

## ***Review and Promotion Policies of the Center for High Energy Physics***

### **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 for High Energy Physics (CHEP) 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 CHEP are reviewed annually, typically in the spring. During their first contract, career NTTF will 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. Generally there is one supervisor, but if there is more than one, each will be responsible for their area of assignment.
- 2.4 The annual evaluation will be based on 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 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 reflect progress towards goals set in the prior year.
  - 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 CHEP, 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 three TTF and career NTTF members who have a rank equivalent or higher to the aspirational rank of the candidate. This committee should include at least one research NTTF member of the appropriate rank, if such a faculty member is available. 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 director.
- 3.2.4 In the event that there are not enough members of CHEP 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 will include a voting summary in their evaluation letter.

#### **3.3 Review materials**

- 3.3.1 Curriculum vitae: comprehensive and current research, scholarly and creative activities and accomplishments, publications, appointments, presentations, and similar activities and accomplishments
- 3.3.2 Personal statement: 2-6 pages evaluating own performance measured against applicable criteria for promotion. This statement should address research and creative activity. Any teaching and service contributions should be included. The statement should also include discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.
- 3.3.3 Research portfolio: comprehensive portfolio of research and creative activity, including appropriate evidence of national or international recognition or impact

- 3.3.4 Service portfolio (if applicable): summary of service contributions to CHEP the university, or the community.
- 3.3.5 Teaching portfolio (if applicable): examples of mentorship of graduate research students; when classroom teaching has been done, include representative examples of syllabi or equivalent descriptions of course content and instructional expectations, examples of student work and exams, and similar material;
- 3.3.6 External reviewers (required): member provides list of potential qualified outside reviewers
- 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 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
  - 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 CHEP 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 research program of the Center.
  - 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 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 Evidence of significant impact on the research activities for which the candidate is responsible.
    - 3.5.5.2 Complete execution of goals and assignments in recent years.

- 3.5.6 Criteria for promotion to senior research associate and senior research associate II
- 3.5.6.1 Evidence of significant impact on the research activities for which the candidate is responsible.
  - 3.5.6.2 Evidence of recognition outside UO for contributions to research efforts.
  - 3.5.6.3 Strong record of impact in the research community derived from conference and workshop presentations and publications.
- 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 Research - Excellence in research is required. A successful and productive program of scholarly research is an absolute requirement for promotion. This is evaluated based on a number of indicators. The quality (as measured by the peer review process) of scientific publications is of paramount importance in gauging overall research productivity. External funding at a level required to do internationally competitive research is crucial. External evidence of international impact as documented through citation ratings, outside letters of evaluation from distinguished referees, participation in conferences and workshops, and invited talks are among the factors considered.
  - 3.5.7.3 Service - Faculty members in CHEP are expected to contribute to sustaining and enhancing the community through service activities, in so far as their funding allows them to do so. Faculty members generally are expected to participate in CHEP governance and share in organizational work. The assessment of service contributions plays a minor role in evaluation of the faculty member for promotion to research associate professor, but the evaluation for promotion to research full professor should involve a clear demonstration of leadership in either administrative or service activities. Furthermore, this increased level of commitment to professional service should extend beyond the Center.
  - 3.5.7.4 Teaching - Excellence in teaching, either in the classroom or as mentor within the research environment, is encouraged. An important aspect of the teaching mission of CHEP is the training and mentoring of students. For research professors (assistant, associate, or full) supervision and mentoring of graduate students working on graduate student thesis projects is the most important way this is done, although working with undergraduates is also undertaken.