

**Review and Promotion Policies for
Career Non–Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF) in the
Center for the Study of Women in Society (CSWS)**

1.0 Collective Bargaining Agreement Processes

Review and promotion procedures are specified in Article 19 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. This document only elaborates on those components of review and promotion that are not prescribed in the CBA. When conducting contract and promotion reviews, CSWS 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 CSWS are reviewed annually. During their first contract, career NTTF will be also be reviewed halfway through the contract period.
- 2.2 The CSWS director is responsible for setting timelines for annual reviews, and communicating deadlines to faculty.
- 2.3 The director performs the annual evaluation.
- 2.4 The annual evaluation is 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.
- 2.5 At the time of the annual evaluation, the director, with input from the faculty member, will set individual goals for the upcoming year. Progress toward these goals will be reviewed as part of the annual review for the subsequent year.
- 2.6 Review materials
 - 2.6.1 The director is responsible for developing and maintaining evaluation forms.
 - 2.6.2 In preparation for an annual review, the faculty member will provide the director with a complete updated CV and a report on activities and accomplishments that reflects progress toward goals set a year prior.
 - 2.6.3 For each faculty member being reviewed, the director will gather the following: a current job description, and all of the documents provided to them by the faculty member. This will form the basis for the evaluation.
 - 2.6.4 The director and the faculty member should sign the 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 the director 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 CSWS, the director appoints a promotion review committee as well as a review committee chair.
- 3.2.2 The committee will be made up of three faculty members (TTF or career NTTF) who have a rank equivalent to or higher than the aspirational rank of the candidate. This committee will normally be drawn from members of the CSWS advisory board, but may include other CSWS affiliate faculty if necessary and appropriate. Prior to appointing a funding contingent faculty NTTF to this committee, the director will confirm that their funding permits participation.
- 3.2.3 The review committee will not include the director.
- 3.2.4 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 to the OVPRI.

3.3 Review materials

- 3.3.1 The chair of the review committee will solicit the following materials: the position descriptions and statement of duties and responsibilities; an up-to-date curriculum vitae for the candidate; a two-to-six page personal statement developed by the candidate evaluating their performance measured against the applicable criteria for promotion; letters of evaluation from the director, associate director, and other supervisors as applicable; a service portfolio demonstrating evidence of the candidate's service to CSWS and the university; external reviewers' letters (if applicable).

- 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, 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. For those whose job duties include expectations of having independent external impact, external reviews are expected.
 - 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 the director's evaluation, and internal and external reviews.
- 3.5 Criteria for promotion
- 3.5.1 The director 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.
 - 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 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.
 - 3.5.5 Criteria for promotion to senior research assistant and senior research assistant II
 - 3.5.5.1 At each level from research assistant to senior research assistant I and II, faculty members will be expected to demonstrate progressively higher levels of responsibility, as well as excellence in their job duties.
 - 3.5.6 The criteria and standards for promotion will include sustained, high-quality, innovative contributions to the mission of CSWS and ongoing, responsible service and leadership to CSWS, the university, and the community, within the scope of the candidate's position description.