2013 Chairs Conference
Discussion of Academic Personnel Topics
with
CP/EVC Alison Galloway
CAP Chair Christina Ravelo
VPAA Herbie Lee

September 20, 2013
University Center
Faculty Salaries and Issues Relating to Compensation

- **Current budget and faculty salaries**
  - Faculty merits will continue
  - Salary scale adjustment for 2014, undecided

- **Campus special salary practice**
  - Goal: increase faculty salaries via merit process
  - Originally for three years 2008-09 through 2010-11
  - Extended for another three years (through 2013-14)
Academic advancement is based on teaching, research/creative activities, and service

- **One-step advancement**
  - excellence in all three areas
- **Greater-than-one-step advancement** (one step plus additional off-scale)
  - outstanding in one or two of the three areas and excellent in the remaining area(s)
- **Accelerated advancement** (two or more steps)
  - outstanding in all three areas significantly beyond expectations
Campus Special Salary Practice

Merit Increases by Type Awarded:
One-Step, Greater-than-One-Step, Accelerated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>One-step</th>
<th>Greater-than-One-Step</th>
<th>Accelerated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Plan 2007-08</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 2008-09</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 2009-10</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 2010-11</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4 2011-12</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5 2012-13</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amount of off-scale increase

• Greater-than-one-step files that are closer to a one-step action
  o Consider a one-step advancement plus a half-step

• Greater-than-one-step files that are closer to an acceleration
  o Consider a one-step advancement plus off-scale to $100 less than the next step

• Accelerations
  o Consider an additional off-scale salary component, typically equivalent to a half-step
Delegation of authority to the deans for merits

- Deans can approve merits up to an increase not to exceed $100 less than next step

- Deans can approve merits up to the campus off-scale limits*
  - $165,500 for regular ranks, academic year
  - $181,400 for BEE scale, academic year

*As of 7/1/2013
Campus Special Salary Practice

Special cases

• **Promotion or advancement to Step 6**
  o Meet criteria for the major action under review
  o Record of accomplishments since the last merit review is evaluated for:
    • One-step increase
    • one of the two greater-than-one-step increases
    • acceleration
    • acceleration plus an additional half step

• **Special salary practice does not apply**
  o Above scale actions
  o Reviews for salary increase only at “barrier steps” (Associate, Step 4; Professor, Step 5; Professor, Step 9)
Salary Increase Only Actions

- Faculty do not satisfy the criteria for major advancement to
  - Professor from Associate, Step 4
  - Professor, Step 6, from Professor, Step 5
  - Above Scale from Professor, Step 9

- But may warrant some level of advancement

- Can be reviewed for a “salary increase only action” in lieu of a review for a major action
Salary Increase Only Actions

• **Salary increase only actions**
  o Allows for modest increase in off-scale salary, (i.e., quarter or a half step)
  o Eligible for additional modest increases in subsequent reviews
  o NOT salary equal to a full step or for the campus special salary practice

• **Professor, Step 9**
  o Capped at the campus off-scale limit
  o Expectation is movement to Above Scale to achieve an above scale salary
Salary Increase Only Actions

- Faculty cannot request a “salary increase only” at a non-barrier step
  - Faculty are expected to be reviewed for merit (step) advancement at non-barrier steps
  - The result of a less than excellent merit review may be a salary increase without a concomitant advancement in step
Above Scale Advancement

~Distinguished Professor~

• Faculty are expected to serve at least four years at Step 9 before advancement to Above Scale
• Reserved only for the most highly distinguished faculty
• Criteria:
  o Sustained and continuing excellence
  o National and international recognition
  o Broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact
  o Excellent teaching performance
  o Highly meritorious service
• Honorary title of Distinguished Professor
Above Scale Advancement

Initial Advancement to Above Scale

• Effective with 2013-14 actions, standard advancement to Above Scale is an increase in salary equal to 11% of the published Step 9 rate
  o Any current off-scale increment is added to this amount
  o This is the practice with all other advancement actions
  o Recommendations for greater than 11% will be considered and must be justified in the department letter
Further Above Scale Advancement

- Minimum of four years must be served between reviews
- Further Above Scale advancement must be justified by new evidence of merit and elevated distinction
  - Continued good service is not an adequate justification
- Effective 2013-14, standard advancement will be a flat dollar amount
  - A flat rate of $16,000 to be added to the current salary rate when files meet advancement criteria
  - If criteria are not met, requests for less than $16,000 could be justified for continued distinguished work
  - A recommendation greater than $16,000 can only be justified when advancement is combined with a major achievement, such as a major award in recognition of career accomplishments
Department Recommendation

Documenting Recommendations in Department Letters

- Be explicit about the level of advancement recommended
- Provide clear justification to support that level
- Address why a specific salary is recommended
- If multiple votes are taken, the highest advancement with a majority vote is considered the department recommendation
Tenure Preparation and Reviews

