Senate Faculty Advancements Workshop

April 29, 2025

Overlapping Steps

- Assistant Professor/Assistant Teaching Professor
  - Steps V and VI

- Associate Professor/Associate Teaching Professor
  - Steps IV and V

- Professor/Teaching Professor
  - Steps V+ and IX+

Overlapping Steps

Assistant Professor		Associate Professor		Professor		
Step	Normal Period of Service	Step	Normal Period of Service	Step	Normal Period of Service	
V	2	I	2			
VI	2	II	2			
		III	2			
		IV	3	I	3	
		V	3	II	3	
				…		
				V+	3	VI
				…		
				IX+	4	Above

Lateral Advancement to Overlapping Step

- Must be lateral if advancing before normative time at current step
  - e.g. Assistant V → Associate I after only 1 year at step

- Still entails career review

- External letters required for advancement to next rank (promotion) or Above Scale, even if lateral!

- $100 increase in annual salary

Eligibility Scenario #1– overlapping steps

- Prof. Romanov advanced from Associate Professor II to Associate Professor III, effective 7/1/22

- Next Eligibility: Promotion, effective 7/1/24
    - Instead, she advances to Associate IV, eff 7/1/24

- Next eligibility: Promotion, effective 7/1/25

- Actual options?
    - Lateral Promotion to Professor I, eff 7/1/25 (w/$100 salary increase)
    - Defer and pursue normative Promotion to Professor II, eff 7/1/27
    - Defer and pursue merit to Associate V, eff 7/1/27

Assistant Professor Eligibility

- Appraisal review during Year 4 (mandatory)

- Tenure review during Year 6
  - Must be undertaken no later than Year 7!

- Clock Extensions do not alter eligibility listing
  - Eligibility will still show up during normative years, e.g. Appraisal during Year 4
  - Extension allows deferral of action, e.g. 1-year extension allows deferring Appraisal to Year 5

Tenure/SOE Review Timeline

2020 – 21	1	Initial Appointment (7/1/2020)
2021 – 22	2	
2022 – 23	3	
2023 – 24	4	Appraisal (done Fall '23, effective 7/1/24)
2024 – 25	5	
2025 – 26	6	Tenure Review (done in Fall '25, effective 7/1/26)
2026 – 27	7	*(new tenure case if F'25 tenure review fails)*
2027 – 28	8	Terminal year if tenure not achieved

Eligibility Scenario #2: tenure-track

- Prof. Shuri is appointed as Assistant Professor II on 7/1/17 and has an accelerated advancement to Assistant Professor IV, effective 7/1/19 (year 2).

- Next Eligibility: Appraisal/Promotion, effective 7/1/21

- Actual Options?

  - Promotion to Associate Professor (no appraisal needed)

  - Appraisal Only

  - Appraisal + Merit action

  - Appraisal CANNOT be deferred unless promoting or clock extension

Eligibility Scenario #3: tenure-track, deferred

- Prof. Foster is appointed as Assistant Professor II on 7/1/15. She defers her 7/1/17 merit review, goes up the following year, and advances from Assistant II to Assistant III effective 7/1/18 (year 3).

- Next Eligibility in subsequent years:

  - Year 4: Appraisal, effective 7/1/19

  - Year 5: Merit, effective 7/1/20

  - Year 6: Promotion, effective 7/1/21

- Options at each stage?

Eligibility Scenario #3b

- A slight twist on the previous scenario. Prof. van Dyne is appointed as Assistant Professor III on 7/1/15, and defers her 7/1/17 merit, advancing from Assistant III to Assistant IV effective 7/1/18 (year 3).

- Next Eligibility:

  - Year 4: Appraisal, effective 7/1/19

  - Year 5: Promotion, effective 7/1/20

- How/why does it differ from Professor Foster's scenario?

Online Bio-bib

- Department AP staff have edit access to all departmental faculty bio-bibs

- Functionality: import BAP teaching data
  - Only import classes that fulfill the teaching requirement
- Activity Log available: shows additions and edits

Bio-Bib - Computer Science (COMS)

Filter: Enter a name

Name	Department(s)	Bio-Bib Template
Ambuj Singh	Biomolecular Science and Engineering Computer Science	Professor Series
Amr El Abbadi	Computer Science	Professor Series
Arpit Gupta	Computer Science	Professor Series
Ben Hardekopf	Computer Science	Professor Series
Chandra Krintz	Computer Science	Professor Series
Christopher Kruegel	Computer Science	Professor Series
Dahlia Malkhi	Computer Science	Professor Series
Daniel Lokshtanov	Computer Science	Professor Series
Diba Mirza	Computer Science	Teaching Professor Series
Divyakant Agrawal	Computer Science	Professor Series
Elizabeth Belding	Computer Science	Professor Series
Eric Vigoda	Computer Science	Professor Series
Frederic Gibou	Computer Science Mechanical Engineering	Professor Series
Giovanni Vigna	Computer Science	Professor Series
James Preiss	Computer Science	Professor Series
Jianwen Su	Computer Science	Professor Series
Jonathan Balkind	Computer Science	Professor Series
Kanika Mahajan	Computer Science	Academic Researcher Series
Kate Kharitonova	Computer Science	Teaching Professor Series

Name: Dana Mastro [Professor Series ▾]

● View All Entries ○ Filter by Date Range

| Bio-Bib Home | Curriculum Vitae | I. Research & Creative Activity | II. Teaching & Mentoring | III. University, Public, and Professional Service |

Instructions

To enter items into the Bio-Bib, click on the tab for the area of review.

Instructions for each area of review are available below:

- Curriculum Vitae
- Part I. Research & Creative Activity
- Part II. Teaching & Mentoring
- Part III. University, Public, and Professional Service

} User guides with more detailed information on how to enter data

Create PDF

Please enter the review period

Cutoff Start Date   [▾] [▾]

Cutoff End Date   [▾] [▾]

} Enter review period start and end date to generate PDF containing only items within current review period

[Generate Bio-Bib]

Contacts:

For technical issues: help@aait.ucsb.edu

For all other feedback: ap-info@ucsb.edu

Resources:

- Bio-Bib Activity Log ⟶

Bio-Bib Assistants Authorizations

For use to grant Bio-Bib access (beyond Department Business Officer/AP Analyst) to personnel who will assist with data entry, e.g. faculty assistants.

[Add New]

| Name | Email | Begin | End | Comments |

Name: Dana Mastro [Professor Series ▾]

● View All Entries ○ Filter by Date Range

| Bio-Bib Home | Curriculum Vitae | **I. Research & Creative Activity** | II. Teaching & Mentoring | III. University, Public, and Professional Service |

I. Research & Creative Activity

One of a kind materials related to research are available in a folder at

[Edit]

No url entered

Cumulative List of Publications or Creative Activities

[Add New] [Excel]   Search: [_____]

Year	Title and Authors	Publisher/Outlet	Category	Status	Description	History
Published (92 Total)						
2000-1	The color of crime and the court: A content analysis of minority representation on television. Tamborini, R., Mastro, D., Chory, R., & Huang, R.	Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, vol. 77, pp. 639-654	Journal Article, peer reviewed	Published		[Edit]
2000-2	Cops and crooks: Images of minorities on primetime television.	Journal of Criminal Justice, vol. 28, pp. 385-396	Journal Article, peer reviewed	Published		[Edit]

Catalog Courses

Only courses that fulfill teaching requirement need be included

[Add New] (**Import**) [Excel]   Search: [   ]

NEW

| Quarter | Title | | Departme |

Import Teaching Data

Select the range of quarters to get courses:

Start [Quarter ▾] [Year ▾] End [Quarter ▾] [Year ▾]

[Get Courses]

Courses to Import

Only courses that fulfill teaching requirement need be included

[Import Selected Courses]

☐	Quarter	Title	Department	Course Number	Type	Units	Hours/Week	Enrollment
☑	F17	MED RACE ÐNICITY	Communication	COMM 103	Lecture	4.0	2.5	79
☐	F17	DISSERTATION PREP	Communication	COMM 599	Tutorial	12.0	0	2
☐	F17	DIRECTED READING	Communication	COMM 593A	Seminar	4.0	0	1
☐	F17	INDEP RESEARCH ASST	Communication	COMM 199RA	Tutorial	4.2	0	4
☐	W18	INDEP RESEARCH ASST	Communication	COMM 199RA	Tutorial	3.2	0	4
☐	W18	DISSERTATION PREP	Communication	COMM 599	Tutorial	12.0	0	2
☐	W18	INDEP RESEARCH ASST	Communication	COMM 99RA	Tutorial	4.0	0	1
☑	W18	MED EFFECTS INDIV	Communication	COMM 113	Lecture	4.0	2.5	83
☐	S18	PREP FOR QUAL EXAM	Communication	COMM 597	Tutorial	12.0	0	1
☐	S18	INDEP RESEARCH ASST	Communication	COMM 199RA	Tutorial	4.0	0	5
☐	S18	DISSERTATION PREP	Communication	COMM 599	Tutorial	11.5	0	2
☐	S18	INDEP RESEARCH ASST	Communication	COMM 99RA	Tutorial	1.0	0	1
☐	F18	DISSERTATION PREP	Communication	COMM 599	Tutorial	12.0	0	1
☐	F18	INDEP RESEARCH ASST	Communication	COMM 199RA	Tutorial	4.0	0	5

Advancement Approval Authority

Merits	
Normative, one-step merits (on-schedule/decelerated)	Dean
Normative merit + additional ½ step o/s	Dean
Merit to Professor VI, to and within Above Scale	Chancellor
Other merits (incl retentions, accelerations, within-step, etc)	Associate Vice Chancellor
Formal Appraisal	Associate Vice Chancellor

Promotions	
Associate Professor, Associate Teaching Professor	Chancellor
Professor, Teaching Professor	Chancellor

Case Reminders

- Case cover sheet should match department letter and accurately reflect rank/step/salary recommendation

- Add a line to student evaluations to denote current review period "below the line"

- Clarify departmental teaching load, *including how the candidate met that load during review period!*

