

*University of Oregon Research Core Facilities
Review and Promotion Policies*

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 research core facilities 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 research core facilities are reviewed annually, typically in the spring. During their first contract, career NTTF will be also be reviewed halfway through the contract period. This review may follow the annual review procedures, or may be more informal. Informal reviews should be in writing (email is acceptable) and placed in the faculty member's personnel file.
- 2.2 The core facility 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 for a faculty member each will be responsible for their area of assignment.
- 2.4 The annual evaluation is based upon the professional responsibilities described in the faculty member's position description along with annual goals and major assignments during the year under review. Evaluations of research faculty funded by sponsored projects should reflect the 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 under review, 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 Office of the Vice President for Research and Innovation will develop evaluation forms for the use of the Research Core Facilities.
 - 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 core facility director/manager with: a current job description, all of the documents provided 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. The faculty member may also provide a response or addendum to the evaluation.
 - 2.6.5 Documents provided by the faculty member and their 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 their desire to seek promotion in the year prior to seeking promotion. This must be in writing and should typically be done as part of the annual review process, but may occur as late as June 30.
- 3.1.2 The core facility 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 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 research core facilities, the VPRI or designee appoints a promotion review committee as well as a review committee chair.
- 3.2.2 The committee will be made up of 3-5 TTF and career NTTF members who, where possible, have a rank equivalent to or higher than the aspirational rank of the candidates. This committee should include at least one research NTTF member of the appropriate rank, if such a faculty member is available. For review of all appointments except those in the research professor line, career NTTF faculty should comprise the majority of the committee. Prior to appointing a funding contingent faculty NTTF, the director will confirm that their funding permits participation in this committee.
- 3.2.3 The review committee will not include the candidate's immediate supervisor or the core facility director/manager.
- 3.2.4 In the event that there are not enough members of the research core facilities at the appropriate rank to make up a committee, the VPRI or designee 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 core facility director/manager. The director/manager will include a voting summary in their evaluation letter.

3.3 Review materials

- 3.3.1 The candidate wishing to be considered for promotion must provide:
 - 3.3.1.1 Curriculum vitae: comprehensive and current research, scholarly and creative activities and accomplishments, publications, appointments, presentations, and similar activities and accomplishments
 - 3.3.1.2 Personal statement: 2-6 pages evaluating own performance measured against applicable criteria for promotion. Should address service center duties, support to core users, impact on

core facility operations, teaching, scholarship, research and creative activity, and service contributions. The statement should also include discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.

- 3.3.1.3 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
- 3.3.1.4 Scholarship portfolio (if applicable): comprehensive portfolio of scholarship, research and creative activity; and appropriate evidence of national or international recognition or impact
- 3.3.1.5 Service portfolio (if applicable): evidence of service contributions to member's core facility, user base, 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.
- 3.3.1.6 Professional activities portfolio (if applicable): comprehensive portfolio of professional or consulting activities related to faculty member's discipline
- 3.3.1.7 External reviewers (if applicable): member provides list of potential qualified outside reviewers
- 3.3.1.8 Other materials as applicable to a particular candidate, such as statements from core facility users regarding contributions from the candidate to their work

3.4 External and internal reviews

- 3.4.1 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 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. Candidates whose job duties include expectations of having independent external impact should have external reviews. Candidates who are largely part of teams with no expectations of independent impact will likely only need internal reviews.
- 3.4.3 Promotions to research associate professor and research full professor will have external reviews, and will also include internal reviews.
- 3.4.4 Before obtaining reviews, the review committee chair will discuss with the OVPRI the candidate and their job duties, and obtain agreement from the OVPRI on the type and quantity of reviews.
- 3.4.5 The review committee chair manages the process of obtaining the supervisor's evaluation, and internal and external reviews.

3.5 Criteria for promotion

- 3.5.1 The research core facilities rely 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 core facility, user

base, the university, and local, state, and national community, as applicable to the position.

