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POLICY IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE FOR AY ’14 –’15

The color system utilized below is a guide for threads of tasks (for example, everything that relates to the development of internal governance is in blue).

Color key:

- **Internal governance policy development** Blue
- **NTTF professional responsibility policy development** Orange
- **NTTF review and promotion** Green
- **TTF professional policy development/TTF promotion and tenure** Purple

By 9/26  Academic Affairs provides feedback to departments/units on internal governance policies.

By 11/1  Internal governance revisions due to AA

11/4  Open forum for deans, department/unit heads on NTTF professional responsibility; writing NTTF research job descriptions and NTTF review and promotion

By 11/11*  Deans and department/unit heads provide input to faculty inclusive of Provost/Academic Affairs/vice president recommendations on NTTF professional responsibility and NTTF review and promotion policies, copy to Academic Affairs

By 12/15  Faculty submit proposed NTTF professional responsibility and NTTF review and promotion policies to deans

January, 2015 **  Workshop for deans, department/unit heads on TTF professional responsibility and TTF promotion and tenure

By 1/9  Deans provide any alterations to NTTF professional responsibility and NTTF review and promotion policies to faculty with explanation

By 1/20  Deans submit NTTF professional responsibility and NTTF review and promotion policies to Academic Affairs

By 3/2  Academic Affairs approves policies and requests edits on a rolling basis

By 4/1  Deans and department/unit heads provide input to faculty inclusive of Provost/Academic Affairs/vice president
recommendations on TTF professional responsibility and TTF promotion and tenure policies, copy to Academic Affairs

By 4/1  Deans provide Academic Affairs with NTTF renewal/non-renewal decisions

By 5/1  Notice provided to NTTF on renewal/non-renewal

By 5/18  Faculty submit proposed TTF professional responsibility and TTF promotion and tenure policies to deans

By 6/1  Deans provide any alterations TTF professional responsibility and TTF promotion and tenure policies to faculty with explanation

By 6/17  Deans submit TTF professional responsibility and TTF promotion and tenure policies to Academic Affairs

* Each College can determine its own internal timeline for developing NTTF professional responsibility and NTTF review and promotion policies, which can begin anytime after Provost/Academic Affairs’ guidance is provided in October. Faculty should have at least five weeks to develop the policies. They must be reviewed by the deans prior to submission to Academic Affairs by January 20.

** Each College can determine its own internal timeline for developing TTF professional responsibility and TTF promotion and tenure, which can begin anytime after Provost/Academic Affairs’ guidance is provided in January. Faculty should have at least five weeks to develop the policies. They must be reviewed by the deans prior to submission to Academic Affairs by June 17.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

Policy development for Article 18 (Summer Session) and Article 35 (Professional Development) will occur in fall 2015. There will be guidelines for summer session ’15 provided in the fall of 2014.
UA/UO Joint Implementation Team Memo

November 3, 2014

Dear colleagues,

This fall we are working on the development of two significant policies, one that defines instructional NTTF professional responsibilities (more informally known as “workload” policies) and another that defines NTTF review and promotion policy. We will be working on similar TTF policies starting this winter.

As you know, the CBA entails a process that was designed to encourage broad faculty involvement in policy development to exemplify the University’s vision of shared governance.

Attached is your dean’s and department head’s input, which is meant to incorporate CBA requirements, as well as Provost/Academic Affairs guidelines.

In response to repeated requests from across campus last year to improve the process of policy development, this input comes in the form of draft templates or policy drafts which faculty may accept, alter or reject. Providing input in this way is intended to encourage faculty engagement in the development of the policies by making the task more accessible and manageable.

Faculty development of the policies is very important. Because this process represents a change in how we do things, some units experienced natural growing pains last year in moving from old practices to the new process. To help make the development of this policy run smoothly, we offer the following guidance drawn from best practices across campus.

First, it is important that the unit head invite and encourage all faculty to participate in the development of the policies. In units where this has worked best, unit heads have sent a clear signal that faculty engagement in policy development is desired. Second, the faculty in the unit should have a clear sense of what "faculty developed" means. They should devise a process to solicit participation and input from all faculty, and a process for faculty to write the policies. "Faculty developed" should not mean merely commenting on existing policies or the initial input — this is an opportunity for all faculty to deliberate seriously on these matters. Some units have accomplished the task by deploying an established committee, some have created ad hoc committees for policy development, and some have worked as a committee of the whole. Finally, faculty should be clear about how they will certify that the final policy to be submitted to the unit head is truly "faculty developed."

