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:
Curriculum vitae: comprehensive and current research, scholarly and creative activities and accomplishments, publications, appointments, presentations, and similar activities and accomplishments

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.

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.

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

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.

Professional activities portfolio (if applicable): comprehensive portfolio of professional or consulting activities related to faculty member's discipline.

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.
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Note: Units do not have to use this language, but may do so if they are so inclined. This document is designed to stimulate thinking. Mandatory language is in *italics*.

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.

2.1 Annual (contract) review
2.2 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.
2.3 The [director/manager] is responsible for setting timelines for annual reviews, and communicating deadlines to faculty and their supervisors.
2.4 Supervisors perform the annual evaluation. Where there is more than one supervisor, each will be responsible for his/her area of assignment.
2.5 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.
2.6 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.

2.7 Review materials
2.7.1 The [director/manager] or designee is responsible for developing and maintaining evaluation forms.
2.7.2 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.
2.7.3 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.
2.7.4 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.

2.7.5 Documents provided by the faculty member and his/her supervisor will be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file.

3.1 Promotion review

3.2 Timeline

3.2.1 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.

3.2.2 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.

3.3 Review committee

3.3.1 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.

3.3.2 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.

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

3.3.4 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.

3.3.5 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.

3.4 Review materials
3.3.1.1 Other materials as applicable to a particular candidate

3.5 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}

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

3.5.2 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}

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

3.5.4 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}

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

3.6 Criteria for promotion

3.6.1 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.

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

3.6.3 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]