

*CBIRT*  
*Review and Promotion Policy*

### **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 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 Center are reviewed at least annually, typically in the spring or 60 days before the end of the contract period. During their first contract, career NTTF will be also be reviewed halfway through the contract period.
- 2.2 The director 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, the primary supervisor will perform the review, and secondary/tertiary supervisors will provide input to the primary.
- 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, 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 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 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. Faculty 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 should typically be done as part of the annual review process, but may occur as late as June 30.
- 3.1.2 The 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 Center, the director appoints a promotion review committee as well as a review committee chair. In the event that the director is being promoted, the VPRI or designee will appoint the committee.
- 3.2.2 The committee will be made up of 2-3 career TTF or NTTF members who have a rank equivalent or higher to the aspirational rank of the candidate. Prior to appointing a funding continent faculty NTTF, the director will confirm that their funding permits participation in this committee.
- 3.2.3 The review committee may include the candidate's immediate supervisor or the director.
- 3.2.4 In the event that there are not enough members of the Center at the appropriate rank to make up a committee, the director 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. The [director/manager] will include a voting summary in their evaluation letter.

### 3.3 Review materials

- 3.3.1.1 Other materials as applicable to a particular candidate

### 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 by their immediate supervisors, unless the candidate has job duties that are to create an external impact.
- 3.4.2 Promotions to research associate I and research associate II will include reviews by their immediate supervisors and internal reviews by the promotion review committee.
- 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.

- 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 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 Performance is ranked according to a three-point scale as follows: (1) does not meet expectations; (2) meets expectations; (3) exceeds expectations. These rankings will be used to determine promotion eligibility, as detailed in sections 3.5.6-3.5.8.
  - 3.5.3 Promotion is not an automatic process, awarded for having put in their time, but rather awarded for excellence.
  - 3.5.4 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.
  - 3.5.5 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. Candidate's statement should describe opportunities they have had to contribute to the University's goals of equity and inclusion
  - 3.5.6 Criteria for promotion to senior research assistant I and to senior research assistant II
    - 3.5.6.1 To advance from research assistant I to research assistant II, need to achieve a rating of "3" using the ranking scale detailed in 3.5.2 across 5 out of 6 of these categories with no less than a "2" in the remaining category, plus supervisor recommendation:
      - (a) Job Knowledge and Skills;
      - (b) Initiative / Flexibility;
      - (c) Responsibility;
      - (d) Work Relationships;
      - (e) Organizational skills;
      - (f) Communication
  - 3.5.7 Criteria for promotion to senior research associate I and to senior research associate II
    - 3.5.7.1 To advance from senior research associate 1 to senior research need to achieve a rating of "3" across 5 out of 7 of these categories with no less than a "2" in the remaining categories, supervisor recommendation, plus successful progress on goals as determined in annual evaluation:

- (a) Job Knowledge and Skills;
- (b) Initiative /Flexibility;
- (c) Responsibility;
- (d) Work Relationships;
- (e) Organizational skills;
- (f) Communication;
- (g) Managing others

3.5.8 Criteria for promotion to research associate professor and research professor

3.5.8.1 Generally, the criteria for promotion in this classification are comparable to criteria for tenure-track faculty, including national and international impact of their scholarship. To advance from research associate professor to research professor, need to achieve an average rating of “2.5” across these 10 core competencies, recommendation of supervisor, plus successful progress on goals as determined in annual evaluation:

- (a) Job Knowledge and Skills;
- (b) Initiative /Flexibility;
- (c) Responsibility;
- (d) Work Relationships;
- (e) Organizational skills;
- (f) Communication;
- (g) Managing others;
- (h) Innovation/Quality Improvement;
- (i) Commitment to Service & Results;
- (j) Commitment to an inclusive community