Institute of Neuroscience: 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, ION 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 ION are reviewed annually, typically in the spring. During their first contract, career NTTF will be also be reviewed halfway through the contract period.
    2.2 The Business Manager is responsible for setting timelines for annual reviews, and communicating deadlines to supervisors. Supervisors will be responsible for communicating to their staff.
    2.3 Supervisors will perform the annual evaluation. Where there is more than one supervisor, each will be responsible for their area of assignment.
    2.4 The annual evaluation is based upon the responsibilities and job expectations 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 Business Manager 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 Business 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. 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 Business 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 ION has research NTTF promotion reviews, the Director will appoint 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 3-5 TTF and/or 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 continent 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 ION 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   Required of all candidates:

      3.3.1.1   Supervisor evaluation and recommendation.

      3.3.1.2   Curriculum Vitae.

      3.3.1.3   Personal Statement: A 2-6 page evaluating their performance measured against the applicable criteria for promotion. It should also address:

            3.3.1.3.1   The subjects of research, teaching (if relevant), scholarship (if relevant), and creative activity (if relevant).

            3.3.1.3.2   Contributions to the institute, university, profession or the community.

            3.3.1.3.3   A discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.

      3.3.1.4   Statement of Waiver/Non-waiver.

    3.3.1.5 Position Description of previous duties and responsibilities.
    3.3.1.6 Current Position Description showing increase of duties and responsibilities.
    3.3.1.7 Current Contract.
  3.3.2 Required if relevant:
    3.3.2.1 External/internal letters of recommendation (not required but encouraged).
    3.3.2.2 Scholarship portfolio.
    3.3.2.3 Service portfolio.
    3.3.2.4 Professional Activities portfolio.
    3.3.2.5 Teaching evaluations.
    3.3.2.6 Other materials as applicable to a particular candidate.

3.4 External and internal reviews
  3.4.1 Review for promotion to senior research assistant/associate I and senior research assistant/associate II will generally include only internal reviews, unless the candidate has job duties that are to create an external impact.
  3.4.2 Promotions to research associate professor and research full professor will have external reviews, but may also include internal reviews.
  3.4.3 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.
  3.4.4 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 ION relies on the following primary indicators to evaluate faculty performance: (a) quality of work; (b) effectiveness or impact of effort; and (c) the individual's contribution to ION, the university, and local, state, and national community.
  3.5.2 Promotion is not an automatic process; employees are not 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 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, given the candidate's job duties. Candidate's statement should describe opportunities they have had to contribute to the University¹s goals of equity and inclusion.
  3.5.5 The following criteria will be used where applicable for promotion to <u>senior research assistant and senior research assistant II:</u>

	3.5.5.1	Demonstrated growth and excellence related to outreach and/or technical assistance activities as defined in the job description.
	3.5.5.2	If Research Assistant positions include managerial responsibilities, demonstrated excellence related to outcomes of the unit managed or project supervised.
	3.5.5.3	Demonstrated excellence around innovation, research outcomes, and research productivity.
	3.5.5.4	Progressively expanded their job duties as defined in the original job description compared to current job description.

3.5.6 Criteria for promotion to <u>senior research associate and senior research associate II</u> based on the growth the individual has demonstrated in their job description. The following factors may be used where relevant:

3.5.6.1 Demonstrated excellence related to expertise and innovation in relevant research techniques and tools.

3.5.6.2 Demonstrated engagement in discovery/analysis/outreach; involvement in dissemination of findings.

3.5.6.3 Demonstrated engagement in proposal submissions;

3.5.6.4 Increased institutional service.

3.5.6.5 Demonstrated engagement in training/education.

3.5.6.6 Increased managerial responsibilities.

3.5.6.7 Continued success in meeting outcomes/deliverables of assigned projects.

3.5.7 Criteria for promotion to <u>research associate professor and research full professor</u>

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 Demonstrated excellence in the professional products or outcomes (peer reviewed publications in high quality journals, books published, white papers produced).

3.5.7.3 Active and notable participation in professional communities (presentations, posters, institutional/national/international professional committees, journal editorial board service within guidelines appropriate to the funding source).

3.5.7.4 Demonstrated excellence in institutional service, number of submissions for external support for research projects.

3.5.7.5 Demonstrated excellence in the number of active awards managed, and/or impact of professional work on the field/profession/public policy.

3.5.7.6 Demonstrated excellence in education/teaching/training, in so far as education/teaching/training is a job duty.