

II-9
EXCELLENCE REVIEWS
(Revised 4/25)

This section outlines the requirements for the Excellence Review, which determines a Unit 18 faculty's Continuing Status. See Article 7B and Article 43 of the MOU.

I. Eligibility

A Unit 18 faculty member shall be eligible for Excellence Review when:

1. The Unit 18 faculty is appointed for an 18th quarter of service in the same department and
2. Instructional need as defined in Article 7B.B exists in the 19th quarter

Excellence Reviews will be conducted by the department in response to the annual call issued by the Office of Academic Personnel. Excellence Reviews are to be submitted to the Dean's office based on the schedule provided by Academic Personnel so that the campus review process may be completed by the end of the 18th quarter of service.

The department shall notify the eligible Unit 18 faculty in writing no less than 45 days prior to the date by which the review materials must be submitted. The notification requirements are outlined in [Article 43.B.2](#) and the [notice template](#) on the AP website should be used.

II. Criteria

The standard for continuing status is demonstrated excellence in teaching, academic responsibility per Article 3 of the MOU, and other assigned duties.

Per [Article 43](#), instructional performance shall be evaluated according to the following criteria, as demonstrated by the materials in the review file:

- Dedication to and engagement with teaching;
- Command of the subject matter and continued growth in mastering new topics;
- Organizing and presenting course content effectively and with demonstrated learning outcomes;
- Setting pedagogical objectives appropriate to the course topic, level, and format;
- Responding to student work in ways commensurate with student performance, course topic, level, and format;
- Awakening in students an awareness of the importance of the subject matter;
- Inspiring interest in beginning students and stimulating advanced students to do complex work;
- Developing pedagogically effective assignments, lecture slides, lesson plans, exams, and/or other course materials and/or prompts for student work

III. Documentation of Performance

The following review materials are required:

- Current CV or bio-bibliography
- A self-reflection/self-statement/self-evaluation of the candidate's performance, teaching objectives, and teaching activities
- ESCIs (Spring 2024 and earlier) or SET reports (Summer 2024 and later) and written student evaluations
- Term-by-term enumeration of the number and types of courses taught

- Solicited, confidential extramural letters of evaluation (see Section IV below)

See [Article 43.C](#) for other, optional review materials that may be submitted and used in the review.

IV. Extramural Evaluations

As part of the review file for the Excellence Review, departments must submit five or more letters of recommendation. Departments should strive to ensure that at least half the letters submitted with the case come from references chosen by the Chair in consultation with the department, but independent of feedback from the candidate and without consulting the candidate. These letters may be of two types:

1. Letters from extramural referees with knowledge of the candidate's professional status and teaching record including former students, and graduates who have achieved notable professional success since leaving the university, reviewers who can comment on the candidate's command of the subject and continuous growth in the subject field, or any appropriate referee with knowledge of the candidate's performance.
2. Letters from UCSB Senate faculty or Continuing Lecturers, external to the department, who have conducted peer review of the candidate's teaching. Peer evaluation may include such things as classroom visits or videotaping, commentary on course syllabi, reading assignments, and examinations. Qualitative descriptions and opinions are preferable to quantitative ratings or comparative rankings in peer evaluation of teaching.

Both types of letters are subject to the same redaction and confidentiality policies as extramural letters.

The candidate must be given the opportunity to suggest the names of persons who could be solicited for letters of evaluation, and also to indicate in writing the names of persons who, in the candidate's view, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications or performance for any reason (which may include "personal reasons"). The candidate should know that a request to exclude certain potential evaluators will become part of the review file and that such requests are made regularly and should in no way jeopardize the candidate's case. Furthermore, such requests are generally honored to the extent possible unless they interfere with proper evaluation.

The sample solicitation letter and confidentiality statement must be used when soliciting letters of evaluation (Red Binder I-49 and I-50). Additional wording may be added describing the criteria that are relevant in a particular candidate's case. If wording is added or changed, Academic Personnel must be consulted regarding the revised language prior to sending the solicitation letter.

V. Review Procedure

Excellence Reviews will be conducted by a departmental committee composed of academic appointees with sufficient knowledge in the field of expertise of the candidate. In addition, the department will make reasonable efforts to ensure that a qualified Unit 18 faculty member will participate in such review committees. All such service will be voluntary. If the review is conducted by an ad hoc committee rather than a standing departmental committee, the individual under review will be consulted concerning the Unit 18 faculty representation. If it is not practical to form a review committee within a department, the committee will be formed at the college level following established procedures.

Once all materials are assembled, and before the departmental review committee evaluates the file, the candidate will be provided an opportunity to inspect all non-confidential materials in the file, pursuant to [Article 10](#). The candidate may also, at this time, request redacted copies of the confidential materials in the file. The candidate will then have 5 days from the date materials are received, to submit an optional written statement in response to or commenting upon the materials. This statement would be added to the review file.

The departmental review committee evaluates the case file and makes a preliminary recommendation. This preliminary recommendation should accurately reflect all committee views, including those of dissenting members.

The review committee will present its recommendation to the eligible Senate faculty within the department (voting faculty, as defined by the department's by-laws). The voting faculty will review the case file, discuss the committee's recommendation, vote on supporting the committee's recommendation, and provide additional analysis as appropriate. These comprise the department's final recommendation. Once the final department recommendation is complete, the candidate should be advised of the outcome and, upon request, provided a copy of the department letter. The candidate will have 5 days to submit an optional written statement in response to the departmental recommendation, which will be added to the file. The candidate will sign the Safeguard Statement within AP Folio, and the complete case file is sent to the office of the appropriate Dean.

The Dean of the appropriate college makes an analysis and recommendation based on the materials and recommendation submitted by the department. The case is then forwarded to the Associate Vice Chancellor (AVC) for Academic Personnel.

The AVC has approval authority for Excellence Review cases, and if they determine that additional review is necessary for proper evaluation, they may request that the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) review the case.

The final decision is based on the documentation presented in the departmental file, as well as the recommendations of the Dean and CAP (in those cases where CAP is asked to review).

If the candidate's performance is deemed excellent and they achieve Continuing status, they will first be moved to the salary point on Table 16 that corresponds to their current pre-six salary. A minimum of 2 salary points shall be awarded from there as a merit increase.

Requests for reconsideration of a final decision will be governed by Red Binder I-10.