- 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. Evaluations of research faculty funded by sponsored projects will also reflect the 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 be in the areas of research, teaching, and service activities, as appropriate given the candidate's job duties.
- 3.5.5 Criteria for promotion to senior research assistant and senior research assistant II
 - 3.5.5.1 In order to qualify for advancement to Senior Research Assistant I, the faculty member is expected to have made significant impact to the core facility, core facility users, and/or the University as a whole. In previous contract year evaluations, the faculty member should have exceeded the expectations of the position, rather than merely meeting expectations. As each core facility is unique, and research assistants fill a variety of roles, expectations of individual faculty members will vary considerably. The job description should serve as a guide, and each applicant for advancement should be evaluated on their own merits. Some examples of how a research assistant may demonstrate excellence include (but are not limited to):
 - Demonstrated initiative in achieving goals
 - Individual efforts that contributed to successful research publications, grants, internal publications, or patents
 - Cultivation of new information, skills or techniques that benefit facility users
 - Activity that leads to cost savings or greater efficiency in the facility
 - Teaching, training, or mentoring responsibilities
 - Presentations at the UO, at professional meetings, and/or at other institutions
 - Service contributions and community outreach
 - 3.5.5.2 The rank of Senior Research Assistant II is reserved for faculty members who have demonstrated exceptional impact to the core facility, its users, the University as a whole, or beyond the University. While a standardized set of criteria for all faculty does not exist, applicants should be able to demonstrate a

continued positive trajectory of professional accomplishments, such as:

- Authorship or acknowledgments on scientific papers, grants, internal publications, or patents
- Mastery of information, skills and techniques that benefit facility users and the larger community
- Contribution to the growth of the facility
- Managerial responsibilities
- Significant teaching, training, or mentoring responsibilities
- Presentations at the UO, at professional meetings, and/or at other institutions

3.5.5.3 Service contributions and community outreach. Article 19 of the collective bargaining agreement states that all research faculty become eligible for promotion after six years of service. Presumably this timeline originated in the world of tenure, where six years is considered a reasonable amount of time in which to develop a body of work. However, career research assistants in the core facilities operate under very different conditions, and in many cases will be able to demonstrate excellence in their positions in a shorter amount of time. The CBA allows for accelerated review for particularly meritorious cases. Research assistants who believe they have a strong case for accelerated review are encouraged to discuss the matter with their supervisors.

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

3.5.6.1 Similarly to Research Assistants, Research Associates are expected to have made significant impact to the core facility, core facility users, and/or the University as a whole in order to advance. In previous contract year evaluations, the faculty member should have exceeded the expectations of the position, rather than merely meeting expectations. As Research Associates are expected to operate more independently than Assistants, a greater degree of initiative is expected as well in order to justify advancement. Expectations of individual faculty members will vary. The job description should serve as a guide, and each applicant for advancement should be evaluated on their own merits. Some examples of how a research associate may demonstrate excellence include (but are not limited to):

- Individual efforts that contributed to successful research publications, grants, internal publications or patents
- Authorship on scientific papers, grants, or patents
- Managerial responsibilities
- Teaching, training, or mentoring responsibilities

- Cultivation of new skills or techniques that benefit facility users
 - Activity that leads to cost savings or greater efficiency in the facility
 - Presentations at the UO, at professional meetings, and/or at other institutions
 - Service contributions and community outreach
- 3.5.6.2 The rank of Senior Research Associate II is reserved for faculty who have demonstrated exceptional impact to the core facility, its users, the University as a whole, or beyond the University. While a standardized set of criteria for all faculty does not exist, applicants should be able to demonstrate a continued positive trajectory of professional accomplishments, such as:
- Authorship on scientific papers, grants, internal publications or patents
 - Mastery of information, skills and techniques that benefit facility users and the larger community
 - Contribution to the growth of the facility
 - Managerial responsibilities
 - Significant teaching, training, or mentoring responsibilities
 - Presentations at the UO, at professional meetings, and/or at other institutions, especially invited talks
 - Service contributions and community outreach
- 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 Development of a successful and ongoing program of independent research is a requirement for promotion. Research productivity is measured primarily by peer-reviewed scientific publications. Continued commitment to research is expected, as evidenced by a body of work that is in progress with a reasonable plan for future work. External evidence of impact on the field should be documented through external reviews, participation in conferences and workshops, speaking invitations, and awards. A consistent record of obtaining research grants is also an important factor. For promotion to Research Professor, the candidate is expected to be a leader in their field of expertise.
- 3.5.7.3 Some amount of service within the research core facilities and at the University level is expected. This includes serving on committees, organizing, and other activities not directly related to the faculty member's research and scientific activities, in so far as these are allowable activities given the sources of funds

for their positions. Outreach to the community is also considered a service activity.