Career NTTF Review & Promotion Process 2017-2019
American English Institute (AEI)

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. For NTTF holding joint or multiple appointments, a memorandum will be completed at time of hire or assignment specifying expectations for promotion review and identifying how the promotion process will be handled among the units. 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.

Faculty are evaluated by the Annual Review Committee in the areas of teaching, (alternatively or in addition: administration or project work), professional development, and service. These areas are consistent with university requirements for evaluating all non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) members. Information from the ARC is used by the Executive Director in making personnel decisions, such as hiring, merit raises, and in cases of renewal/non-renewal. If a faculty member seeks promotion in a year when a contract renewal review is due, only a single review must be completed. The decision on whether to promote or renew must be made independently.

Please refer to CBA Article 19 for promotion eligibility standards. Guidelines and criteria for promotion are included at the end of this document.

Documentation and Submission Deadlines
Faculty
- Formative Observation deadline
  By Friday at 5pm of University Week 9 (IEP Week 8) in the fall term of the calendar year to be reviewed, _faculty_ submit to AEI Human Resources the following:
    - *(required) Evidence of formative observation (see formative observation tool options below)

- Feedback and support deadline
  By Monday at 9am after University Week 10 (IEP Week 9) in the fall term of the calendar year to be reviewed, _faculty_ submit to AEI Human Resources the following:
    - (optional) Faculty Feedback to Administrators Forms completed by submitting faculty member as a peer critique of faculty with administrative duties (forms located in AEI Network/Annual Review Materials/1-FAC and Admin Feedback Forms)
    - (optional) Administrators Feedback to Faculty Forms completed by submitting faculty member as a peer critique of faculty with teaching administrative duties (forms located in AEI Network/Annual Review Materials/1-FAC and Admin Feedback Forms)
    - (optional) Current, signed, dated letters of support from direct supervisors, committee chairs, project supervisors, lead teachers, or others who can comment on the quality and quantity of your work.
    - (optional) Other documentation that evidences existence and quality of work for which you are claiming points on the metric.

- Metric/CV Submission Window

Between Wednesday 9am and Friday 5pm of University Week 1 in the winter term after the calendar year to be reviewed, _faculty submit to AEI Human Resources the following:_
- *(required) Updated vita in standard AEI format (see below)
- *(required) Completed Self-report Metric (see self-report metric below; the metric will be completed in an Excel sheet, not in a word table as here)

AEI Human Resources
- By December 31 of the calendar year to be reviewed, _AEI Human Resources_ provides:
  - *(required) Student Evaluations (numeric and signed comments) for all courses taught with number of students 5 or more
  - *(required) Student Evaluations Summary sheet unique to each faculty member (copy to receiving faculty by Monday of University Week 1 (IEP Week 0)
  - *(required) Summative Observations [peer reviews] (see observation form below; one summative observation per contract period required, not obligatory annually on 2+-yr. contracts)
  - *(required) Faculty Feedback to Administrators Forms completed by another faculty member as peer critique of submitting faculty member's administrative work (copy to receiving faculty by Monday of University Week 1 (IEP Week 0)
  - *(required) Administrators Feedback to Faculty Forms optional completed by an administrative faculty member as peer critique of submitting faculty member's instructional work (copy to receiving faculty by Monday of University Week 1 (IEP Week 0)

Committee Constitution
In the beginning weeks of fall term, the Academic Director lists on a ballot all faculty eligible (those Career Track faculty who have been reviewed at least twice themselves) to serve on the Annual Review Committee (ARC), and sends out a survey to all faculty to vote. Roughly half of the ARC (typically 8-12 members total) are carried over in any given year, continuing in a two-year commitment. The number of faculty elected will depend on how many members have been carried over from the previous year. Once the ARC is constituted, the committee meets and then directs the Academic Director as to how they would like the chair of the committee to be chosen. The eventual chair begins communications and arrangements with the Assistant Director of Human Resources as to timeline, processing of submitted documents, etc.

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.

