A GUIDE TO RED BINDER UPDATES

Effective: April 1, 2024
BUT FIRST...
WHY WERE THE PROPOSED 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
ARE THE FOUNDATIONS OF FACULTY EVALUATIONS CHANGING?  
(ANSWER: NO)

• The basis of faculty evaluations remains the same  
  • all of the same accomplishments 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
• **September 30**
  • Assistant Professor deferral requests

• 2\textsuperscript{nd} Monday in November
  • Dean’s Authority cases

• 2\textsuperscript{nd} Monday in December
  • Expanded Review cases

• Campus-wide cutoff date: **August 31**
Online Biobib accessible via AP Folio

- for immediate use in upcoming 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 will be provided to manually input cumulative record
    - Initial priority: those eligible for review during 2025-26 cycle
    - Next priority: 2026-27 cycle eligible faculty, and so on

Helpful resources:
- Biobib Workshop on Friday, June 28th from 1:00-2:30 pm
  - Register on the AP Website under Training and Workshops Registration (Faculty Workshops)
- AP Zoom Office Hours: weekly on Mondays from 1:00-2:00 (see main page of AP website)
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
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
Standardized range of advancement options (includes Above Scale):
- Normative 1-step
- 1½ steps
- 2 steps
- 2½ steps
- 3 steps, etc.

Reasonable flexibility can/should be used
- 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
- 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>10/1/2023 Annual</th>
<th>half-step increment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Professor / Assistant Teaching Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>$78,700</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>$83,100</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>$87,700</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>$92,400</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>$97,200</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Professor / Associate Teaching Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>$92,500</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>$97,300</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>$102,400</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>$108,200</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>$116,600</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professor / Teaching Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>$108,300</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>$116,700</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>$125,800</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>$135,300</td>
<td>$5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>$145,400</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI/ V+</td>
<td>$156,200</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>$168,200</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>$181,800</td>
<td>$7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>$197,100</td>
<td>$7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX+</td>
<td>$216,800</td>
<td>$7,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

IX+ in UCPath = IX on-scale (197,100) plus o/s+ (19,700). o/s+ does not carry forward at next review.
“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

Helpful resources:
- Overlapping Step Advancement Matrix
- Step V+ and IX+ Examples

Available on the AP Website under Compensation & Benefits

See RB I-75 for Table
### Overlapping Step Advancement Matrix

Available on the AP Website under Compensation & Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank and Step</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>On-time Advancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asst Prof V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lateral to Assoc Prof I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Prof V</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promotion to Assoc Prof II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Prof V</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Merit to Asst Prof VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Prof VI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lateral to Assoc Prof II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Prof VI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promotion to Assoc Prof III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lateral to Prof I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof IV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lateral to Prof I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof IV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Promotion to Prof II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof IV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Merit to Assoc Prof V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lateral to Prof II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof V</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lateral to Prof II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof V</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Promotion to Prof III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof V+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lateral to Prof VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof V+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lateral to Prof VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof V+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Advancement to Prof VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof IX+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lateral to Above Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof IX+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lateral to Above Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof IX+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lateral to Above Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof IX+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Advancement to Above Scale with merit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Step V+ and IX+ Examples

Available on the AP Website under Compensation & Benefits

#### Example: normative advancement using V+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eff Date</th>
<th>Base (On-Scale)</th>
<th>Off-Scale</th>
<th>O/S+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2022</td>
<td>$145,400</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$155,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action: merit to Prof V**
New status: Prof V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eff Date</th>
<th>Base (On-Scale)</th>
<th>Off-Scale</th>
<th>O/S+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2025</td>
<td>$145,400</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
<td>$166,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action: merit from V+ to VII**
New status: Prof VII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eff Date</th>
<th>Base (On-Scale)</th>
<th>Off-Scale</th>
<th>O/S+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2028</td>
<td>$168,200</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$178,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Example: normative advancement using IX+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eff Date</th>
<th>Base (On-Scale)</th>
<th>Off-Scale</th>
<th>O/S+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2021</td>
<td>$197,100</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$207,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action: merit to Prof IX**
New status: Prof IX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eff Date</th>
<th>Base (On-Scale)</th>
<th>Off-Scale</th>
<th>O/S+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2025</td>
<td>$197,100</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$19,700</td>
<td>$226,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action: merit to Above Scale**
New status: Prof Above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eff Date</th>
<th>Base (On-Scale)</th>
<th>Off-Scale</th>
<th>O/S+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2029</td>
<td>$246,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$246,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
• 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
Important considerations for departments:

- Clarify the value, weight, and expectations for different sets of activities and accomplishments
  - For example:
    - 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