



UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

# Demystifying the Sixth Year Review

Preparing for the Continuing  
Appointment Review

# Relevant Policies

Unit 18 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

- Article 7a Appointments

- Article 7b Process for Initial Continuing Appointment

- Article 7c Continuing Appointments

UC Academic Personnel Manual

# Pre-6 Mentoring Meeting

- A mentoring meeting is required during the 9<sup>th</sup> quarter.
- The Chair or designee will provide feedback on NSF performance of assigned duties.
- NSF can decline the meeting in writing
- Documentation of the occurrence of the meeting will be signed by NSF and placed in Personnel file

# Article 7a- Appointments

- Pre-continuing lecturers who request reappointment shall be reviewed prior to a reappointment decision
- Criteria for reviews will be posted online by UC
- Lecturers may request that credit for cross listed courses be applied to either department
- Joint appointments are possible where credit accrues in the home department for work done in another department
- Lecturers can receive limited credit for similar courses taught at other UC campuses

# Continuing Appointment Basics

During the academic year of your 18<sup>th</sup> quarter you will be reviewed for a continuing appointment. This review is often referred to as the sixth year review, or excellence review.

If your review is successful, you will be granted a continuing appointment with the following benefits:

- An indefinite contract with a set percentage time
- Seniority, layoff and rehire rights
- Eligibility for merit-based salary increase every 3 years

# Process Overview

## (A Typical Timeline)

modify for semester campuses

Review Notice- 15-16<sup>th</sup> quarter, no less than 30 days prior

Submit Materials- 16<sup>th</sup> quarter

Ad hoc Committee Recommendation- 17<sup>th</sup> quarter

NSF Response to Committee Recommendation- 17<sup>th</sup> quarter

Faculty Vote and Recommendation to Dean- 17<sup>th</sup> quarter

Dean Recommendation to CAP- 18<sup>th</sup> quarter

CAP final decision, notification from Dean- 18<sup>th</sup> quarter

# Instructional Need

Exists when:

There is a need for courses to be taught by qualified NSF

Need does not exist when:

Senate Faculty, an unanticipated distinguished Visiting Professor, or Adjunct Professor, graduate student, or more senior, qualified Continuing Appointee is designated to teach your course(s).

This rarely happens!

# Continuing Status

- If the review is successful and instructional need exists for the 19<sup>th</sup> quarter or 13<sup>th</sup> semester, a continuing appointment will be granted.
- If the review is successful and instructional need *does not* exist for the 19<sup>th</sup> quarter or 13<sup>th</sup> semester, Continuing Status will be granted with recall rights for two years

# Continuing Appointment Base Percentage

- NSF will be provided notice of the Continuing Appointment percentage by the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> quarter or 12<sup>th</sup> semester.
- Initial Continuing Appointment % will normally be the same as previous years appointment, but it can be reduced per Article 7c.B.

# Review and Notice

As soon as practicable, but no less than 30 days prior to the review, UC shall notify the NSF in writing of the review, its timing, criteria and the procedure that will be followed.

# Evaluation Criteria

Evaluations of NSF shall be made on the basis of:

- a. Demonstrated excellence in the field and in teaching
- b. Academic responsibility
- c. Other assigned duties, including University co-curricular and community service

# Evaluation Criteria

Instructional performance is measured by:

- 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.

(Performance should be judged with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities)

# Evaluation of Teaching Excellence

The following exemplify excellence in teaching:

- 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
- e. assessments resulting from classroom visitations by colleagues and evaluators

# Review Materials

In addition to student evaluations, course materials, class observations by faculty, and solicited letters collected by your department, NSF may submit:

- a. A self-statement or self-evaluation of her or his teaching objectives and performance
- b. Letters of assessment from individuals with expertise in her/his field, and/or other relevant materials to the evaluation file
- c. Names for department to solicit for letters
- d. Written comments to material in file, including student evaluations, letters, class observations, etc

# Review Committee

- a. A dept'al committee shall review and make recommendations
- b. Committee appointees will have sufficient knowledge of NSF's field of expertise
- c. NSF may raise concern about bias on part of individuals involved in the review
- d. Reviewing entity shall determine weight given to materials
- e. Evaluation of NSF shall be based only on material in Academic Review File

# Best Practices Prior to Review

- a. Get a copy of department review procedures, including expectations and criteria
- b. Talk with Post-6 NSF in your department about their experience with the review process
- c. Document efforts to address criticism, or otherwise improve your teaching
- d. Ask colleagues to write up an observation of your class

# Best Practices When Review Begins

- a. Ask for a copy of your academic review file, or ask to see your review file before the committee meets to discuss it
- b. Attach covers to all materials in file that need explanation or highlighting, including student comments, focus on trends of improvement
- c. Submit materials that exhibit all your work, including curriculum development, professional development, committee work, senior thesis, etc
- d. Make sure the review procedure is clear, change the committee composition if you don't like it
- e. Notify UC-AFT if you think there may be a problem

# Best Practices at End of Review

- Read and Respond to Ad Hoc Committee Report ASAP!
- Clarify the rest of the review procedure, (i.e. Dean and CAP):  
Ask about timing of final outcome
- Notify UC-AFT if you think there may be a problem
- The review should be completed prior to the end of your 18<sup>th</sup> quarter. You should be notified of the outcome shortly after completion of the review.

# Common Problems with Reviews

- Non-reappointment without review at end of 5<sup>th</sup> year
- Short timeline for submitting materials
- No previous reviews on file
- No clear criteria or expectations given
- NSF doesn't prepare materials well
- Department has never done a 6<sup>th</sup> Year review before
- Bad politics in department
- Bad personal relationship with reviewer
- Materials placed in review file that are not part of personnel file
- Potentially disciplinary materials placed in file
- Unsubstantiated criticism placed in file
- Review not completed on time

If you have any questions regarding your annual appointments, continuing appointment, or merit reviews, please contact:

<http://www.ucaft.org/content/contact-us>