

A GUIDE TO RECENT RED BINDER UPDATES

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA

BUT FIRST...

WHY WERE THE REVISIONS DEVELOPED?

- Stemmed from calls (at all levels) to address persistent concerns:
 - Process-based concerns:
 - time-consuming and burdensome nature of the process for faculty and staff
 - particularly with regard to managing the biobibliography
 - complexity of the process
 - creating unintended errors that slow or complicate cases
 - delays in case reviews; late case completions
 - inconsistency with application/interpretation of APM
 - Review-related concerns:
 - perceived lack of clarity regarding expectations for acceleration
 - perceived inventory and itemization of expectations leading to an increase in faculty workload
 - perceived 'micro' focus
 - concentration on rules and lists rather than on a comprehensive evaluation of the record
 - perceived inconsistency regarding reviewing agency expectations throughout the process
 - in terms of both case preparation and outcomes
 - Acknowledgement of the value and benefits of the review system

HOW WERE THE CHANGES DETERMINED?

- Product of a series of analyses, consultations, feedback, and discussions based on:
 - Campus study:
 - Deans, CAP leadership, Associate Deans, Department Chairs, and AP, Senate, Divisional, & Department Analysts
 - Systemwide analysis:
 - AP Offices across the 9 other UC campuses
 - Analyses of merit and advancement policies and procedures
 - Campus discussion and consultation
 - Deans, CAP leadership, Associate Deans, AP, Senate and Divisional Analysts
 - Campus distribution of proposed Red Binder changes
 - Feedback from campus
 - Additional campus discussion and consultation on feedback
 - Deans, CAP leadership, Associate Deans and FEAs, Campus leadership, AP

**DID THE BASIC FOUNDATIONS OF
FACULTY EVALUATIONS CHANGE?
(ANSWER: NO)**

- The fundamental basis of faculty evaluations remains the same
 - all of the same accomplishments can continue to be considered and rewarded
- Expectations, standards, and values continue to be defined by the Department/discipline and campus requirements
- Extent of possible advancements/accelerations remains the same
- Still APM based

Documents existing practices

KEY RED BINDER SECTIONS

RED BINDER I-2: DEADLINE DATES

- • **September 30**
 - Assistant Professor deferral requests
- 2nd Monday in November
 - Dean's Authority cases
- 2nd Monday in December
 - Expanded Review cases
- • Campus-wide cutoff date: **August 31**

RED BINDER I-6: CAREER EQUITY REVIEW (undergoing campus review)

- Justification for CER unchanged
 - additional clarification provided
- • **Decouples CER from merit review process**
 - May only be initiated during a non-review year
- If approved, effective immediately, in current case cycle

RED BINDER I-27: INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF THE BIOBIBLIOGRAPHY

- Online Biobib accessible via AP Folio
 - for immediate use in current 2024-2025 merit cycle
 - in career review cases, current cumulative Biobib or CV can be included with one-of-a-kinds
 - one-time clerical assistance provided to manually input cumulative record
 - First priority: those eligible for review during 2025-26 cycle
 - Next priority: 2026-27 cycle eligible faculty, and so on
 - Refrain from listing routine, expected activities (e.g., graduate student committee meetings, meetings of campus committees, lunches with job candidates, etc...)
 - these are understood
 - including these items adds unnecessary workload at all levels
- Helpful resources:
 - AP Zoom Office Hours: weekly on Mondays from 1:00-2:00 (see main page of AP website)

RED BINDER I-30: DEAN'S AUTHORITY

- Assistant Professor and Assistant Teaching Professor:
 - All one-step and one and one-half step merit advances **(including to overlapping steps)**
- Associate Professor and Associate Teaching Professor:
 - All one-step and one and one-half step merit advances **(including to overlapping steps)**
- Professor and Teaching Professor:
 - **All one-step and one and one-half step merit advances including overlapping steps**
 - *excluding* advancement to Step VI and Above Scale

RED BINDER I-35: HOW TO WRITE A DEPARTMENT LETTER

In Brief:

- Provide concise but thorough and analytical assessment of the record in all 3 areas of review
 - Supply evidence to support the recommendation
 - Document expectations for normative advancement
 - Address disciplinary norms and expectations
 - Address significance of accomplishments
 - Contextualize so that achievements can be understood by those outside of the discipline
 - Address both positive and negative aspects of case, when relevant
 - **Do not** recap every item on the biobib
- Basis for advancement should not rely on numerical tabulations
 - Essential to address impact, quality and significance of the activity & candidate's role
- Provide explicit justification for acceleration
 - Provide clear, reasoned argument for the specific degree of acceleration, calibrated to rank/step

RED BINDER I-36: MERIT ADVANCEMENTS

- Standardized range of advancement options (including Above Scale):
 - Normative 1-step
 - 1½ steps
 - 2 steps
 - 2½ steps
 - 3 steps, etc....
- Advancements awarded in step (i.e., on the ladder), except when the recommendation includes a ½ step increase
 - Increases awarded only in full steps or half steps
 - In rare circumstances, accelerations in off-scale may be granted, based on appropriate circumstances
 - Advantages and considerations
- Reasonable flexibility can/should be used
- Increasing expectations as ascend ranks/steps
- Larger accelerations require increasingly meritorious achievements
- Cases for acceleration may not contain deficiencies in any area
- Within-step advances
 - ½ step may be granted when justified
 - maximum 2 within steps, at the same rank/step
- Helpful resources:
 - *Half-step Increase Chart* available on the AP Website under Compensation & Benefits

*Half-step Increase Charts
(General Scale & B/E/E Scale)*

Available on the AP Website under
Compensation & Benefits

<https://ap.ucsb.edu/compensation.and.benefits/>

General Scale (Table 1)

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Step</u>	<u>10/1/2024 Annual</u>	<u>half-step increment</u>
Assistant Professor / Assistant Teaching Professor	II	\$82,200	\$2,200
	III	\$86,600	\$2,400
	IV	\$91,400	\$2,500
	V	\$96,400	\$2,500
	VI	\$101,400	\$2,700
Associate Professor / Associate Teaching Professor	I	\$96,500	\$2,500
	II	\$101,500	\$2,700
	III	\$106,800	\$3,000
	IV	\$112,800	\$4,400
	V	\$121,600	\$4,800
Professor / Teaching Professor	I	\$112,900	\$4,400
	II	\$121,700	\$4,700
	III	\$131,100	\$5,000
	IV	\$141,000	\$5,300
	V	\$151,600	\$5,700
	VI/ V+	\$163,000	\$6,200
	VII	\$175,400	\$7,100
	VIII	\$189,500	\$8,000
	IX	\$205,400	\$10,300
	IX+	\$225,900	\$10,300

IX+ is equivalent to step IX plus one above scale increment

VI+/IX+ in UCPath = V/IX on-scale plus o/s+ . o/s+ does not carry forward at next review

RED BINDER I-37: OVERLAPPING STEPS

- “Special” requirements removed
- Lateral with corresponding step at the next rank
- Important considerations:
 - doesn’t change normative advancement
 - e.g., Asst IV to Assoc I
 - doesn’t change normative time at step
 - trajectory & advancement options
 - placement upon promotion

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR (8 year limit, non-tenured/PSOE)		ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (6 years normal, tenured/SOE)		PROFESSOR (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)

See RB I-75 for Table

- Helpful resources:

- *Overlapping Step Advancement Matrix*
- *Step V+ and IX+ Examples*

Available on the AP Website under Compensation & Benefits

Overlapping Step Advancement Matrix

Available on the AP Website under
Compensation & Benefits

<https://ap.ucsb.edu/compensation.and.benefits/>

Rank and Step	Year	On-time Advancement	
Asst Prof V	1	Lateral to Assoc Prof I	No change in salary. Next review for merit would be after one year
Asst Prof V	2	Promotion to Assoc Prof II	
Asst Prof V	2	Merit to Asst Prof VI	
Asst Prof VI	1	Lateral to Assoc Prof II	No change in salary. Next review for merit would be after one year
Asst Prof VI	2	Promotion to Assoc Prof III	
Assoc Prof IV	1	Lateral to Prof I	No change in salary. Next review for merit would be after two years
Assoc Prof IV	2	Lateral to Prof I	No change in salary. Next review for merit would be after one year
Assoc Prof IV	3	Promotion to Prof II	
Assoc Prof IV	3	Merit to Assoc Prof V	
Assoc Prof V	1	Lateral to Prof II	No change in salary. Next review for merit would be after two years
Assoc Prof V	2	Lateral to Prof II	No change in salary. Next review for merit would be after one year
Assoc Prof V	3	Promotion to Prof III	
Prof V+	1	Lateral to Prof VI	No change in salary. Next review for merit would be after two years
Prof V+	2	Lateral to Prof VI	No change in salary. Next review for merit would be after one year
Prof V+	3	Advancement to Prof VII	
Prof IX+	1	Lateral to Above Scale	No change in salary. Next review for merit would be after three years
Prof IX+	2	Lateral to Above Scale	No change in salary. Next review for merit would be after two years
Prof IX+	3	Lateral to Above Scale	No change in salary. Next review for merit would be after one year
Prof IX+	4	Advancement to Above Scale with merit	

Step V+ and IX+ Examples

Available on the AP Website
under Compensation & Benefits

<https://ap.ucsb.edu/compensation.and.benefits/>

Example: normative advancement using V+

	eff date	on-scale	off-scale	o/s+	total	Notes
Current status: Prof V	7/1/2022	\$151,600	\$10,000		\$161,600	
Action: merit to Prof V+ New status: Prof V	7/1/2025	\$151,600	\$10,000	\$11,400	\$173,000	Overlapping step
Action: merit to Prof VI New status: Prof VI	7/1/2026	\$163,000	\$10,000		\$173,000	Normative time on step not yet met; lateral move to Step VI (no salary change)
Action: merit from V+ to VII New status: Prof VII	7/1/2028	\$175,400	\$10,000		\$185,400	Normative time on step (3 years) has passed, so salary increases

Example: normative advancement using IX+

	eff date	on-scale	off-scale	o/s+	total	Notes
Current status: Prof IX	7/1/2021	\$205,400	\$10,000		\$215,400	
Action: merit to Prof IX+ New status: Prof IX	7/1/2025	\$205,400	\$10,000	\$20,500	\$235,900	Overlapping step
Action: merit to Above Scale New status: Prof Above	7/1/2029	\$256,400			\$256,400	Normative time on step (4 years) has passed, so salary increases

Note: these figures are based on the 10/1/24 Table 1 salary scale, and do not reflect intervening range adjustments

RED BINDER I-75: APPOINTMENT AND ADVANCEMENT (SLIDE 1 OF 3)

- Professor series criteria for evaluation:
 - Research and Creative Activity
 - Teaching and Mentoring
 - University and Public Service
 - Professional Activities fold into Research and Service
- Teaching Professor series criteria for evaluation:
 - Teaching and Mentoring
 - Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity
 - University and Public Service

RED BINDER I-75: APPOINTMENT AND ADVANCEMENT (SLIDE 2 OF 3)

- Summary of and expectations for each area of review
 - Teaching and Mentoring (Professor series and Teaching Professor series)
 - Evaluating teaching and mentoring
 - Forms of evidence in evaluating teaching
 - Research and Creative Activity (Professor Series)
 - Achievements and activities that constitute research/creative activity
 - Evaluating research/creative activity
 - Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity (Teaching Professor series)
 - Achievements that constitute professional and/or scholarly activities
 - University and Public Service (Professor series and Teaching Professor series)
 - Achievements and activities that constitute service
 - Evaluating service
- Contributions to DEI
 - Evaluating DEI contributions
 - Achievements and activities that are expected vs. exceed expectations

RED BINDER I-75: APPOINTMENT AND ADVANCEMENT (SLIDE 3 OF 3)

- Important considerations for Departments:
 - Clarify the value, weight, and expectations for different sets of activities and accomplishments *as well as* for different areas of review
 - Do not conflate traditional research accomplishments (e.g., peer reviewed journal article) and scholarly professional accomplishments (e.g., invited talks, conference presentations)
 - Be sure not to dilute expectations for and importance of traditional research accomplishments
 - Use care not to devalue professional scholarly achievements
 - Do not merge University service (e.g., department, Senate, etc.) with professional service (e.g., academic conference planning, manuscript reviewing)
 - Explain deviations from expectations, when justified

QUESTIONS

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA