

---

## 3104: MERIT, ADVANCEMENT, APPRAISAL REVIEW

---

Reappointments which commence after twelve semesters of service in a Unit 18 title in the same Unit at UC Merced are known as “Continuing Appointments” and are granted only after an Excellence Review has been conducted and resulted in a positive assessment. All Lecturers who provide six years of service in the same Unit at UC Merced are eligible to undergo an Excellence Review, although a Continuing Appointment can only be made when instructional need is established as described below. If instructional need does not exist for the semester(s) following successful completion of an Excellence Review, the Lecturer will be said to have “Continuing status” and shall be notified that he or she is entitled to the right of first refusal for NSF work for which he or she is qualified for two years. After the two-year period of right of first refusal has expired, should there again be a need for the Lecturer’s service, he or she may be rehired through the normal appointment process outlined in MAPP 3103 above. This Lecturer would retain Continuing status upon being rehired.

Conferment of Continuing status following an Excellence Review after six years of service, and the subsequent merit reviews, are intended to reward those individuals who meet specified needs and standards of excellence. The retention of these candidates beyond the sixth year is a significant academic personnel action and the criteria and guidelines herein must be carefully followed in the review process.

### INITIAL CONTINUING STATUS

#### EXCELLENCE REVIEW

A Lecturer who has been appointed to twelve semesters of service must undergo an Excellence Review to determine whether she or he meets the excellence standard required for Continuing status. **(MOU Article 7b)**

The Excellence Review will be conducted during the academic year in which the Lecturer’s twelfth semester in the same Unit at UC Merced falls<sup>2</sup>.

Prior to the initiation of the Excellence Review (i.e., before the **Procedural Safeguard Statement** is initiated), normally in March of the previous year, the Lecturer under consideration shall be notified in writing of the review, and the timing, criteria, and procedures that will be followed. This Letter of Eligibility will indicate that the candidate’s materials are due to the Dean’s office by **July 15**, and the completed Case File is due to APO by the following **March 15**. **(Schedule for AP Actions)**.

Once the Excellence Review is initiated (i.e., the Procedural Safeguard Statement has been initiated), the Case File shall continue through the entire review process (i.e., all files, including files in which the School recommends against a Continuing Appointment, shall be forwarded to all reviewing entities). The candidate, however, may request in writing to the VPF at any time that the review be halted. If such a request is made, the file will not continue through the review process, and reappointment will not be considered further.

#### CONTINUING STATUS CRITERIA

Consideration for Continuing status shall be made on the basis of demonstrated **excellence** in the field and in all three of the following categories:

- Teaching/instructional performance;
- Academic responsibility;
- Other assigned duties which may include University co-curricular and community service. **(MOU 7b.E)**

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

- Command of the subject matter and continued growth in mastering new topics;
- Ability to organize and present course materials;

---

<sup>2</sup> See **MOU Article 7a.B.1** for potential transfer of service credit from another UC campus.

**LECTURERS**

- Ability to awaken in students an awareness of the importance of the subject matter;
- Ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students to do creative work;
- Achievements of students in their fields; and
- Evidence of learning as determined by learning outcome assessment. **(MOU 7b.E)**

**REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Excellence Reviews will be conducted by a Review Committee within the School appointed by the Dean in consultation with Senate faculty and composed of Senate faculty with sufficient knowledge in the field of expertise of the individual being reviewed. In addition, the School will make reasonable efforts to ensure that a qualified non-Senate faculty member (e.g., Lecturer) be a member of each review committee. All such service will be voluntary.

**PREPARATION OF THE CASE FILE**

All candidates for Excellence Review will complete the **Procedural Safeguard Statement** to ensure that their rights under Articles 7b and 7c of the MOU have been explained and upheld.

**Candidate's Materials**

Once a Lecturer has been informed of her or his eligibility for an Excellence Review, she or he is expected to assemble a file of documentation including:

1. Updated curriculum vitae, including teaching information and current address;
2. Instructional materials that may include syllabi, tests and reading lists;
3. Student evaluations, including written comments;
4. Evidence of student learning outcomes assessment; and
5. Optional materials that may include letters of assessment not solicited by the School (such as assessment by peers or other faculty members or from former students), a statement of pedagogical philosophy and goals, and/or other relevant materials such as a self-statement or self-evaluation. The program or School may have specific requirements regarding these or other materials.

**Other Documentation of Performance**

The School will gather other evidence for evaluation, which may include:

1. Assessment from classroom visitations by colleagues and evaluators;
2. Annual pre-six assessments; and
3. Solicited letters of assessment.

The candidate shall have the opportunity to review the file and to respond in writing within five business days. Any such statement will become part of the Case File.

**Case Analysis**

It is the Review Committee's responsibility to submit analytical comments concerning the candidate's teaching effectiveness in the form of a Case Analysis. These comments must be accompanied by evidence from the materials included in the file. Any references to confidential letter writers must be by alpha code. The Case Analysis should include the following:

1. Evaluation of performance in all assigned duties and evaluation of qualifications in relation to criteria for a Continuing Appointment;
2. Recommendation for or against Continuing Appointment; and

**LECTURERS**

3. Merit recommendation: if the candidate is found to have met the excellence standard for a Continuing Appointment, the salary must be raised to the minimum annual salary for Continuing Appointment per **Table 17-B** of the Academic Salary Scales.
4. Either within the Case Analysis or in a separate document, the standards of excellence appropriate to the particular discipline or subject area being used in evaluating the candidate should be outlined.

The candidate shall have the opportunity to review the Case Analysis and to respond in writing within five business days. Any such statement will become part of the Case File.

**Faculty Vote**

If so specified in the Unit's voting procedures, the Case File may be considered by voting members of the Unit. Any discussion and vote by the Unit should be recorded in a Transmittal Memo written by the Chair and included in the Case File which is then forwarded to the Dean.

**Dean's Recommendation Letter**

In the Letter, the Dean provides his or her recommendation regarding the proposed action and supplies additional analysis as needed. The Dean should also either endorse the salary recommendation put forth or provide justification for a different recommendation.

**Routing**

Once completed, the Case File is routed to the Academic Personnel Office for review by the Vice Provost for the Faculty, who shall make the final decision regarding granting Continuing status.

**DETERMINATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL NEED**

Instructional need shall exist when the Dean determines the following:

1. There is a curricular need for courses to be taught by Lecturers in the area in which the Lecturer under consideration has taught, and
2. the Lecturer under consideration is qualified to teach the course(s), and
3. a Continuing Appointee is not already expected to teach the course(s).

Instructional need will **not** exist when:

1. A specified Senate faculty member is designated to teach the course(s) previously assigned to the Lecturer in the next academic year;
2. a graduate student whose training is in the same discipline, or where the assignment is made pursuant to an academic plan for pedagogical training, is designated to teach the course(s) previously assigned to the Lecturer during the initial appointment year;
3. an unanticipated distinguished Visiting Professor or Adjunct Professor is designated to teach the course(s) previously assigned to the Lecturer during the initial appointment year; and/or
4. the assignment of the Lecturer to teach the course(s) conflicts with the established School academic program requirements for intellectual diversity.

**ESTABLISHING THE CONTINUING APPOINTMENT PERCENTAGE**

Normally, the Lecturer's initial Continuing Appointment base percentage will be at least equal to his or her appointment percentage in the previous academic year (e.g., the sixth year). It may be lower, however, if the Dean determines that the course(s) taught by the Lecturer in the previous year will not be offered, or will not be taught by Lecturers because Instructional Need has changed for one or more of the reasons cited above.

## MERIT REVIEWS

Every March, the appropriate Dean's Office will issue letters of eligibility for Merit Reviews for Continuing Appointees. It is the School's responsibility to initiate review of Continuing Appointees every three years. Each School, using standards of excellence appropriate to the particular discipline or subject areas, should develop systematic methods and criteria for discriminating among levels of performance. Documentation of these standards should be included with the case. The process for conducting a Merit Review for a Continuing Appointee shall follow the same procedure outlined above for an Excellence Review. The primary criterion for review will be demonstrated excellence in teaching, along with the other criteria outlined in MAPP 3104 above. Well-documented evidence should be provided on which the appraisal of teaching competence has been based. A positive review shall result in a merit increase of at least 6% on the **Academic Salary Scale (MOU Article 22.C.2.b)** If during the course of a review, or at any other time, the School determines that based on the evaluation criteria there has been a significant decline in the quality of performance by the Continuing Appointee, the procedures outlined in **Article 30** of the MOU must be followed.

A Continuing Appointee may request a one-year deferral of the merit review. Such a request should be submitted in writing to the Dean for approval by the May 15<sup>th</sup> following distribution of letters of eligibility. Future eligibility for review will be based on the new review date.

Schools should inform the candidates of internal deadlines and the opportunity to submit materials to be included in the Case File. If the candidate does not provide materials by the School's due date, the School will conduct the review based on the materials available in the School as of the due date.