Annual Review and Promotion Report Processing
When the reviews are complete:
1. The ARC chair or designee delivers all relevant documents   for all employees reviewed to the Assistant Director of Human Resources or provides notification, if files are in electronic versions.
2. The Assistant Director of Human Resources and staff file all reviews and generate a summary sheet/sign-off form for each reviewed employee, which is placed in a sealed envelope and placed in personal mailboxes in hard copy.
3. This form needs to be read and received by the reviewed employees, signed and returned to the Assistant Director of Human Resources' office by the date stated on the form, whether there is acceptance or non-acceptance on the part of the reviewed employee. (Non-acceptance may be in the form of something as simple as noticing an error in points calculation, or a typo, or something

more complex—concern that the review committee intentionally, with rationale provided, did not award points that the reviewed employee had expected would be awarded.)

4. The Assistant Director of Human Resources files as complete the reviews with the acceptance of the analysis, and returns to the committee chair any reviews where there was disagreement.
5. The review committee reconvenes, either in person or remotely via email, to either:
    a. 'resolve' the non-acceptance by making change(s), unanimously, or not making change(s), unanimously.
    b. attempt to resolve, and then clearly state intra-committee variance on whether to make change(s), in an email to the Academic Director.
    c. In the case of 'b' above, the entire annual review file for the employee in question is delivered to the Academic Director, who reviews the complete file alongside the reviewed employee's comments concerning non-acceptance, and notes from the secondary review meeting or correspondence forwarded by the committee members. The Academic Director makes the final decision, in a case where the ARC cannot come to a conclusion in response to non-acceptance.
6. If resolved by the ARC, the ARC chair or designee delivers secondarily reviewed files to the Assistant Director of Human Resources.
7. If resolved by the Academic Director in favor of the employee, the Academic Director delivers secondarily reviewed files to the Assistant Director of Human Resources, who then distributes resolved review sign-off to employee in question.
8. If the result of resolution is reconfirmation of the committee's original review, the Academic Director will meet with the employee to explain the resolution. Under no circumstances is the employee to address any member of the ARC in further discussion about the review. In cases where the resolution entails an overall 'performance does not meet expectations,' or in cases where the performance issue in question may involve a progressive discipline process or mandatory mentoring for the employee, the Asst. Director of Human Resources will also be present for this meeting.
9. If, after a reconfirmation of an original review, the employee wishes to file a response for their file, this is permitted.
10. The Asst. Director of Human Resources will then file both the original and secondary review documents, and the matter will be closed.
11. Any employee may request a meeting with the Academic Director regarding the content of their review, whether acceptance or non-acceptance is stated.
12. A third appeal may be lodged with the Executive Director.
13. An unsuccessful candidate for promotion may continue employment at the current rank as long as eligible to do so under the CBA and university policy. NTTF who are denied promotion may reapply for promotion after having been employed by the university for an additional three years at an average of 0.3 FTE or greater, accrued at no greater than three terms per academic year. Unsuccessful candidates may also appeal as provided by Article 21 of the CBA (Tenure and Promotion Denial Appeal) or other university appeals processes which apply to faculty not covered by the CBA. A candidate may withdraw an application for promotion in writing to the Provost and the dean at any time before the Provost's decision.
14. Opportunity to discuss performance and effort with the Academic Director will be provided upon request to all instructors of any contract status (adjunct or career track) throughout the academic year.
15. 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.

CV for AEI Annual Review/Promotion Template 2017-2019
(include dates for all entries)

NAME

EDUCATION
>PhD, EdD   University, location, date degree conferred
>MA, MS   University, location, date degree conferred
>BA, BS   University, location, date degree conferred
>Certificates (some people have CELT or other certificates)

TEACHING
Academic Appointments
>Courses taught
>>Duties and Responsibilities

ADMINISTRATION
Administrative Appointments
>Roles held, location, dates
>>Duties and Responsibilities

OTHER RELEVANT WORK EXPERIENCE
>Roles held, location, dates
>>Duties and Responsibilities

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
Publications*
>Published *(separate peer-reviewed, non peer-reviewed, and works in press/publication)*
>>Books
>>Articles
>>Book Chapters
>>Reviews
>>Others (newsletter, guide, materials)
>Unpublished
>>Books
>>Articles
>>Book Chapters
>>Reviews
>>Others (newsletter, guide, materials)

Conference Presentations, Workshops, Colloquiums, English Language Specialist or other teacher-training workshops

Other (In-house presentations, webinars, etc.)

