UO DEPARTMENT OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE NTTF REVIEW AND PROMOTION POLICY

Approved by the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs: January 19, 2017

PURPOSE

This policy outlines the Landscape Architecture Department's policies and procedures for conducting review and promotion assessments for Non-Tenure Track Faculty. This policy applies to all represented faculty and is intended to comply with all provisions of Article 19 of the CBA. To the extent there are any discrepancies or inconsistencies, CBA Article 19 controls for represented faculty. This policy also applies to all unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy.

1. **Inclusion and Limitations**

   Career NTTF are eligible for regular reviews associated with contract renewal and promotion reviews per the terms of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). The following process and procedures are utilized by the department for these reviews. It is noted that although a review for promotion may be substituted for a review for contract renewal, the decision on whether or not to renew a contract must be made independently from the promotion review itself. If review or promotion procedures change during the course of a faculty member's employment, they may elect between current criteria and those in effect during the six years prior to the initiation of a given review or promotion process.

   Pro Tem (adjunct) faculty are evaluated by way of end-of-term student course evaluations. While not required, adjunct faculty may request peer evaluation of teaching. There are no promotion opportunities for those appointed as adjunct NTTF.

2. **Evaluation Criteria**

   2.1. Review – Evaluation Criteria will mirror the department's Merit Policy criteria, with the caveat that weighting of the review criteria will reflect a realistic balance of duties. Career NTTF must be reviewed in each contract period prior to consideration for renewal or once every three academic or fiscal years of employment, whichever is sooner. If a career NTTF member has multiple contracts in a year, only one review per fiscal academic year is required. Review will consider performance since last review. Career NTTF will be evaluated on the quality of their teaching and other professional responsibilities in proportion to the FTE in their job descriptions.

   2.2. Promotion – Evaluation Criteria will mirror the department's Merit Policy criteria with the following modifications, or otherwise as needed to reflect a realistic balance of duties:

   2.2.1. Review Period – The candidate will be reviewed for the period of time over which the candidate established themselves as eligible for promotion (see Article 19, Sec. 5).

   2.2.2. Consideration of Individual Professional Responsibilities and Contributions

   A candidate must be considered for merit criteria in each dimension of Teaching; Research, Scholarship, and Creative Practice; and Service provided in the candidate's job description.

   Additionally, a candidate may opt to include consideration of merit criteria in any dimension of Teaching; Research, Scholarship, and Creative Practice; and Service even if

the candidate is not normally assigned duties in those designated areas. In such cases, the candidate will submit a written request to the Department Head detailing the weights they would like used for the promotion evaluation, including merit criteria from their job description and additional criteria the candidate wishes to be reviewed for. The Department Head may either accept or modify the weights of these merit criteria, and will provide the candidate with a final proposal for regular and alternative criteria weights. The Head may not depart unreasonably from the contractual weights or unreasonably emphasize activities that contribute little to the achievement of University duties. The candidate must notify the Department Head in writing whether they choose to be evaluated per the Department Head's alternative criteria weights or the weights indicated by the candidate's job description. The criteria weights may not be altered by either the candidate or evaluators once this written determination is made.

2.2.3. Standards of Performance for Promotion

Promotions are granted for performance that is clearly above expectations as defined by the Department's merit criteria. Promotions are granted on the basis of whether or not in the academic and professional judgment of the evaluators, the candidate has performed to a standard where they meet the criteria to qualify for a rating of either "Exceeds Expectations" or "Highest Expectations" under the merit criteria. Either of these two standards must be met for a majority of the most heavily weighted merit criteria applied to each review. If a majority of such ratings is marginally lacking then any ratings of exceeds or highest expectations among the less weighted merit criteria can tip the balance in favor of promotion. Ratings of "Does Not Meet Expectations" for any of the merit criteria under review can disqualify promotion.

