EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Thursday, May 19, 2016
2:10 PM to 4:00 PM
1003 Kemper Hall

Agenda Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:10-2:40</td>
<td>Acting Chancellor Ralph Hexter Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40-2:45</td>
<td>Meeting Summary Review/Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45-3:00</td>
<td>Academic Freedom Issues – Chris Elmendorf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-3:15</td>
<td>CAP Proposal: Step Plus Revisions – Debra Long (attachment)</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15-3:45</td>
<td>Chair’s Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45-4:00</td>
<td>New Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consent Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: If unable to attend, please secure an alternate from your committee or organization and notify the Academic Senate Chair of your absence and the alternate’s name.
April 22, 2016

André Knoesen, Chair
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

Re: Revisions to Step Plus

Dear Andre,

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has been conducting an on-going review of the implementation of new Step-Plus guidelines. We have identified two issues of concern and discussed proposals for addressing them. One issue involves clarification of how Step-Plus criteria should be applied in conjunction with promotions and merit advancements to Professor, Step 6.0, and Professor, Above Scale. The second issue involves the use of Step-Plus criteria in conjunction with accelerated in-time promotions to Associate and Full Professor.

How should Step-Plus criteria be applied in the context of promotions and merit advancements to Professor, Step 6.0, and Professor, Above Scale?

CAP has noted considerable inconsistency in how Departments are applying Step-Plus criteria when candidates undergo evaluation at promotion and barrier steps. Some departments apply the criteria to the full period of review since appointment or last promotion, asking whether the candidate’s record in research, teaching, and/or service has been outstanding in the entire period. Other departments make an assessment of the candidate’s suitability for promotion or barrier step and then apply the Step-Plus criteria to the recent record, the period since the last merit review.

CAP has also struggled with this issue and noted that inequities can arise when the Step-Plus criteria are applied in either manner. For example, applying the criteria to the entire period of review can lead to situations in which the record is judged as outstanding based on activities for which a candidate already received a half-step advancement during a preceding merit review. Alternatively, applying the criteria to only the most recent period can lead to situations in which a half-step advancement is given based on an outstanding record in the period since the last merit review when the overall record during the period is satisfactory, but not outstanding.

CAP has discussed numerous proposals for addressing this issue and recommends the following:

When evaluating a candidate for promotion or barrier step, Step-plus guidelines should be applied to the entire period of review. Additional half-step advancements should be recommended when achievements during the period of review have not been recognized, or have been insufficiently recognized, by half-step advancements during merit evaluations within the review period.

CAP believes that this proposal will reduce confusion in the Departments and lead to the fewest inequities in the application of Step-Plus.

How should Step-Plus criteria be applied in conjunction with accelerations in-time?

The new Step-Plus system eliminated in-time advancements except for promotions to Associate and Full Professor. Accelerations in-time are difficult to evaluate in conjunction with Step-Plus criteria. Some departments consider an acceleration to be the equivalent of a half-step advancement to be given when candidates are outstanding in one category of review. They then use Step-Plus criteria to make recommendations for an additional half-step advancement as warranted. Other departments apply the Step-Plus criteria without taking the acceleration into account.
One proposal that CAP considered was to eliminate the acceleration in-time option for promotions. We decided against this proposal, however, because it may disadvantage particularly those who have appointed at the Assistant Professor rank, but are expected to be promoted to Associate Professor as soon as they have established a record of teaching at UC Davis. After discussing the merits of several proposals, CAP recommends the following:

Promotions to Associate and Full Professor can be accelerated in-time or can be evaluated according to Step-Plus criteria, but not both.

We believe that this would preserve the flexibility that in-time accelerations provide while eliminating the confusion that arises in evaluating an acceleration in combination with the new Step-Plus guidelines.

CAP welcomes your feedback on our proposals. Please let me know if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

Debra Long, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

Cc: Rachael Goodhue, Vice Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
    Edwin Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate