

ARTICLE 7b
PROCESS FOR ACHIEVING CONTINUING STATUS AND CONTINUING
APPOINTMENTS

A. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. This Article contains the policies and procedures that govern the process by which NSF achieve Continuing status.
2. When an NSF receives an appointment that includes an 18th quarter, 12th semester or 24th fiscal quarter of service in the same department, program, or unit, the University shall conduct the excellence review in accordance with this Article.
3. The University shall conduct the excellence review in the academic year in which the 18th quarter, 12th semester or 24th fiscal quarter of service occurs, and the University shall complete the excellence review prior to the commencement of the 19th quarter, 13th semester or 25th fiscal quarter. However, the University shall not be obligated to complete an excellence review if the NSF does not perform service in an eighteenth (18th) quarter, twelfth (12th) semester or twenty-fourth (24th) fiscal quarter. Following completion of the excellence review, the University shall notify the NSF of the results.
4. If as a result of the excellence review the NSF is deemed excellent, and the NSF has performed service in the 18th quarter, 12th semester or 24th fiscal quarter in the same department, program, or unit, the NSF shall have Continuing status
5. Conversely, if, as a result of this review, the University determines that the NSF is not qualified to perform anticipated responsibilities at an excellent level in the department, program, or unit, the NSF will be released at the end of her/his appointment.
6. For NSF who have achieved Continuing status and for whom there is instructional need in the 19th quarter, 13th semester or 25th fiscal quarter as defined in Section B below, the University shall provide notice of a Continuing appointment in accordance with Article 7c by the end of the 18th quarter, 12th semester or 24th fiscal quarter, or as soon as practicable.
7. For NSF who have achieved Continuing status but for whom there is not instructional need in the 19th quarter, 13th semester or 25th fiscal quarter as defined in Section B below, the University shall notify the NSF by the end of the 18th quarter, 12th semester or 24th fiscal quarter, or as soon as practicable, that they have the right of first refusal for two years for NSF work for which they are qualified. This right of first refusal shall not abridge the reemployment rights of another NSF, as

specified in Article 17 — Layoff.

8. Either Continuing status or a Continuing appointment, if any, shall commence at the start of a 19th quarter, 13th semester or 25th fiscal quarter, regardless of when the excellence review is completed.
9. Nothing in this MOU shall preclude a department, program, or unit from hiring an NSF who has achieved Continuing status after the period of right of first refusal has expired. In such a hiring, the NSF shall be hired as a Continuing Appointee.
10. If an NSF is not deemed excellent, the University shall provide the NSF timely notice.

B. FISCAL YEAR APPOINTEES

When an NSF receives an appointment to a 6th full calendar year in the same department, program, or unit, the University shall conduct an excellence review to be completed by the end of the 6th calendar year, provided the NSF performs service in the 4th quarter of the 6th year.

C. INSTRUCTIONAL NEED

1. Instructional need to establish a continuing appointment shall exist when the University determines the following with respect to the nineteenth (19th) quarter, thirteenth (13th) semester, or 25th fiscal quarter:
 - a. there is a departmental need for courses to be taught by NSF in the area in which the NSF member has taught; and
 - b. the NSF member is qualified to teach those courses; and
 - c. a Continuing Appointee is not already expected to teach the course(s).
2. Instructional need to establish a continuing appointment will not exist when:
 - a. Senate Faculty is designated to teach the course(s) during the next academic year previously assigned to the NSF;
 - b. graduate Academic Student Employee (ASE) whose training is in the same department or related discipline, or where the assignment is made pursuant to an academic plan for pedagogical training of the ASE, are designated to teach the course(s) previously assigned to the NSF during the next academic year;

- c. an unanticipated distinguished Visiting Professor, or Adjunct Professor, is designated to teach the course(s) during the next academic year previously assigned to the NSF;
- d. the assignment of the NSF to teach the course(s) conflicts with established departmental academic program requirements for intellectual diversity, as outlined in Article 7a.D.2.b.

D. SPECIAL NOTICE REQUIREMENT FOR ANTICIPATED REDUCTION OF INITIAL CONTINUING APPOINTMENT

If, prior to the issuance of the Letter of Continuing Appointment, the University determines that an NSF who has been appointed to an 18th quarter, 12th semester or 24th fiscal quarter will have an initial continuing appointment percentage that is less than that of the previous year, the University will provide notice to the NSF as soon as practicable, with a copy to the Union.

E. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Evaluations 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.

1. 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.
2. 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.

F. EXCELLENCE REVIEW

1. The University shall notify the NSF in writing of the review, its timing, criteria, and the procedure that will be followed. Such notice shall be no less than thirty (30) calendar days, when practicable. Should the University provide less than thirty (30) calendar days notice, the University shall not unreasonably deny an extension to the NSF to submit her/his materials for the review file.
2. All relevant materials shall be given due consideration. These may include:
 - 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, program or unit, 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.
3. An NSF may provide a self-statement or self-evaluation of her/his teaching objectives and performance.
4. An 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:
 - a. departmental NSFs;
 - b. departmental Academic Senate Faculty;
 - c. other academic appointees;
 - d. students; and/or
 - e. others external to the University of California.
5. A committee shall review and make recommendations about NSF performance pertaining to the Excellence 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. The membership of the Excellence Review committee is not confidential.

6. 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.
7. 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.
8. The NSF may submit a written response to the recommendation from the department, program, or unit, which shall be included in her/his excellence review file.
9. An evaluation of an NSF shall be based on an academic review file. The academic review file shall contain only material relevant to consideration of personnel action. Performance-based decisions concerning appointment to a Continuing Appointment and termination for non-excellence shall be based upon the material contained in the academic review file.

G. GRIEVABILITY AND ARBITRABILITY

1. Allegations of procedural violations of this Article shall be subject to the full grievance and arbitration provisions of this Article. An Arbitrator reviewing procedural violations shall have the authority to order the University to redo the procedure.
2. An Arbitrator shall not have the authority to substitute her/his judgment for the University's judgment with respect to instructional need, academic qualifications or determinations of excellence or non-excellence and thereby compel the University to make or continue an appointment. Nevertheless, the Arbitrator shall have the authority to resolve factual disputes related to Section C.2.

3. The Arbitrator shall have jurisdiction to review the performance review process and the academic review file. If the Arbitrator finds that the performance review process was flawed, or that the decision related academic review file, and that such flaw/decision had a material adverse impact on the review results, the Arbitrator's remedy shall be limited to an order that the University re-do the performance review process. Where the arbitrator determines that an individual involved in the academic review has in any way materially violated the MOU, the Arbitrator may order the University to designate different individuals to conduct the subsequent performance review.
4. Upon the request of either party, the Arbitrator may retain jurisdiction to ensure that the parties have complied with her/his award. When the Arbitrator retains jurisdiction, the Arbitrator's remedy shall be limited to an order that the UC redo the performance review process.