3. Periodic Performance Reviews

3.1. The review process will include an opportunity for the Career NTTF to discuss their efforts & performance with a supervisor at least once during each contract period. **Frequency** – Reviews are conducted in each contract period, or every three years, whichever is sooner.

3.2. Timing – In years where a merit assessment is performed, the period of merit assessment will apply to all NTTF in the Department. If a merit assessment is not required in relation to merit pay increases, the Department Head will follow the merit process to perform a similar assessment not connected to a merit increase.

3.3. Criteria – The reviews will employ the department's Merit Policy criteria, with the caveat that weighting of the review criteria will reflect a realistic balance of duties. For instructional Career NTTF, student course evaluations will be offered for all courses with five or more students. The evaluation of teaching will include a review of evaluations for each course taught and one peer review of teaching per contract period. Notice of a peer review will be given at least 1-week before a peer review is conducted. To the extent applicable, the evaluation of scholarship, research, and creative activity will include an assessment of work quality, impact on the field nationally and internationally, and overall contribution to the discipline or program. In evaluating the performance of required professional development activities, the review will consider the availability of professional development funds, opportunities for professional development, and the Career NTTF faculty member's efforts to secure funding. Career NTTF

will be evaluated on the quality of their teaching and other professional responsibilities in proportion to the FTE in their job descriptions.

3.4. Materials – Review materials will be submitted in accordance with the department's Merit Policy. As part of each contract review, Career NTTF will have an opportunity to submit a personal statement containing information relevant to their performance of assigned duties and responsibilities.

3.5. Documentation & Notification – Documentation and notification will be provided in accordance with the department's Merit Policy.

4. Promotion Reviews

The Landscape Architecture Department affirms the NTTF Promotion process and procedures outlined in Article 19 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and provides the following department specific clarifications:

4.1. Eligibility – Eligibility for NTTF Promotion is provided as described in the CBA (see Article 19, Sec. 5), without modification.

4.2. Accelerated Review – An accelerated promotion review may occur in particularly meritorious cases as determined by the Provost or designee in consultation with the appropriate vice president, dean, department or unit head, and candidate.

4.3. Credit for Prior Service – Credit for prior service is provided as described in the CBA (see Article 19, Sec. 8), without modification.

4.4. Multiple or Joint Appointments – For NTTF holding multiple or joint appointments, a memorandum will be completed at the time or hire or assignment specifying expectations for promotion review and identifying how the promotion process will be handled among the units. Such memorandum is not valid unless approved in writing by the bargaining unit faculty member and the Provost or designee.

4.5. Initiation of Promotion Process – Candidates wishing to be considered for promotion should notify the department head in the Spring term prior to the year when promotion is sought. Upon or before the date provided by the Head, candidates will provide the following:

4.5.1. Curriculum Vitae – A comprehensive and current curriculum vitae including the candidate's current research, scholarly and creative activities and accomplishments, including publications, appointments, presentations, professional achievements that contribute to University work, and similar activities and accomplishments.

4.5.2. Personal Statement – A 2-6 page personal statement where the candidate evaluates their own performance measured against the Department's promotion criteria. The personal statement should expressly address the subjects of teaching; scholarship, research and creative activity; and service contributions to the department, school, university, profession and community, as are consistent with their terms of employment and any additional merit criteria the candidate wishes to be evaluated against, as per Section 2.2.2. The statement must also include discussion of the candidate's contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.

4.5.3. Supervisors' Letter(s) of Evaluation

4.5.4. The following documents only to the extent applicable:

4.5.4.1. Teaching Portfolio – Representative examples of course syllabi or equivalent descriptions of course content and instructional expectations for courses taught by

the faculty member, examples of student work and exams, other similar materials the candidate would like considered.

4.5.4.2. Scholarship Portfolio – A comprehensive portfolio of scholarship, research and creative activity, and appropriate evidence of national or international recognition or impact.

4.5.4.3. Service Portfolio – Evidence of the candidate's service contributions to the department, school, university, profession, and community.

