might surpass normative expectations includes, but is not limited to: efforts that result in structural or transformative improvements for marginalized groups; work that establishes or transforms policies or practices that apply beyond the original context; and/or work that creates new conditions for the advancement of historically excluded communities.

Contributions to DEI typically pertain to dimensions of diversity that result from different identities, such as ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, racial, gender, sexual orientation, and disability. Most often, DEI activities are highlighted in a Diversity Statement submitted by the faculty, as these efforts may otherwise go unrecognized.  Such self-assessments should provide context and documentation of the nature of the work and evidence of impact, possibly including, but not limited to:

- Detailed description of the faculty member's role and/or leadership in the activities.

- Detailed description and evidence of impact and/or outcomes, within a given field/discipline or in society.

- Documentation of consistent track record that spans many years.

- Articulation of the challenges in the context of the DEI activity, faced by minoritized individuals, including those whose identities intersect multiple minoritized groups.

- Discussion of the underrepresentation and/or marginalization of specific groups and the consequences for education, the profession, or the public good.

- Effectiveness in facilitating institutional, structural change.

- Efforts to leverage the activity to broaden dissemination and impact.


## VII.    CONFIDENTIALITY AND PERSONNEL SAFEGUARDS

Our system of review depends upon impartial professional judgment, and confidentiality has always been essential to the effective functioning of the system. One reason for confidentiality is that it protects impartial judgments from pressures of other interested parties. At UC, confidentiality applies to the votes and analyses of individual department members; to the authorship of extramural letters of evaluation; and to the membership of ad hoc review committees.

Confidentiality, however, is consistent with the rights of candidates to understand the evidence and the criteria upon which they are judged. The details of a candidate's rights in this area are described in APM Sections 160 and 220 and are designed to ensure that the use of confidential documents does not cloak abuse.

## VIII.  DEPARTMENTAL VOTING ON PERSONNEL CASES

Departmental voting rights in personnel cases are governed by **SENATE BY-LAW 55** (Santa Barbara Division Bylaw 240). Substantial differences among departments exist. Departmental voting plans must be approved by the CAP and be on file in the Office of Academic Personnel.