

Spring 2023 Red Binder Updates

May 3, 2023

Summary of updates

- In effect for 23-24 review cycle (7/1/24 cases)
- Senate Faculty process updates: external letter requirements, normative time at step, accelerations, eligibility, and more
- <https://ap.ucsb.edu/news.and.announcements/memos/?4.10.2023.Red.Binder.Updates>

Eligibility and Advancement Actions

Normative Eligibility Timeframe

Assistant Professor/LPSOE (8 year limit, non-tenured)		Associate Professor/LSOE (6 years standard, tenured)		Professor/Senior LSOE (indefinite, tenured)	
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 (special, overlapping)	I	2		
VI	2 (not used at UCSB)	II	2		
		III	2		
		IV	3 (special, overlapping)	I	3
		V	3 (not used at UCSB)	II	3
				III	3
				IV	3
				V	3
				VI	3 (barrier step)
				VII	3
				VIII	3
				IX	4
				Above Scale	4

Eligibility and Acceleration (RB I-4, I-36)

- Eligibility now resets with *any* change (to rank, step, or salary)
- Acceleration is no longer permitted in time
 - Normative time at step *must* be served before any kind of further advancement can be considered
 - Potential exceptions, but must still meet RB I-36 criteria for acceleration
 - Promotion to tenure/SOE
 - Promotion action from special step (Asst/LPSOE V, Assoc/LSOE IV) after less than normative time at special step-- RB I-36 and I-37 criteria still apply
- Acceleration may be permitted in step
 - e.g. Professor II → IV (after at least 3 years at Prof II)

Potential action outcomes

- Normative advancement in rank and/or step
- Within-step increase in off-scale salary only
- Acceleration (in step, not time)
- No change
- Key thing to note: except for an outcome of “no change”, any of the above actions sets the eligibility timeframe anew

Eligibility Examples based on case outcome

Current Rank/Step	Action/Outcome (effective 7/1/24)	Next Eligible
Professor II	Advance to higher step (e.g. Professor III, Professor IV, etc)	7/1/27
Professor II	Professor II w/increase in off-scale only (no change in rank or step, change in salary only)	7/1/27 *
Professor II	No Change (rank/step/salary all remain the same)	7/1/25

* This reflects a change from past procedure, where eligibility would have rolled over to the following year, even with change in salary only – see RB I-4

Acceleration Justification (RB I-36)

- May be proposed after normative time at step, when there is clear justification
- Examples (non-exhaustive; only updates are reflected here):
 - Professor series: achievement well above disciplinary/field norms in research/creative activity, *coupled with excellent performance in all other areas*
 - SOE series: achievement well above the high campus standards in teaching, coupled with excellent performance in all other areas
 - Extraordinary accomplishments in admin service roles after the completion of a normative term, with significant leadership, activities, and achievements exceeding normative expectations for the role
 - More examples are cited in RB I-36

Special (Overlapping) Steps (RB I-37)

- Assistant/LPSOE V; overlaps with Associate/LSOE I
 - Normative advancement progression from here:
 - After 1 year at Step V: promotion to Associate/LSOE Step I (lateral move)
 - After 2 years at Step V: promotion to Associate/LSOE Step II (one step advance)
- Associate/LSOE IV; overlaps with Professor/Sr. LSOE I
 - Normative advancement progression from here:
 - After 1-2 years at Step IV: promotion to Professor/Sr. LSOE Step I (lateral move)
 - After 3 years at Step IV: promotion to Professor/Sr. LSOE Step II (one step advance)

Special Step Example

- Current Case: advanced to Asst Prof V, effective 7/1/23
- Next Eligible: promotion effective 7/1/24

Action	Effective	Recommendation	Normative/Accel?	Notes
Promotion	7/1/24	Associate I	Normative	Lateral move; salary increase of \$100
Promotion	7/1/24	Associate II	Acceleration	Requires justification per RB I-36
Deferral	7/1/24	N/A	N/A	
Promotion	7/1/25	Associate II	Normative	One-step increase

Career Reviews

External Letters (RB I-46)

- UC-familiar letter writers are no longer required! (also in RB I-75)
- Clarification on conflicted relationships:
 - Advisor/Mentor or Student/Advisee
 - Close personal, family, or direct financial relationship
 - Current UCSB employee (except as appropriate with SOE cases)
 - Substantive collaboration in the last 4 years
 - Including co-authorship, grant collaboration, co-teaching, co-editorial work, etc
- Clarification on non-conflicted relationships:
 - Members of candidate's graduate school, service as dept colleagues at previous institution, service together on editorial board/committee

External Letters – SOE series

- For SOEs whose instruction is focused on professional practice (e.g. secondary teacher education, performance), experts in distinguished professional roles or with distinctive practical expertise may be suitable alternative to full professors at top universities– *given appropriate justification on the coded list*
- In *exceptional* circumstances: these practical expertise referees may include former students *with distinguishing qualifications* who have had no relationship with the candidate in at least the past 4 years.

Coded List

- Must include:
 - Biographical/contextual information about reviewer that justifies why they are qualified to write for candidate's advancement action
 - Justification for any deviations from RB I-46 reviewer requirements
 - Identification of which names were candidate-suggested vs department-suggested
 - Overlaps = department suggested
 - Names of referees who did not respond or declined to write
 - Names of referees whom the candidate specified *not* to contact
- See RB I-48 for example/template coded list

Materials to External Reviewers (RB I-51)

- Professor series: CV and access to copies of select publications
 - If bio-bib is used in lieu of CV, it must be stripped of links to any other materials besides relevant publications
 - Caution should be exercised when providing additional materials
- SOE series: CV and demonstration of teaching effectiveness
 - Examples: teaching statement describing teaching philosophy and goals, list of courses taught (along with relevant details), syllabi, assignments and exams, etc...
- Teaching evaluations/ESCI are NEVER appropriate to send!
- Key: consistency!

Redaction of Extramural Letters



- Should candidates receive redacted letters automatically?
 - No – offer of redacted copies should be made to candidates, but do not prepare redacted copies unless requested
 - Must be given in advance of case deadline to allow time for response
- Redact letterhead information from each page, plus signature block and any material below it
 - No redactions *within* the body of letter– use a “paper cutter” approach
- Evaluative text must be within the body of the letter!
- If provided, redacted versions must be uploaded to case
- Verify that candidate has filled out Safeguard Statement appropriately

Dept Letter and Confidential Information

- External letter quotes should not be used in excess in lieu of analysis
- Avoid information that may identify a letter writer, e.g.
 - Name, title, leadership roles, background/expertise, institution, etc
- Avoid details about solicitation process– this is already in coded list!
- Avoid justification for RB deviations– again, this goes in coded list!
- Review dept letter carefully before providing final copy to candidate
 - **EDIT** out inappropriate information from the dept letter as needed!



Other Case Miscellany

Bio-bib and dept letter

- Bio-bib (RB I-27): multiple sets of lines are to be used ONLY in the case of “no change” outcome in previous review(s)
- Dept letter (RB I-35): teaching load must be clarified:
 - Dept normative teaching load (e.g. X courses per year)
 - Accounting of how candidate met the teaching load obligation during the review period (explain how courses taught fulfill the obligation; include releases to grant, leaves, overload, etc)
 - Use the templates/examples furnished in RB I-35

Admin Service (RB I-67)

- Faculty Administrators: Dept Chairs, Deans, Assoc Deans, AVCs, etc
- Merit reviews follow the standard procedures, acknowledging that the admin service requires surrender of time otherwise spent on teaching, scholarship, professional activities, and other service roles
 - Principle: academic leadership is in itself significant academic activity
- Admin service alone cannot serve as primary justification for career review advancement or acceleration
 - Rare cases of significant accomplishments far exceeding normal expectations of the role may justify advancement during the review cycle
 - More typically: acknowledged at the completion of full term of service

Who is Responsible for What?

- Candidate:
 - Supply up-to-date materials on time (observing dept-specified deadlines)
 - Make necessary corrections/updates as requested by dept analyst
- Department Chair (can be in conjunction w/personnel committee):
 - Provide original, analytical assessment of candidate's qualifications
 - Justify proposed action
 - Provide qualitative and contextual info on external reviewers (Coded List)
- Department Analyst:
 - Ensure the above are in place and conform to policy
 - Actively work with faculty and dept chair on corrections and clarifications
 - Check accuracy of/consistency across materials, before submitting case to College
 - Remove "TMI" on external letters from the dept letter

Other RB Updates

Faculty Appointments (RB I-14, I-46)

- AAU offer deadline (Apr 30) no longer applies
 - Intercampus UC deadline (Apr 1) still in effect– see APM 510
- Asst Prof/LPSOE appointments require at least 3 external letters
 - These may consist of letters submitted as part of application materials (e.g. via UC Recruit)
- Tenure/SOE appointments:
 - External letters submitted as part of application materials may be used
 - BUT may not constitute more than half of the letters
- ONLY in Appointment cases may external letters be included that do not meet the standard of non-conflict

SB 1162 (RB VII-4, VII-5)

- Effective Jan 1, 2023: employers must disclose pay scales on all job postings and to current employees upon request
- What is a “pay scale”? The salary range the employer reasonably expects to pay for a position
- In UC Recruit: “Salary Range” field of “Position” tab
- General idea: if your pay scale comprises a range of \$X - \$Y, then you will not offer less than \$X or more than \$Y to a finalist
- <https://ap.ucsb.edu/resources.for.department.analysts/content/UCSB.Implementation.AB.168.and.SB.1162.pdf>

Outside Professional Activities

- Conflict of Commitment and Outside Professional Activities
- Categories:
 - Category I:
 - Appear to be a conflict
 - Prior approval required
 - Must report hours (which count toward 39-day max during AY)
 - Category II:
 - Unlikely to be a conflict
 - Prior approval not required, but must report hours (which count toward max)
 - Category III:
 - No conflict; not reported; does not count toward 39-day max

APM 025 & RB I-29 – Category I clarified

- Honorary, visiting, adjunct or other institutional appointment at an outside institution (whether compensated or uncompensated)
- Application to talent recruitment program sponsored by government agency of a non-US nation
- Employment outside the University
- Teaching, research, or administration of a grant at an entity outside the University
- Executive or managerial position in a business (for-profit or non-profit)
- Founding or co-founding a company

APM 025 & RB I-29 – Category II clarified

- Teaching for PaCE or other self-supporting UC degree programs
- Consulting or testifying as an expert or professional witness
- Providing outside consulting services/engaging in professional practice
 - Including for Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore National Labs (except for Board of Governors – see APM 025)
- Serving on the board of directors of an outside entity
- Providing or presenting a workshop for industry

APM 025 and RB I-29 – Category III clarified

- Serving on government or professional panels/committees or as an officer or board member of professional or scholarly society
- Attending & presenting talks at academic colloquia/conferences
- Participating in or accepting commission for artistic performance or event not sponsored by the University– other than Cat I activities
- Acting as reviewer or editor for journal or book manuscripts
- Developing scholarly communications (even w/financial gain)
- Accepting honoraria (other than those received for Cat II activities) and prizes

APM 025 (RB I-29) Disclosure Requirements

- All Senate Faculty & Adjuncts \geq 50% must report and certify annually
 - Whether activity is compensated or uncompensated
 - Required even when on sabbatical or other leave with pay
 - Remember: Cat I requires approval *prior* to undertaking activity
- Tracked in OATS (Online Activity Tracking System)
 - Must acknowledge in leave request form in AP Folio
- No time restrictions for Cat I/II activity during summer
 - **Unless** receiving additional University compensation!
 - Then limit is 1 day/week during the period summer compensation is received

Upcoming Training for Faculty

- Chair's MP Workshop
 - Friday, May 5; 1:30 – 3:00pm
- Faculty bio-bib workshop
 - Friday, May 19; 1:00 – 2:30pm

<https://ap.ucsb.edu/~staff.training.registration/>

- Writing Effective Teaching Statements
 - Friday, May 25; 3:00 – 5:00pm
 - Sponsored by OTL; contact otl@ltsc.ucsb.edu to register
- Encourage your Chairs/faculty to sign up!

AP Contacts

Mira Lázaro	Senate Faculty MLPS, Engineering, Bren	x5728	mslaza@ucsb.edu
Lia Cabello	Senate Faculty HFA, SOSC, CCS, Education	x5979	lia.cabello@ucsb.edu
Joanna Kettmann	Researchers, Project Scientists, Specialists	x5048	joanna.kettmann@ucsb.edu
Helly Kwee	General AP Policy	x7396	helly.kwee@ucsb.edu