4.5.4.4. Professional Activities Portfolio – A comprehensive portfolio of professional or consulting activities relative to the candidate's faculty appointment.

4.5.4.5. External Reviewers – A list of qualified outside reviewers. The committee decides whether or not internal and/or external reviews (over and above supervisors' evaluations) will be used in a given promotion case. The use of such reviewers and the process for their selection will be discussed with the candidate in advance of solicitation of reviewers. External reviewers will be selected based on an ability to present a knowledgeable and objective evaluation of the candidate and their qualifications.

4.6. Waiver of Access to Materials – Candidates may choose to waive access to see any or all of the evaluative materials used for promotion by providing a written statement in advance of the promotion process. Candidates choosing to waive access to these documents maintain all rights afforded to them under the CBA with regards to use of redacted version of the documents in a denial review process.

4.7. Up or Out – The department affirms that there is no "Up or Out" promotion requirement with regards to its Non-Tenure Track Faculty members.

4.8. Notice of Meetings - A candidate will receive at least three days' notice of any meeting or hearing which the member is invited or required to attend, with a dean or the Provost or designee regarding recommendations or decisions on promotion. The candidate may have a colleague or Union representative present at the meeting as an observer.

4.9. Evaluation File – The promotion review file should include the following information:

4.9.1. Statement of duties and responsibilities
4.9.2. Curriculum vitae
4.9.3. Conditions of appointment
4.9.4. Merit criteria for promotion
4.9.5. Personal statement
4.9.6. Supervisors' letters of evaluation
4.9.7. Professional activities portfolio (as applicable)
4.9.8. Teaching portfolio (as applicable)
4.9.9. Peer reviews of teaching (as applicable)
4.9.10. Scholarship portfolio (as applicable)
4.9.11. Service portfolio (as applicable)
4.9.12. External reviews (as applicable)
4.9.13. Department Head and/or unit committee recommendations
4.9.14. Dean's recommendation
4.9.15. Waiver of access to materials (as applicable)

4.10. **Review by Department or Unit** – Following the department's review and evaluation of the promotion file, the Department Head or unit committee will prepare a report on the merits of the promotion case with consultation in good faith with the core faculty. The report will include the department promotion committee recommendation, a voting summary, and the Department Head's independent recommendation. The file will then be sent to the Dean or Dean's designee for review.

4.11. **Review by Vice President, Dean, or Director** – The vice president, dean, or director, as appropriate, ("Reviewer") will review the file and consult with appropriate persons and may ask for and document additional non-confidential information. Once the review is complete, the Reviewer will prepare a separate report and recommendation. The Reviewer will share their report and recommendation with the candidate and allow them 10 days from the date of receipt of the report to provide responsive material or information, which shall be included in the evaluation file. The Reviewer will then submit the complete evaluation file to the Provost or designee.

4.12. **Review by Provost or designee** – The Provost or designee will review the file, with input from Academic Affairs and the Office of the Vice President for Research and Innovation, as appropriate, and decide whether to grant or deny promotion. The candidate will be notified of the decision in writing.

4.13. **Assumption of New Rank** – Successful candidates for promotion will assume their new rank beginning with the next academic or fiscal year or the nearest next term of employment should their contract not begin with fall term.

4.14. **Reapplication for Promotion** – An unsuccessful candidate for promotion may continue employment at their current rank as long as eligible to do so under the CBA and university policy. Candidates who are denied promotion may reapply for promotion after having been employed by the department for an additional three years at an average of 0.3 FTE or greater, accrued at no greater than three terms per academic year.

4.15. **Appeal of Promotion Denial** – Faculty who are denied promotion may appeal the decision through the procedures in Article 21 of the CBA or other university appeals processes which apply to faculty not covered by the CBA.

4.16. **Withdrawal of Application** – A candidate may withdraw an application for promoting by providing a written request to the Provost and Dean at any time before the Provost's decision.