  - Can be explained in bio-bib or department letter

- Submitted ("C") items do not need to be accounted for in future reviews

Present Status		Proposed Status		
Rank & Step	Professor III O/S	**Rank & Step**	- ⌄	- ⌄
Total Salary	$	**Total Salary**	$	
Offscale Supplement	$	**Offscale Supplement** $		
Years at Rank	3	**Effective Date**	7/1/2026 ⌄	
Years at Step	3			
Years Since Last Advancement				

Department Votes

Yes		No		Abstain		Not Voting		Total Eligible	

Statement of Voting Method & Comments (Max 1500 characters):

Case Options

○ **Dean's Authority**   ○ **Expanded Review** (Check as appropriate)

☐ On-schedule advancement to:
Assistant Professor/Assistant Teaching Professor III-VI
Associate Professor/Associate Teaching Professor II-V
Professor/Teaching Professor II-V+ or VII-IX+

☐ On-schedule advancement of the above
with up to 1/2 step additional off-scale increase

☐ Deceleration in time of any of the above

☐ Formal Appraisal
☐ Promotion
☐ Acceleration
☐ Professor VI
☐ To Professor Above Scale
☐ Within Professor Above Scale
☐ Decrease in Off-Scale
☐ Increase in Off-Scale outside the Dean's Authority parameters
☐ No Change
☐ Retention
☐ Career Equity Review

External Letters

- Candidate and department-suggested names: independently derived

- No deviations from RB wording without AP consultation!
  - This includes significant additions to template

- No directing/steering letter writers on what to include!

- Items to send to reviewers
  - Maintain consistency with other case materials!

- What if an external reviewer declines to write but includes a bit of narrative about the candidate?

Solicitation Letter– what NOT to add!

In making your candid evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments we encourage you to weigh in on such aspects you feel inclined to do, but ask that you specifically emphasize the following:

1. Your relationship to the candidate. If you are not a fully arm's length reviewer, please describe the nature of any past collaboration.

2. The scope and significance of the candidate's scholarship and the degree of recognition achieved within the candidate's discipline. How does the candidate compare to other scholars in the discipline and field, at similar stages of their careers and coming from institutions like UCSB?

3. Whether or not, you would recommend the candidate to be appointed at the proposed rank based on the record you have reviewed and your knowledge of UCSB's international stature, mission and objectives.

4. The scope and significance of the candidate's teaching, teaching practice and curriculum development, as well as the candidate's contribution to an educational mission.

5. The scope and significance of the candidate's service record, including institution service, professional associations and a national and international activities.

External Letters, cont'd

- Please avoid:
  - Close collaborators
  - Referees who have written for previous case

- Coded list should include ALL solicitations

- Deviations from standards, and pertinent referee info → coded list, not dept letter!

- *No identifying info in department letter!!*

External Letters– Proper Redaction

- Header & footer only
  - Identifying info within the body of the letter remains
  - "Guillotine Paper Cutter" approach
- Evaluative text must be within the body of the letter
  - What happens if they misunderstand our confidentiality statement and put their text below the signature line?
- Include letter codes on redacted letters, too

What not to put in a dept letter

- Six outside letters were received from outstanding scientists and leaders in Professor Maximoff's areas of research. Three of these were from Professor Maximoff's list of possible letter writers and three were from the Department's list of possible letter writers.

- The department solicited letters from 15 leaders in the field of underwater basket weaving. Of these, 7 writers responded; including professors within the University of California system who are well familiar with the requirements for the Professor Above Scale rank. Of the remaining 8 invited evaluators, 2 agreed to write a letter but never sent one, 1 declined (citing over-commitment), 1 was on medical leave, 3 were on sabbatical and 1 never responded to the invitation.

What not to put in a dept letter!

- Nine letters were solicited and seven were obtained. Three of the letter writers were taken from a list provided by Professor Nakia (Reviewers A, C, and E) and four were selected by the department (Reviewers B, D, F, and G). Three of the seven letter writers are University of California faculty (A, B, and C), and two additional reviewers are UC familiar (F and G)... Five of the seven letter writers offered an assessment of whether Professor Nakia would be granted tenure at their home institutions (Berkeley, Stanford, MIT, Columbia, and Yale)

What not to put in a dept letter!

The department solicited 6 referees and received 6 letters for the Excellence Review. Four of these letters (Letters A,B,D and E) were from students who uniformly praised Dr. Nebula's teaching efforts and ability. They all commented on her commitment to her students and their education. One letter (Letter C) was from a colleague at [campus center]. He commented that Dr. Nebula had participated in [center program] to improve her teaching material. The same person praised Dr. Nebula's syllabus preparation and efforts to engage students in large lectures. He stated that Dr. Nebula has participated in numerous workshops to improve her teaching and teaching materials. One lecturer at another department (Letter F) read online evaluations of Dr. Nebula's lectures and got a positive impression. However, she claimed that the grades were an example of grade inflation. The Department [rebuttal]. In response, Dr. Nebula described her method for making exams and assigning grades, including training her teaching assistants, that the Department finds very satisfactory.

Questions?