ADVANCEMENT STANDARDS
SCHOOL OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Date: June 6, 2025
Dept Name: Analytical Writing Program
Standards for Advancement: AY 2025-26
Series: Teaching Professor

The Analytical Writing Program (AWP) will use the following document as the basis for its Teaching Professor Review Standards, while also making some AWP-specific modifications:

> Performance Criteria for College Academic Program and Analytical Writing Program Teaching Faculty dated Spring 2025 (attached).

Modifications to Colleges Performance Criteria

1. Edit to Category 3. University and public service
   - Under 1. College/Institute Service add: Participation in Excellence Review Committees for AWP Unit 18 faculty.

Teaching Load

The AWP baseline teaching load is five courses. Instructor Workload Credit (IWC) for AWP 3, AWP 4A, and AWP 4B is 1.42%. Because of the higher IWC, the baseline for a full teaching load for AWP teaching professors is five courses rather than six.

AWP teaching professors who have responsibilities for administering the program will receive course equivalencies for their administrative work, as is standard practice among the university's writing program administrators. The Director and any Associate Directors receive a two-course teaching reduction. They will teach three courses each year.

When an AWP administrator takes a sabbatical, the person assuming the bulk of that administrator's work may be eligible for an additional course release for that quarter.

Effective June 2025, these criteria will be officially adopted for academic reviews. (i.e. they will be used to evaluate files that are up for review in the 2025-26 Academic Year). This document should be reviewed yearly by the faculty, COP, and DUE if and as revision is needed.

This document provides specific details on the three categories used to assess Academic Senate faculty (Teaching Professors) appointed to administer the College Academic Programs and the Analytical Writing Program (AWP). For academic advancement and promotion, Teaching Professors (at all levels) must demonstrate proficiency in all three review categories: Teaching Excellence, Professional/Scholarly Activity, and Service. The criteria for each category do not reflect any priority of activities, nor do they set any expectation that Teaching Professors must fulfill *all* of the activities in each category. Rather, this list is designed to help reviewers by pointing out the diversity of metrics that can be used to demonstrate proficiency in each category, with faculty expected to show their excellence throughout multiple areas within each category. Note that professional activity in one category often overlaps with the scope of work in another category of evaluation.

The College and AWP Teaching Faculty positions differ from most teaching professor positions on campus in their significant administrative responsibilities (See [Teaching Loads in AWP + Colleges](#)). These positions develop and manage large general education academic programs. This may include: directly and indirectly managing a staff, faculty, and graduate teaching assistants in the program; developing, assessing, and revising program-wide curriculum, assessments, and structures; and collaborating with fellow directors to create a culture of writing on campus. For college program faculty, responsibilities can include ensuring the academic program contributes to the living and learning experience of students according to the mission and vision of the undergraduate college. Faculty in AWP and the Colleges receive course release to perform typical administrative work. However, administrative projects above and beyond normal expectations could serve as a justification for acceleration and/or a BOS.

1. Teaching Excellence. Teaching Excellence for the Undergraduate Colleges and AWP is defined by pedagogy that is self-reflexive and shows development and iteration in course design and instructional methods. This means being responsive to student learning outcomes as outlined by the program; consideration of assessment data; employing appropriate instructional strategies; and fostering an inclusive and engaging class climate. *Teaching Excellence focuses on an individual's teaching and will be demonstrated via a submitted Teaching Portfolio, including no more than 3-4 representative syllabi and curated course materials pertinent to the review period.*

Evidence for Teaching Excellence includes:
- Student evaluations, such as CAPEs, SETs, or other course evaluations (SET and/or CAPE data will be automatically added by AP Staff)

- Course syllabi, including exemplary assignments and evaluation methods–especially syllabi that have been newly developed and/or revised significantly.
- Designing pedagogical training for graduate student teaching assistants (e.g. developing and/or teaching 500 or 200-level courses for teaching assistants)
- Mentorship of graduate student teaching assistants and/or undergraduate tutors in pedagogical development (e.g. modeling grading of assignments, supporting TAs in working with challenging students, observation and feedback on TA teaching, career mentorship, research mentorship, etc.)
- Implementation of evaluation and assessment practices that assess writing, content, instruction, and/or other program aspects aligned with learning outcomes and designed to support student growth
- Development and teaching of curricular programs, such as Global Seminars, first-year/senior seminars, and/or co-curricular programs, community-engaged programs, including those beyond the university
- Recognition and awards for teaching, including university and college-based pedagogy awards
- Facilitation of workshops or initiatives for improving instruction at UC San Diego
- Instructional review by peer Teaching Professors and/or the Teaching & Learning Commons
- Participation in and/or leadership in a UC San Diego and/or wider teaching community

2. Professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity.

These criteria assume that intrinsic administrative duties essential to the function of the college/AWP programs are being fulfilled. The focus here is on professional and/or scholarly achievement that extends beyond individual classrooms, has program-wide impact (e.g. intellectual leadership, curricular development, faculty development, etc.), and professional/scholarly contributions that are outward facing in the field. Campus-related activities do apply here, and should complement professional activity and connections beyond the university.

In terms of output, the expectation for a regular review period is 2-3 achievements for a 2yr review cycle and 4-5 achievements for a 3yr review cycle. Achievements that have sustained and/or substantive impact on the program and/or university and/or beyond, may count as more than a singular achievement in a review period.

Evidence for Professional Activity and Scholarly Achievement includes:
- Creation and implementation of or support for program-wide pedagogical contributions, which may include program-wide assessment, program-wide guidebooks/textbooks, curriculum development, digital content, policies and protocols, etc.

- Collaboration, coordination, and/or mentorship of/with fellow teaching faculty and Unit-18 lecturers, to support implementation of learning outcomes throughout the program
- Development of new program-wide courses or revision of existing courses, including "R" versions of existing courses
- Development of program-specific proposals advocating for and supporting the program's pedagogical mission, including proposals for new staff positions, new designs of physical space, etc.
- Facilitation of workshops or initiatives in the faculty member's disciplinary expertise or in pedagogy at UC San Diego
- Receipt, design, and successful implementation of grant funding for relevant projects
- Leadership and research in community-engaged research projects and programs that extend beyond normal teaching expectations
- Leadership in professional academic organizations, such as CCCC, AHA, MLA, etc.
- Invitation for speaking engagements outside the university in academic or non-academic settings
- Professional conference presentations on areas of disciplinary or pedagogical expertise
- Peer-reviewed publications: books, book chapters, articles, book reviews, conference proceedings, or other scholarly forms of writing or creative output
    - Publications are not required for the Teaching Professor series but are markers of scholarly impact and achievement. Larger projects could potentially count across several review cycles, if there is tangible evidence of progress. For example, draft manuscript under review in one review, completion and contract in another.
- Public Writing: publications like op-eds, creative works, digital media, exhibitions, etc. that are not peer reviewed but published for wider audiences. These kinds of publications do not count similarly to peer reviewed works, but can be used to show outward facing professional activity.

3. University and public service: college, university-wide, system-wide, professional, and community service.

University and public service is required as part of our positions as faculty, but the expectations for junior and senior faculty differ. Service intrinsic to the department should not be included here (such as, departmental colloquia, faculty candidate recruitment events, Convocation or Commencement attendance). Service expectations increase with seniority in terms of level or duration of commitment and scale of impact, e.g. college versus campus versus system-wide. Service can align with faculty's expertise and interests, and should extend beyond the program to support college, university, or local communities broadly. The expectations for a regular review period is service on 2-3 bodies for a 2-yr review cycle and service on 3-4 bodies for a 3-yr review cycle. Please note that service is considered not only on quantity but on quality and impact and therefore the complexity of the type of service must be taken into account.

Evidence for University and Public Service includes:
1. College/Institute Service
   - College-specific committees and programming (within AWP this includes division- or institute-specific committees and programming)
2. University Service
   - Academic Senate Service, including committee participation, service as Chair, and service on UC-wide committees
   - Other university (non-Senate) service, such as *ad hoc* committees outside your program/college, senate-administration workgroups, etc.
   - Officially-appointed leadership roles at the university (beyond the college or committee service)
   - Search Committees beyond one's own program
   - Creation and facilitation of public talks, conferences, workshops, or other events at UCSD
   - Engagement and leadership in initiatives to promote diversity, equity, inclusion, and other university-wide efforts
3. Service Beyond the University Campus
   - Leadership in professional societies (this overlaps with #2, but also demonstrates service)
   - Community partnerships and engagement, including working with primary or secondary education, community organizations outside of one's scholarship and pedagogy
   - System-wide service to the UC, including sitting on system-wide committees, chairing system-wide committees

Bonus off Scale and Accelerations

Teaching Professors (at all levels) may be eligible for acceleration and/or a bonus off-scale (BOS) if their performance is at an exceptional level during the review period. Bonus off-scale and acceleration proposals must address how the candidate/file meets and exceeds the department's standards for normal merit advancement and articulate the manner in which the appointee's achievements warrant the award of a bonus off-scale salary component and/or accelerated merit.

Bonus off Scale (BOS):

A bonus off-scale (BOS) is a temporary increase in salary which can be awarded for successful completion of a singular and significant project in a singular review area, during the review period. A BOS is generally awarded in recognition of outstanding achievements exceeding what is required for normal merit advancement, but insufficient to support accelerated advancement. To be eligible for a BOS, the file must meet expectations in all the other review criteria as well.

Examples include but are not limited to:
- Serving as interim/acting Director for the Program, when the Director is on leave
- A faculty member has doubled the amount of research in the expected review period

- A faculty member has taken on a significant project with impact beyond their local program
- For additional examples, see here: 📕 **Acceleration vs Bonus 2022.pdf**

Criteria for acceleration:
An acceleration is an advancement in steps beyond a normal merit advancement. Teaching excellence must be maintained across the review period and the file/case should be exceptionally strong so as to warrant an acceleration. In a strong case for acceleration, the file would demonstrate excellence in teaching as well as excel in two of the three categories (e.g. maintaining teaching excellence while excelling in service and professional/scholarly activity or exceptional excellence in teaching and excelling in one other category). Accelerations before Step IV should be rare and compelling, according to CAP.

Reviewers should consider pedagogical impact and innovation (in the CWP or AWP and across campus); scholarly impact through publications, grants (of significant size), professional conferences, and collaborative work; service impact, including leadership on campus and UC-wide, leadership in regional and national organizations.

For examples and more information on accelerations, see here:
📕 **Acceleration vs Bonus 2022.pdf**