

The Representative Assembly Step Plus System motion, approved June 4, 2014, directed appointment of a task force to assess whether the efficiency and efficacy envisioned by the Step Plus Proposal was realized following implementation. The Representative Assembly specified that the assessment occur in 2016-2017, producing its report during the spring (April 2017) Representative Assembly meeting. The Academic Senate will establish these criteria in Fall Quarter, 2014 so that the dimensions of the performance evaluation are defined *prior* to the implementation of the system.

The performance of the Step Plus system will be assessed relative to the previous system and in absolute terms. Comparing it to the previous system allows the identification of any changes under the new system. When assessing relative performance, the 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14 academic years will be used as the comparison period because three years encompasses one normal merit cycle for most faculty. Assessing the pattern of advancement under the Step Plus system after its implementation allows the identification of potential problems, such as differences across academic units, that could be addressed by the Academic Senate and administration within the Step Plus System or by modifying it.

The proposed criteria for assessing the Step Plus System will examine its overall performance and its performance in terms of the distribution of advancements by academic unit, department, and gender and ethnicity categories. The Step Plus System will be evaluated based on whether or not merits and accelerations occurred at the same rate, and whether the same fraction of faculty went forward at normative time and accelerated time, as under the current system. The evaluation will be conducted both overall and within each category listed below. The minimum standard for the Step Plus System to be judged successful is that it performs at least as well as the acceleration in time system.

The gender and ethnicity categories will be used as those used in the forthcoming report by the Joint Administration-Academic Senate Oversight Task Force on Faculty Salary Equity Analyses.<sup>1</sup> This task force was convened in 2014 to respond to a request from UC Office of the President (UCOP). The expectation is that the equity analysis will be performed regularly in the future. Using the same groups as this ongoing exercise will facilitate evaluation of the Step Plus System.

### **Performance criteria**

1. *How many actions are processed annually under the Step Plus System?* How many were processed annually under the acceleration in time system in the 2011-12 to 2013-14 period? How many actions following implementation of the Step Plus System in 2014-2015 and in 2015-16 nevertheless requested an acceleration in time? Of these actions, how many resulted in the requested advancement? How many resulted in a less than requested (or no) advancement? How many resulted in a more than requested advancement? Globally analyze and disaggregate into the following three processing categories:

- A. Campus level
- B. College/school level, FPCs and deans
- C. College/school level , deans only

2. *How many appeals are processed annually under the Step Plus System?* How many were processed annually under the acceleration in time system in the 2011-12 to 2013-14 period? How many were

---

<sup>1</sup> Ethnic categories will include under-represented minority (URM), white, Asian, other and unknown. URM will also be disaggregated following guidelines from UCOP. While data will be provided by all categories, outcomes included in the 2016-17 report will be aggregated sufficiently to prevent the identification of individual actions.

successful? Globally analyze and disaggregate into the following three processing categories based on the initial decision that was appealed:

- A. Campus level
- B. College/school level, FPCs and deans
- C. College/school level , deans only

3. *How many actions were resolved and how at the following ranks under the Step Plus System and under the acceleration in time system?* Report on an annual basis at the following seven levels of disaggregation:

- A. Rank assistant/associate/full (Steps 1-5)/full (Steps 6-9)/full (above scale)
- B. College/school
- C. Gender and ethnicity categories
- D. Rank and college/school
- E. Rank and gender and ethnicity categories
- F. College/school and gender and ethnicity categories
- G. Rank, college/school, and gender and ethnicity categories

#### Step Plus

- i. Denial
- ii. 1 step
- iii. 1.5 steps
- iv. 2 steps
- v. More than 2 steps
- vi. Advancements that included an acceleration in time *permitted only in the first three years following implementation* (disaggregated by number of steps)

#### Acceleration in time

- i. Denial
- ii. Standard step action (2 years assistant/associate, 3 full)
- iii. Accelerated 1 year
- iv. Accelerated 2 years (full only)
- v. Accelerated 1 step (2 years assistant/associate, 3 years full)
- vi. Accelerated more than 1 step

4. *The Academic Senate will examine departmental voting rules and ballot forms under the Step Plus System.*