1.0 Collective Bargaining Agreement Processes
Review and promotion procedures are specified in Article 19 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. This document elaborates only on those components of review and promotion that are not prescribed in the CBA. When conducting contract and promotion reviews, the NeuroInformatics Center (NIC) will rely on Article 19 as a primary resource. These procedures also apply to all unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy.

2.0 Annual (contract) review
   2.1 All research faculty members of the NIC are reviewed annually, typically in the spring. During their first contract, career NTTF will be also be reviewed halfway through the contract period.
   2.2 The NIC Director is responsible for setting timelines for annual reviews, and communicating deadlines to faculty.
   2.3 For all research faculty members except the Director of the Performance Research Lab (PRL), the NIC Director, together with the PRL Director, will perform the annual evaluation. For the PRL Director, the NIC Director, together with the Associate Vice-President for Innovation, will perform the annual evaluation.
   2.4 The annual evaluation will be based upon the professional responsibilities as described in a faculty member’s position description along with annual goals and major assignments during the year under review. Because the research faculty are funded by sponsored projects, evaluations should reflect the kind of activities that the faculty have been funded to do.
   2.5 At the time of the annual evaluation, the NIC Director, with input from the faculty member, will set individual goals for the upcoming year. Progress towards these goals will be reviewed as part of the annual review for the subsequent year.

2.6 Review materials
   2.6.1 The NIC Director or designee is responsible for developing and maintaining evaluation forms.
   2.6.2 In preparation for an annual review, the faculty member will provide the NIC Director with a complete updated CV and a report on activities and accomplishments that reflects progress towards goals set a year prior.
   2.6.3 For each faculty member being reviewed, a current job description, all of the documents provided by the faculty member, and a completed, signed evaluation using the form provided, will be used.
   2.6.4 The NIC Director and the faculty member will sign the evaluation. The faculty member’s signature acknowledges receipt of the evaluation; it does not indicate agreement with the evaluation. Faculty may also provide a response or addendum to the evaluation.
   2.6.5 Documents provided by the faculty member will be placed in the faculty
member’s personnel file.

3.0 Promotion review

3.1 Timeline

3.1.1 As required by the CBA, a faculty member must notify the director of their desire to seek promotion in the year prior to seeking promotion. This should typically be done as part of the annual review process, but may occur as late as June 30.

3.1.2 The NIC Director is responsible for developing and communicating unit deadlines to promotion candidates and their supervisors well in advance of deadlines. The exact timeline may vary from year to year depending on the number of candidates being considered for promotion.

3.1.3 Complete dossiers must be submitted to the Office of the Vice President of Research and Innovation (OVPRI) by March 1, unless notified by the OVPRI of a different deadline.

3.2 Review committee

3.2.1 In years where there are research NTTF promotion reviews in the NIC, the NIC Director appoints a promotion review committee as well as a review committee chair. In the event that the NIC Director is being promoted, the VPRI or designee will appoint the review committee and chair. Prior to appointing a funding continent faculty NTTF, the director will confirm that their funding permits participation in this committee.

3.2.2 The committee is responsible for reviewing the candidate’s materials, voting, and making a written recommendation, including a formal vote, to the NIC Director. The NIC Director will include voting summary in their evaluation letter.

3.3 Review materials

3.3.1 The materials to be used in the review process should include:

- A comprehensive and current Curriculum vitae of the candidate that includes the faculty member’s current research, scholarly and creative activities and accomplishments, including publications, appointments, presentations, and similar activities and accomplishments.
- Personal statement evaluating the research faculty’s own performance measured on criteria for promotion.
- Comprehensive portfolio of professional or consulting activities related to their discipline.
- Other materials described in Article 17 of the CBA, as appropriate for the particular candidate.

3.4 All NIC reviews are presently internal to the University of Oregon.

3.5 Criteria for promotion

3.5.1 The NIC relies on the following primary indicators to evaluate faculty performance: (a) recognition and professional service in the field, contributions to the field; (b) research productivity; (c) years of experience and (d) contribution to the NIC, the college, university, and local, state, and national community.

3.5.2 Promotion is not an automatic process, awarded for having put in their
time, but rather awarded for excellence.

3.5.3 Because research faculty are funded by sponsored projects, these evaluations will also reflect the kind of activities that they have been funded to do.

3.5.4 All faculty are expected to contribute to the University's goals regarding equity and inclusion. These contributions may consist of research, teaching, and service activities as appropriate, given the candidate's job duties. Candidate's statement should describe opportunities they have had to contribute to the University’s goals of equity and inclusion.

3.5.5 The NIC anticipates future promotion opportunities to senior research assistant or senior research associate. Criteria for promotion to these ranks are specified in 3.5.1.