

Procedures for Initial Continuing Appointment and Merit Review

(Based on the Memorandum of Understanding, Articles 7 and 22)

The following process and criteria are for initial NSF excellence reviews, and continuing appointee merit reviews.

DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY

Eligibility for Initial Review for Excellence:

During the NSF's 15th quarter, the department shall conduct a review to determine if instructional need exists to establish a continuing appointment. (Article 7b, Section B)

When the University determines that instructional need does exist, it will review the NSF prior to the completion of six years of service to determine if the NSF meets the excellence standard required for continuing appointment. (Article 7b, Section C-1)

Eligibility for Continuing Appointee Merits:

The University retains sole discretion in the evaluation of a NSF's performance. NSF will be subject to merit reviews as follows:

- a. All NSF will be considered for a merit review at the time of their initial continuing appointment, and once every three (3) years thereafter. Upon review, if the NSF is deemed excellent, the NSF shall receive a merit increase of at least two (2) steps on the NSF salary scale. (Article 22, Section C)
- b. For current continuing appointees, the NSF's next merit eligibility date shall be three years after the effective date of their last merit increase or the effective date of the last appointment contract, whichever is more recent. (Article 7c, Section A, 3-a-2)

NSF will be eligible for merit increases in accordance with this Article in those years when the University provides merit increases to non-represented academic employees. Consistent with the MOU, decisions to grant or not grant a merit increase to individual NSF are at the sole discretion of the University. (Article 22, Section B)

NOTIFICATION

NSF appointees will be notified in writing by the end of their 15th quarter, whether or not the department has a continuing instructional need. If a need does exist, the NSF will undergo an excellence review for a continuing appointment.

Eligible NSF will be notified in writing during the year the excellence or merit review is to commence. In addition, they shall be provided with copies of the review procedures and deadlines by which any materials need to be submitted to their department. (Article 7b, Section C)

EVALUATION

Evaluation of the academic qualifications or performance of NSF for purposes of consideration for a continuing appointment, shall be made on the basis of demonstrated excellence in the field and in teaching, academic responsibility, and other assigned duties which may include University co-curricular and community service. (Article 7b, Section E)

An evaluation of NSF shall be based on an academic review file. The academic review file shall contain only material relevant to consideration of the personnel action. The following exemplify excellence in teaching. (Article 7b, Section E) All relevant materials shall be given due consideration:

- a. student evaluations, provided that the quantitative measure in the student evaluation is not the sole criterion for evaluating teaching excellence.;
- b. assessment by former students who have achieved notable professional success;
- c. assessments by other members of the department, and other appropriate faculty members;
- d. development of new and effective techniques of instruction and instructional materials; and,
- e. assessments resulting from classroom visitations by colleagues and evaluators.

MATERIALS PROVIDED BY THE NSF (Article 7b, Section E2,3,6,and 8)

NSF may provide materials for their base file. Materials need to be submitted to the department by the date provided to the NSF in his/her notification letter. All relevant materials will be given due consideration by all levels of review. These materials may include any or all of the following:

NSF may provide a self-statement or self-evaluation of his/her teaching objectives and performance.

NSF being evaluated may provide letters of assessment from individuals with expertise in her/his field, and/or other relevant materials to the evaluation file prepared by the University, which shall be included as part of the evaluation process. Those from whom letters may be provided include but are not limited to:

- departmental NSF;
- departmental Academic Senate faculty;
- other academic appointees;
- students; and/or,
- other colleagues external to the University of California.

PROCESS FOR REVIEW

1. A committee shall review and make recommendations on NSF performance pertaining to the merit review for continuing appointments. The committee shall be at the Departmental level, except where not practicable, in which case it will be as close to the departmental level as is practicable (e.g. school, division or college). Such committees will be comprised of academic appointees with sufficient knowledge of the NSF's field of expertise. (Article 7b, Section E-4)
2. The University shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that a qualified NSF will participate on such review committees although no individual shall be required to serve on the committee. Unless the NSF on the committee is a standing appointment, the NSF being reviewed shall be consulted about the NSF appointment on the committee. Care shall be taken to ensure that the committee is composed of faculty who can offer a neutral assessment of the NSF's performance. The NSF, on the review committee, shall be under the same obligation as any other member of the personnel committee with respect to the confidentiality of the review process. (Article 7b, Section E-6)
3. The NSF being reviewed may provide a written list of suggested peers from whom input may be solicited and/or identify qualified persons from whom input may be solicited. The NSF being reviewed shall be afforded an opportunity to raise concerns about possible bias on the part of individuals involved in their review. Any such statement provided by the NSF shall be included in the academic review file.
4. The reviewing entity (e.g., Department Chair or Council on Academic Personnel) shall determine the weight to be given the materials/information provided, and may solicit input from persons not identified by the NSF being reviewed. (Article 7b, Section E-7)

Instructional performance is measured by evaluation of evidence demonstrating such qualities as:

- a. command of the subject matter and continued growth in mastering new topics;
- b. ability to organize and present course materials;
- c. ability to awaken in students an awareness of the importance of the subject matter;
- d. ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students to do creative work; and,
- e. achievements of students in their field.

Due attention should be paid to the variety of demands placed on instructors by the types of teaching called for at various levels and the total performance of the NSF should be judged with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities. (Article 7b, Section D)

5. Based on the evidence available, the review committee will make a recommendation on the case. Performance-based decisions concerning the Continuing Appointment and termination for non-excellence shall be based upon the material contained in the academic review file.
6. The NSF shall be provided with a copy of the review committee's recommendation and may submit written comments that shall be included in his/her personnel file. (Article 7b, Section D-8)
7. Depending upon the department practice, the file may be considered by the voting members of the department. If so, the department will add additional comments, which may include a faculty vote.
8. The NSF shall be provided a copy of the department letter. In addition, the NSF shall be provided, upon request, redacted copies of confidential materials, and within a specified period, the NSF may provide a response to the materials.
9. The file is then forwarded to the Department Chair for his/her recommendation.
10. The file is submitted to the Dean for his/her recommendation, and forwarded to the Office of Academic Personnel. Reviews for Excellence will be submitted to the Counsel on Academic Personnel (CAP) for its recommendation to the Associate Executive Vice Chancellor who will make a final decision. Reviews for merit increase actions will be submitted to the Associate Executive Vice Chancellor for review and decision.
11. The NSF member will receive a notification letter informing them of the final decision on the proposed action. (Article 7b, Section C-5)