- Mentor junior faculty as they progress towards tenure
- Criteria and expectations for tenure must be clear
  - Dean and VPAA are good resources if you are uncertain
- Check in with junior faculty annually (not just at mid-career appraisal) and discuss accomplishments & progress
  - Be honest
  - Develop a plan and set goals
- Be timely with tenure files, especially mandatory reviews
  - Do not hold files hoping to include more work
  - Tenure files are subject to the preliminary assessment process; opportunity to submit additional materials
Contributions to Collaborative Works

- For jointly-authored publications/scholarly works, document the faculty member’s contributions to those works
  
  - It is a “responsibility of the department chair to establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in the joint effort” and to “make a separate evaluation of the candidate’s contribution” to this work (APM 210-1.d(2))

- Campus Academic Personnel Manual (CAPM) provides guidelines to faculty on addressing contributions to joint work
Teaching at All Levels of the Curriculum

- Teaching at all levels of the curriculum is important
  - lower-division
  - upper-division
  - graduate
  - mentoring of graduate students (when applicable)

- Department chair should ensure that faculty are assigned courses at all levels

- The department letter should address when a faculty member has not taught at all levels or not mentored graduate students
Assessment of Teaching in Department Letter

• Provide assessment of the quality of the teaching, not a reiteration of the courses taught
• If problems are identified, discuss how they are being addressed
• CAP requests a table of the quantitative course evaluations of courses in review period (where information is available)
  o Template table has been distributed to chairs and managers (also on APO web site)
• File should contain more than one method of teaching evaluation
• APM 210-d(1) provides details on further measures for evaluating teaching performance
Assessment of Learning Outcomes

- Integral part of teaching and program improvement
  - Student learning
  - Institution, program, or course learning outcomes

- Assessment efforts may be included in the file and could include
  - Development of a program learning outcomes assessment plan
  - Participation in outcomes assessment
Evaluating Accomplishments

Contributions to Diversity

• Contributions to diversity through teaching, service, or research and creative activities
  o encourage
  o recognize in academic personnel actions
  o describe in the department letter

• Examples of activities
  o efforts to advance equitable access to education
  o public service that addresses the needs of California’s diverse population
  o mentoring and advising of underrepresented students or new faculty members
Evaluating Accomplishments

Materials Included in Department Letters

External Letter Writers

• Confidentiality of external letter writers
  o Avoid inadvertent disclosure of information in the department letter
    • “Reviewer A, a member of the National Academy of Sciences....”
  o Include biographical information in the “list of letter writers” appended to the file

• Select letter writers who are:
  o Independent of the candidate
  o Comparable or higher level than the candidate
  o From academic or research institutions
  o Versed in the qualifications for advancement at UC or comparable R1 institution
Evaluating Accomplishments

Materials Included in Department Letters
External Letter Writers

• If you select individuals that do not meet the letter writer criteria
  o Include information on the list of letter writers about why they were selected

• If letter writers decline or do not respond
  o Include names on the list of letter writers
Evaluating Accomplishments

Materials Included in Department Letters

• **Mid-Career Appraisal**
  o External letters are not solicited
  o Department letters must provide “assessment and guidance” appropriate to a mid-career review
  o CAP will provide an advice paragraph in its letter

• **Leaves of Absence**
  o Do not to disclose the nature or type of leave, especially when medical or personal leave
    • Even if the faculty member discloses the reason for the leave in their personal statement
  o Refer to the candidate as “being on approved leave for winter quarter 2012”
Evaluating Accomplishments

Materials Included in Review Files

- **Annotated Biobibliography from Last Review**
  - Include annotated research section of the biobibliography from the last review
  - Last review is the most recent review action (except retention only) regardless of the current action
  - Helps reviewers to identify work that has been completed since the last review
Evaluating Accomplishments

Materials Included in Review Files

• **Work in the Review Period**
  o Assessment should only discuss materials from the current review period
  o Do not resubmit work previously reviewed unless substantially changed
  o Do not introduce work the faculty member does not wish to submit
  o If the department wants to include work the faculty member did not submit, the department should request that the faculty member include such work
Web-based Systems for Academic Personnel Reviews

- Online course evaluations
  - 2011-12 online process for soliciting student feedback of instructors using eCommons
  - Concerns
    - Readability
    - Data integrity
    - Storage and consistency
  - Archive and format solution
  - For 2013-14 actions, academic personnel review files must include:
    - Summary sheet
    - Excel spreadsheet
Web-based Systems for Academic Personnel Reviews

- Online calculator for recommended salary
  - Greater-than-one-step
  - Accelerations
- UC Recruit
- Online Review Process
- More information & brief demos after lunch