Some units have a vote, some put out a final call for feedback after the initial
development process with a deadline, and in others, faculty have delegated the authority to approve to a smaller committee.

The faculty are to provide these two policies to their deans, vice president, or designees, via their department heads, by December 15, 2014.

The dean, vice president, or designee will document and discuss with the unit any revisions he or she makes to the policy before submitting his or her recommended policy to the provost or designee. The provost or designee has final authority to establish policies for units. If the provost or designee materially alters the faculty-recommended policy, he or she will provide a written explanation for the change(s) to the faculty in the unit.

Please get in touch if you have questions.

UA/UO joint CBA implementation team
17. ASSIGNMENT OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Preamble. The University and the Union recognize that, given the diverse nature of the work performed by bargaining unit faculty members, the varying types of appointments, and the needs of the university, the weighting of assignments and the particulars of individual assignments will vary both between and within units. The University and the Union also recognize that each bargaining unit faculty member has the obligation to devote his or her best efforts to the university, and particularly to students; to perform all duties with professionalism and diligence and in accordance with the standards appropriate in AAU institutions; to act ethically and in compliance with the accepted professional standards; to account for all money or property received; to use money and property only for lawful purposes and in accordance with policy; to treat confidential information as confidential; to cooperate with the university with regard to investigations, audits, and legal proceedings; and to represent the university with professionalism.

Section 1. Assignment of professional responsibilities may consist of some combination of instructional activities (including class preparation, classroom teaching, evaluation of student work, advising and mentoring, and various forms of communication with students); research, scholarship, and creative activity; and service within the department, school, college or institute, and the university, and to external organizations, and communities.

Section 2. The faculty in each department or unit will begin the process of developing a written policy for the assignment of professional responsibilities and stipends or academic support resources, by first considering any input provided by the department or unit head, dean, vice president, Provost, or designee. The faculty will submit their recommended policy to the appropriate dean, vice president, or designee for review. The dean, vice president, or designee will document and discuss any revisions he or she makes to the policy with the faculty before submitting his or her recommended policy to the Provost or designee. The Provost or designee will have final authority to establish the policy for each department or unit. If the Provost or designee materially alters the faculty-recommended policy, he or she will provide a written explanation for the change(s) to the faculty in the department or unit. The department or unit head, dean, vice president, Provost, or designee may initiate changes to established policies by informing the appropriate faculty of the change being considered, thereby initiating the process described in this Section.

Section 3. The workload policy shall define a 1.0 FTE workload for all academic instructional classifications and ranks employed by the department or program, and shall address how each of the following items contribute to the overall FTE. For noninstructional classifications or where tenure-related or non-tenure track faculty are not primarily instructional, specific job descriptions should be developed to address the particular workload, of the bargaining unit faculty member. Instructional faculty workloads will, in general, address the following:
(a) Course load
(b) Service expectations
(c) Research, scholarship and creative activity
(d) Professional development related to teaching, research and service
(e) Undergraduate and graduate advising
(f) Student contact and communication

Section 4. Workload policies should also describe a process for accounting for individual faculty needs when assigning workload. Factors to consider include, but are not limited to:
(a) New course preparations
(b) Balance of workload components based on faculty review, promotion and tenure, professional development expectations and agenda for research, scholarship and creative activity
(c) Administrative duties
(d) Timing of activities (e.g., publication and grant deadlines, course load in given terms, and promotion review dates)
(e) Job description

Section 5. An individual’s particular professional responsibilities shall be assigned in accordance with the departmental or unit policy. Assignments shall reflect:
(a) The instruction, research, and service needs of the university and its departments, institutes, centers and other academic units;
(b) The bargaining unit member’s qualifications and expertise and potential to acquire the appropriate expertise;
(c) The bargaining unit member’s evolving professional interests;
(d) Generally accepted practices in the field; and
(e) A realistic balance of duties consistent with the criteria for review.

Section 6. The Provost or designee shall be responsible for the scheduling and assignment of all bargaining unit faculty members’ professional responsibilities. A bargaining unit faculty member shall be afforded the opportunity to meet with his or her dean, director or designee at least annually, before responsibilities are assigned, to discuss the bargaining unit faculty member’s preferences regarding assignments for teaching, research, service and other professional responsibilities as set forth in this Article, and the member’s anticipated resource needs. The Provost or designee may modify scheduled assignments, provided that the department or unit head discusses changes with the faculty member before they are made and that changes are not made for arbitrary or capricious reasons.
Faculty members may request to adjust schedules or assignments.

Section 7. Each bargaining unit faculty member must be fully engaged in teaching, research, and service work for the university to the extent of his or her appointment, and must be engaged in work or reasonably available for work for the entirety of the term for which the bargaining unit member is employed unless on approved leave.

Section 8. An overload assignment is (1) an assignment that is in addition to the bargaining unit faculty member’s regular assignment and FTE status; (2) a one time or limited assignment, made or approved by the Provost or designee, that is in addition to or different from regular or usual assignments for the member’s classification and rank; or (3) assignments unrelated to the bargaining unit member’s primary job responsibilities.

Section 9. Overload appointments will be assigned an FTE percentage commensurate with normal workload duties and compensated accordingly. Faculty may request that
overload compensation take the form of class release. No bargaining unit faculty member may be disciplined or terminated for refusing an overload assignment.

Section 10. Appointments for which compensation is paid, in whole or in part, with federal funds may be ineligible for overload compensation.
To: Deans, Directors, and Heads

From: Barbara Altmann, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
      Brad Shelton, Interim Vice President for Research and Innovation

RE: Professional Responsibilities and Position Descriptions for NTTF Research Faculty

We are writing to provide guidance regarding professional responsibilities for non-tenure track (NTTF) research faculty. The collective bargaining agreement (CBA, Article 17) requires that departments and other units on campus create professional responsibility policies for instructional faculty. These policies are not required for research faculty positions. Instead, the CBA requires position descriptions (aka job descriptions) for each research faculty member. This requirement is for all research faculty positions, including career, adjunct, and postdoctoral positions.

Consequently, departments and other units need to ensure that every research faculty member has a current position description in his or her personnel file. Units that have only research faculty do not need to create professional responsibility policies.

By March 2, 2015, deans and vice presidents, or their designees, will need to send an email to Academic Affairs (srviceprovost@uoregon.edu) to confirm that all of the departments and other academic units in their division have position descriptions for all of their research faculty and that these position descriptions have been placed in the appropriate personnel files. All position descriptions also need to be sent to Unclassified Personnel Services (hrinfo@uoregon.edu) by March 2, 2015.

Position descriptions must use the template for NTTF research faculty position description, which can be found at the UPS website http://ups.uoregon.edu/content/forms. When creating or revising these descriptions, please keep in mind that these position descriptions will be used as the basis for annual reviews and performance evaluations, merit increases, and reviews for promotion. It is important that position descriptions describe the activities associated with the position broadly, but are not so general that they cannot be used for evaluation.

Position descriptions should be reviewed and updated annually at the time of a faculty member’s annual review. At the same time, supervisors should create annual goals and performance measures that are more specific than the position description to guide priorities for the upcoming year.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact either of us. In addition, you may also contact Cassandra Moseley, Office of Research and Innovation, at cmoseley@uoregon.edu or 541-346-4545.
ARTICLE 19. NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY (NTTF) REVIEW AND PROMOTION

Section 1. Reviews for Career NTTF will include: (1) regular reviews associated with contract renewal; and (2) promotion reviews. If a bargaining unit faculty member seeks promotion in a year when a contract review is due, only a single review must be completed. The decision on whether to promote and the decision on whether to renew, however, must be made independently.

Section 2. Policies and Procedures. The faculty in each department or unit that employs NTTF will develop written procedures and criteria for NTTF, which must comport with the general guidelines in Section 4 of this Article. Each department’s or unit’s promotion process will include a promotion review committee which should include tenure-track and tenured faculty and, where possible, NTTF at or above the rank sought by the candidate. Each policy will include a process for reviewing the performance of any adjuncts employed by the department or unit. Each policy will also address whether external reviewers will be included in the review and promotion process and how external reviews will be conducted. If reviewers external to the unit or university are included, they should be reviewers who can present a knowledgeable and objective evaluation of the candidate and his or her qualifications. External reviewers must be asked to base their evaluation and judgment on the criteria in use by the academic department or program.

The faculty in each department or unit will begin the process of developing a written policy setting forth the procedures and criteria for NTTF review and promotion, by first considering any input provided by the department or unit head, dean, vice president, Provost, or designee. The faculty will submit their recommended policy to the appropriate dean, unit head, or designee for review. The dean, unit head, or designee will document and discuss any revisions he or she makes to the policy with the faculty before submitting his or her recommended policy to Academic Affairs or the Vice President for Research, Innovation and Graduate Studies, as appropriate, who will have final authority to establish the policy for each department or unit. If the dean, unit head or Academic Affairs or the Vice President for Research, Innovation and Graduate Studies materially alters the faculty-recommended policy, he or she will provide a written explanation for the change(s) to the faculty in the department or unit. The department or unit head, dean, vice president, Provost, or designee may initiate changes to established policies by informing the appropriate faculty of the change being considered, thereby initiating the process described in this Section.

The procedures and criteria for review and promotion must be made available to bargaining unit faculty members upon request, and published on the Academic Affairs or Research and Innovation website and in the department or unit. If procedures or criteria change during the course of an NTTF bargaining unit member’s employment, the bargaining unit faculty member may elect between current criteria and those in effect during the six years prior to the initiation of a given review or promotion process.

Reviews Associated with Contract Renewal for Career NTTF

Section 3. Sections 3 through 5 apply to contract reviews for Career NTTF. Reviews for Career NTTF are for the purpose of determining if the NTTF member is meeting the
standard of excellence appropriate to a major research university. They should be
designed to help the NTTF bargaining unit members grow as scholars, researchers and
educators, identify areas of strength, and identify areas that need improvement.

Section 4. While the details and structure of reviews are the responsibility of the
University, reviews must follow these general guidelines:
(a) Career NTTF must be reviewed in each contract period prior to consideration for
renewal or once every three academic or fiscal years of employment, whichever is
sooner. The review will consider the Career NTTF bargaining unit faculty
member’s performance since the last review.
(b) For instructional Career NTTF, student course evaluations will be offered for all
courses with five or more students. The evaluation of teaching will include a
review of evaluations for each course taught. Career NTTF bargaining unit
members are expected to undergo at least one peer review of teaching per contract
period. The department or unit will identify the standards to be applied to these
reviews and will establish a time frame for notification to the Career NTTF
bargaining unit faculty member before a peer review is conducted.
(c) Career NTTF in research appointments will be reviewed by established
procedures to assess the quality of work performed and the outcomes of their
contributions to the research program.
(d) Librarians will be reviewed for demonstrated achievement in their professional
roles in the Library.
(e) To the extent applicable, the evaluation of scholarship, research, and creative
activity will include an assessment of work quality, impact on the field nationally
and internationally, and overall contribution to the discipline or program.
(f) The review process will include an opportunity for the Career NTTF bargaining
unit faculty member to discuss his or her efforts and performance with an
appropriate supervisor at least once during each contract period.
(g) As part of each contract review, a Career NTTF will have an opportunity to
submit a personal statement containing information relevant to his or her
performance of assigned duties and responsibilities.
(h) In evaluating the performance of required professional development activities, the
review will consider the availability of professional development funds,
opportunities for professional development, and the Career NTTF bargaining unit
faculty member’s efforts to secure funding.
(i) Career NTTF bargaining unit faculty members will be evaluated only by the
criteria approved and made available to the faculty member.

Section 5. A Career NTTF bargaining unit member may hold appointments in more than
one unit at the university. In such a case, the relevant vice presidents, deans, directors or
designees will notify the NTTF in writing at the time multiple appointments are made
which unit will oversee the review process and the criteria for promotion, if applicable.

Promotion Reviews for Career NTTF

Section 6. Eligibility for Promotion. Career NTTF will be eligible for promotion after
accumulating six years of service at an average of .4 FTE or greater, accrued at no greater
than three terms per academic year for bargaining unit faculty on nine month contracts,
and at four terms per year for bargaining unit faculty on 12-month contracts.
Section 7. “Up or Out.” For all Career NTTF bargaining unit members other than librarians, promotion is elective and does not involve an “up or out” decision. Career NTTF who do not wish to be considered for promotion may continue employment at their current rank as long as eligible to do so under Article 16, Contracts. Librarians must undergo review for promotion to associate librarian at the first time they become eligible. If promotion is denied, the librarian will receive a two year contract, and must come up for promotion again in the second year. If promotion is denied a second time, the librarian will receive a one year terminal appointment. Promotion from associate librarian to senior librarian is elective.

Section 8. Accelerated Review. An accelerated promotion review may occur in particularly meritorious cases as determined by the Provost or designee in consultation with the appropriate vice president, dean, department or unit head, and affected bargaining unit faculty member.

Section 9. Credit for Prior Service. When credit for prior service is agreed upon, the terms of hire will state the number of years of credit granted and the earliest date for promotion eligibility. Teaching, scholarship, research, and creative activity completed by the bargaining unit faculty member during the period of prior service will receive full consideration during the promotion process if the bargaining unit member elects the earliest date for promotion review. Should a bargaining unit member who received credit for prior service at the time of hire choose to delay the review until completing the required six years at the University of Oregon, teaching, scholarship, research, and creative activity completed prior to arrival at the university will be of secondary consideration during the promotion process. Should the bargaining unit faculty member choose to use some, but not all of the credit for prior service, the focus of the review of teaching, scholarship, research, and creative activity will adjust appropriately so that, for example, four years at the University of Oregon would mean that at most two years of prior service will receive full consideration.

Section 10. Multiple or Joint Appointments. For NTTF bargaining unit members holding multiple or joint appointments, a memorandum will be completed at the time of hire or assignment specifying expectations for promotion review and identifying how the promotion process will be handled among the units. Such memorandum is not valid unless approved in writing by the bargaining unit faculty member and the Provost or designee.

Section 11. Initiating the Promotion Process. Candidates wishing to be considered for promotion should notify the appropriate department or unit head in the year prior to the year when promotion is sought, and must provide the following:

CURRICULUM VITAE: A comprehensive and current curriculum vitae that includes the bargaining unit faculty member’s current research, scholarly and creative activities and accomplishments, including publications, appointments, presentations, and similar activities and accomplishments.

PERSONAL STATEMENT: A 3-6 page personal statement developed by the bargaining unit faculty member evaluating his or her performance measured against the applicable criteria for promotion. The personal statement should expressly address the subjects of teaching; scholarship, research and creative activity; and service contributions to the academic department, center or institute, school or
college, university, profession, and the community. The statement should also include discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.

**Supervisors’ letters of evaluation** (e.g., department heads for instructors, research mentor for research assistants).

**Teaching portfolio (if applicable):** Representative examples of course syllabi or equivalent descriptions of course content and instructional expectations for courses taught by the bargaining unit faculty member, examples of student work and exams, and similar material.

**Scholarship portfolio (if applicable):** A comprehensive portfolio of scholarship, research and creative activity; and appropriate evidence of national or international recognition or impact.

**Service portfolio (if applicable):** Evidence of the bargaining unit faculty member’s service contributions to his or her academic department, center or institute, school or college, university, profession, and the community, such as op ed pieces, white papers authored or co-authored by the faculty member, commendations, awards, or letters of appreciation. The portfolio may also include a short narrative elaborating on the faculty member’s unique service experiences or obligations.

**Professional activities portfolio (if applicable):** A comprehensive portfolio of professional or consulting activities related to his or her discipline.

**External reviewers (if applicable):** A list of qualified outside reviewers provided by the bargaining unit faculty member.

---

**Section 12. Waiver of Access to Materials.** Bargaining unit faculty members may choose to waive in advance in writing their access to see any or all of the evaluative materials (see Article 8, Personnel Files). Such waivers, however, shall not preclude the use of redacted versions of these documents in a denial review process. The redacted versions are intended to protect the identity of the reviewer. If redactions are insufficient to do so, the University may prepare a suitable summary. A waiver will be included in the promotion file.

**Section 13. Notice of Meetings.** A bargaining unit faculty member will receive at least three days’ notice of any meeting or hearing which the member is invited or required to attend, with a dean or the Provost or designee regarding recommendations or decisions on promotion. The bargaining unit faculty member may have a colleague or Union representative present at the meeting as an observer.

**Section 14. Evaluation file.** The promotion review file should generally include the following information:

- Statement of duties and responsibilities
- Curriculum vitae
- Conditions of appointment
- Criteria for promotion
- Personal statement
- Supervisors’ letters of evaluation
- Professional activities portfolio (if applicable)
- Teaching portfolio (if applicable)
- Scholarship portfolio (if applicable)
- Service portfolio (if applicable)
- External reviews (if applicable)
- Department or unit committee recommendation
- Department, unit, center or institute head’s recommendation (if applicable)
- Vice president’s, dean’s or director’s recommendation
- Waiver of access to materials (if applicable)

**Section 15. Review by Department or Unit.** Following the department’s or unit’s review and evaluation of the promotion file, the department or unit head will prepare a report on the merits of the promotion case. The report will include the department or unit-level promotion committee report and recommendation and a voting summary, and the department or unit head’s own independent recommendation. The file will then be sent to the appropriate vice president, dean or director for review.

**Section 16. Review by Vice President, Dean or Director.** The vice president, dean, or director, as appropriate, will review the file, and may consult with appropriate persons and may ask for and document additional non-confidential information. Once the vice president, dean, or director deems the file complete, he or she will prepare a separate report and recommendation. The vice president, dean, or director will share his or her report and recommendation with the candidate and allow him or her 10 days from the date of receipt of the report to provide responsive material or information, which shall be included in the evaluation file. The vice president, dean, or director then will submit the complete evaluation file to the Provost or designee.

**Section 17. Review by the Provost or Designee.** The Provost or designee will review the file, with input from Academic Affairs and the Office of the Vice President for Research and Innovation, as appropriate, and decide whether to grant or deny promotion. The candidate will be notified of the decision in writing.

**Section 18. Assumption of New Rank.** Successful candidates for promotion will assume their new rank beginning with the next academic or fiscal year or the nearest next term of employment should their contract not begin with fall term.

**Section 19. Reapplication for Promotion.** An unsuccessful candidate for promotion may continue employment at his or her current rank as long as eligible to do so under this Agreement NTTF bargaining unit members who are denied promotion may reapply for promotion after having been employed by the university for an additional three years at an average of .4 FTE or greater, accrued at no greater than three terms per academic year.

**Section 20. Appeal of Promotion Denial.** Faculty who are denied promotion may appeal the decision through the procedures in Article 21, Tenure and Promotion Denial Appeal.

**Section 21. Withdrawal of Application.** A candidate may withdraw an application for promotion in writing to the Provost and the dean at any time before the Provost’s decision.
NECESSARY ELEMENTS FOR NTTF REVIEW AND PROMOTION POLICIES: EXCERPTS FROM CBA, ARTICLE 19

Career NTTF Reviews (Section 1)

(1) Regular reviews associated with contract renewal; and
(2) Promotion reviews

If faculty member wants promotion review in year when a contract review is due, only a single review must be completed. Decision on whether to promote and decision whether to renew must be made independently.

Policies and Procedures (Section 2)

- Faculty develops written procedures and criteria for reviews related to contract renewal and for promotion for NTTF, after receiving input provided by the department or unit head, dean, vice president, Provost or designee, and subject to review and approval as with other policies developed under the CBA.
- Procedures and criteria must be made available for review upon request and published on Academic Affairs or RIGE website and in the department or unit.
- If criteria changes during course of employment, NTTF member may elect between current criteria and those in effect for prior six years.
- Promotion process includes a promotion review committee which should include tenure-track and tenured faculty, and, where possible, NTTF at or above the rank sought by candidate.
- Policies will include process for reviewing adjuncts.
- Policies will address whether external reviewers will be required in review and promotion process and how external reviews are conducted. External reviewers must be knowledgeable and objective and asked to base their evaluation and judgment on criteria in use by academic department or program.

Reviews Associated with Contract Renewal for Career NTTF (Sections 3, 4, and 5)

- Purpose of review: meeting standard of excellence appropriate to major research university; designed to help NTTF faculty grow as scholars, researchers and educators; identify areas of strength and areas that need improvement.
- General guidelines for review:
  - Review in each contract period or every 3 years, whichever is sooner, and considers performance since last review.
  - For instructional Career NTTF, course evaluations (in classes of 5 or more students offered and reviewed); for Career NTTF at least one peer review of teaching per contract period using standards identified by the department or unit and in the established time frame for notification.
Career NTTF in research reviewed by established procedures to assess quality of work performed and the outcomes of their contributions

Librarians reviewed for demonstrated achievements in professional roles in the Library

As applicable, evaluation of scholarship, research, and creative activity will include assessment of work quality, impact on field nationally and internationally and overall contribution to the discipline or program

Review process will include opportunity for Career NTTF to discuss efforts and performance with supervisor at least once during contract period

Each contract review will include opportunity for submission of personal statement with information relevant to performance

When evaluating performance of required professional development activities, review to consider availability of professional development funds and opportunities, and member’s efforts to secure funding

Career NTTF will be evaluated only by the approved criteria and made available to the faculty member

Promotion Reviews of Career NTTF (Sections 6 – 21)

- Eligibility. “Career NTTF will be eligible for promotion after accumulating six years of service at an average of .4 FTE or greater, accrued at no greater than three terms per academic year for bargaining unit faculty on nine month contracts, and at four terms per year for bargaining unit faculty on 12-month contracts.”
- “Up or Out.” Other than librarians, promotion is elective and not “up or out.” Career NTTF can continue employment at current rank as long as eligible under Article 16, Contracts. Librarians have different promotion guidelines.
- Accelerated Review. May occur in particularly meritorious cases
- Credit for Prior Service. Terms of hire will state number of years of credit granted and earliest date of promotion eligibility. Prior teaching and other activities during period of prior service fully considered, unless faculty member chooses to delay review until completing six years at UO; if faculty member completes six years at UO, then prior activity will be of secondary consideration. If member uses some but not all credit for prior service, focus of review adjusted.
- Multiple or Joint Appointments. Memorandum completed at time of hire or assignment specifying expectations for promotion and identifying process among units. Member and Provost or designee must sign memorandum for it to be valid.
- Initiating Promotion Process. Candidate wishing to be considered for promotion notifies department or unit head in year prior to the year in which promotion is sought and must provide:
o **Curriculum vitae:** comprehensive and current research, scholarly and creative activities and accomplishments, publications, appointments, presentations, and similar activities and accomplishments

o **Personal statement:** 3-6 pages evaluating own performance measured against applicable criteria for promotion. Should address teaching, scholarship, research and creative activity, and service contributions. The statement should also include discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.

o **Teaching portfolio (if applicable):** representative examples of syllabi or equivalent descriptions of course content and instructional expectations, examples of student work and exams, and similar material

o **Scholarship portfolio (if applicable):** comprehensive portfolio of scholarship, research and creative activity; and appropriate evidence of national or international recognition or impact

o **Service portfolio (if applicable):** evidence of service contributions to member’s department, center or institute, school or college, university profession and community (i.e. op-ed pieces, white papers, awards, commendation, or letters of appreciation). May include short narrative elaborating on member’s unique service experiences/obligations.

o **Professional activities portfolio (if applicable):** comprehensive portfolio of professional or consulting activities related to faculty member’s discipline

o **External reviewers (if applicable):** member provides list of potential qualified outside reviewers

- Waiver of Access to Materials. Member may choose to waive in advance, and in writing, access to evaluative materials (Article 8). Waiver doesn’t preclude use of redacted versions in a denial review process. If redactions will not protect identity of reviewers, University may prepare suitable summary. A waiver will be included in promotion file.

- Notice of Meetings. Member to receive three days’ notice of any meeting or hearing with a dean or the Provost or designee regarding recommendations or decisions on promotion. Member may have a colleague or Union representative present at the meeting as an observer.

- Evaluation File. The promotion review file should generally include the following: statement of duties and responsibilities; curriculum vitae; conditions of appointment; criteria for promotion; personal statement; supervisors’ letters of evaluation; professional activities portfolio (if applicable); teaching portfolio (if applicable); scholarship portfolio (if applicable); service portfolio (if applicable); external reviews (if applicable); department or unit recommendation; department, unit, center or institute head’s recommendation (if applicable); vice president’s, dean’s, or director’s recommendation; and waiver of access (if applicable)

- Review by Department or Unit. Following review and evaluation by department or unit, department or unit head will prepare a report on the merits of case. Report will include committee report and recommendation
and voting summary, and head’s independent recommendation. The file will then be sent to appropriate VP, dean or director for review.

- Review by Vice President, Dean or Director. Appropriate VP, dean or director will review file, may consult with appropriate persons and may ask for and document additional non-confidential information. Once the file is complete, s/he prepares separate report and recommendation and shares with candidate. Candidate has ten days from receipt of report to provide responsive material or information, which is included in file. Then submitted to Provost or designee.

- Review by Provost or designee. Provost or designee reviews, with input from Academic Affairs and Office of the VP for Research and Innovation, as appropriate, and decides whether to grant promotion. Candidate notified in writing.

- Assumption of New Rank. Successful candidates for promotion assume new rank beginning with next academic or fiscal year or the nearest next term of employment should their contract not begin with fall term.

- Reapplication for Promotion. Unsuccessful candidates for promotion may continue at current rank as long as eligible under this Agreement. May reapply for promotion after employment by the university for additional 3 years at average of .4 FTE or greater, accrued at no greater than 3 terms per academic year.

- Appeal of Promotion Denial. May appeal as provided by Article 21 (Tenure and Promotion Denial Appeal).

- Withdrawal of Application. Candidate can withdraw application for promotion in writing to the Provost and the dean at any time before Provost’s decision.
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 [center/institute] will rely on Article 19 as a primary
resource.

2.0 Annual (contract) review

2.1 All research faculty members of [center/institute] 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 [director/manager] is responsible for setting timelines for annual
reviews, and communicating deadlines to faculty and their supervisors.

2.3 Supervisors perform the annual evaluation. Where there is more than one
supervisor, each will be responsible for his/her area of assignment.

2.4 The annual evaluation will is 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, supervisors, 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 [director/manager] or designee is responsible for developing
and maintaining evaluation forms.

2.6.2 In preparation for an annual review, the faculty member will
provide their supervisor 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, the supervisor will
provide the [director/manager] with: a current job description, all
of the documents provided to him/her by the faculty member, and
a completed, signed evaluation, using the form provided.

2.6.4 The supervisor and the faculty member should sign the
supervisor’s 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 and his/her supervisor 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 his/her 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 [director/manager] 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 February 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 [institute/center], the [director/manager] appoints a promotion review committee as well as a review committee chair. In the event that the [director/manager] is being promoted, the VPRI or designee will appoint the committee.

3.2.2 The committee will be made up of 3-5 TTF and career NTTF members who have a rank equivalent or higher to the aspirational rank of the candidate. This committee will include at least one research NTTF member of the appropriate rank, if such a faculty member is available.

3.2.3 The review committee will not include the candidate’s immediate supervisor or the [director/manager].

3.2.4 In the event that there are not enough members of the [center/institute] at the appropriate rank to make up a committee, the [director/manager] should appoint faculty members from other units.

3.2.5 The committee is responsible for reviewing the candidate’s materials, voting, and making a written recommendation, including a formal vote, to the [director/manager]. The [director/manager] will include a voting summary in her/his evaluation letter.

3.3 Review materials
3.3.1 [Describe the documents and materials that are required at the
unit level; select from the list in article 19 that are relevant to your
unit]

3.3.1.1 Other materials as applicable to a particular candidate

3.4 External and internal reviews [describe which promotions will have
external reviews and which will have internal reviews, or some
combination and any expectations about the # of reviews]

3.4.1 Review for promotion to senior research assistant I and senior
research assistant II will generally include only internal reviews, un
less the candidate has job duties that are to create an external
impact.

3.4.2 Candidates for promotion to research associate I and research
associate II will be determined on a case by case basis {This is
likely to vary most from unit to unit and person to person
depending on the candidate. For those whose job duties include
expectations of having independent external impact, they should
have external reviews. Candidates who are largely part of teams
with no expectations of independent impact will likely only need
internal reviews. It may be that you want to have different
standards for promotion to I and II, with II requiring external
reviews}

3.4.3 Promotions to research associate professor and research full
professor will have external reviews, but may also include internal
reviews.

3.4.4 Prior to embarking on obtaining reviews, the committee chair will
discuss with the OVPRI the candidate and their job duties, and
propose a plan regarding the time and quantity of reviews, and
obtain agreement from the Office about the type and quantity of
reviews. {Please include this sort of language if you have any
wiggle room in this section of your policy}

3.4.5 The review committee chair manages the process of obtaining
supervisor’s evaluation, and internal and external reviews.

3.5 Criteria for promotion

3.5.1 The [center/institute] relies on the following primary indicators to
evaluate faculty performance: (a) quality of work; (b) effectiveness
or impact of effort; and (c) contribution to the individual’s unit or
department, 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 Promotion criteria may be customized for particular positions.
Position-specific criteria will be based on the most important core
professional responsibilities as described in a faculty member’s
position description and accommodate a wide range of research
and evaluation methods, scholarly approaches, and technical
contributions to diverse disciplinary outlets. 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, as well as involvement with academic and professional associations, non-profit, governmental, and/or private sector organizations.*

3.5.5 Criteria for promotion to senior research assistant and senior research assistant II

3.5.5.1 [Progressively responsible – not simply proficient in their job duties]. [describe criteria and standards here]

3.5.6 Criteria for promotion to senior research associate and senior research associate II

3.5.6.1 [describe criteria and standards here]

3.5.7 Criteria for promotion to research associate professor and research professor

3.5.7.1 Generally, the criteria for promotion in this classification are comparable to criteria for tenure-track faculty, including national and international impact of their scholarship.

3.5.7.2 [describe research criteria and standards here]

3.5.7.3 [describe outreach criteria and standards here, as applicable]

3.5.7.4 [describe service criteria and standards here, as applicable]