Attendance at conferences at conferences and workshops

Learning groups, etc

SERVICE
Service to Department/Unit

Committee work
LTS student support
Other

Service to University (outside the AEI)

Service to the Field

Service to the Public (as relevant to your profession)

MEMBERSHIP IN ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES, PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

HONORS/AWARDS/DISTINCTIONS

GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS

INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE

LANGUAGES SPOKEN

* Ideally, the CV should list publications and presentations in reverse chronological order. There must be clear separation among published and unpublished materials, and publications should be separated by peer-reviewed and not peer-reviewed in categories that may include the following: Books, Articles, Book Chapters, Reviews, Other. Works that have been fully accepted for publication (ie: are "in press" with no further author revisions beyond reading the copy-edited ms. or page proofs) may be listed among publications IF the file includes letters from press and journal editors attesting that the work is fully complete and "in press" or "in production." These letters (emails are fine) should precede the most recent iterations of the CV in the CV section. Work in progress must listed be in a separate category. The CV should be straightforward in identifying publications that have been reprinted – eg, a journal article that then appears in an edited collection. These are not separate publications – best to have one citation that lists the publication and the various places and dates of appearance.

AEI Annual Review Self-Report Metric 2017-2019

Possible Category	Pts	Activity Description	T	A D	PRJ	SVC	PD	Evidence/comments
TEACHING								
Teaching	NA	**Overall (average) instructor and course evaluations at 3.75 or above**						
Teaching	NA	**One summative observation that meets expectations**						
Teaching	NA	**One formative observation**						
Teaching	NA	**No negative feedback from direct supervisor**						
Teaching	NA	**Second summative observation that meets expectations (if overall course evals are under 3.75, if first summative observation does not meet expectations or if teacher receives student complaints)**						
Teaching	1+	IEP Lead teacher (per term)						
Teaching	1+	AEIS lead teacher or eLearning mentor/lead teacher (per course/per year)						
Teaching	1	Goal-setting and 3 formative activities (please complete and attach the form)						
Teaching	1	1 or more new preps during the calendar year (point for each)						
Teaching	1	Significant course redesign or creation of new course (point for each)						
Teaching	1	Overall instructor and course evaluations at 4.25 or above.						

Possible Category	Pts	Activity Description	T	A D	PRJ	SVC	PD	Evidence/comments
Teaching	1	Summative observation that exceeds expectations						
Teaching	2	Positive feedback from direct supervisor						
ADMINISTRATION								
Admin	NA	**Feedback from direct supervisor that "meets" expectations (required)**						
Admin	NA	**Ongoing evaluation of program and procedures, program development or revision**						
Admin	NA	**Successful completion of 2-5 stated outcomes (list outcomes)**						
Admin	NA	**Formative development activity (please complete and attach form)**						
Admin	1	Provides support and/or training to AEI or UO						
Admin	1	Positive feedback from faculty						
Admin	1	Goal-setting and 3 formative activities (please complete and attach the form)						
Admin	1	Evidence of annual administrative data tracking/collection as it relates to position: brief explanation						
Admin	2	Feedback from direct supervisor that "exceeds" expectations						
Admin	2	Successful completion of 6+ stated outcomes (list outcomes)						
Admin	2	Evidence of external communication/ collaboration with individuals outside of the AEI (such as UO or partner institutions)						

Possible Category	Pts	Activity Description	T	AD	PRJ	SVC	PD	Evidence/comments
Admin	2	Program development or significant revision: brief explanation						
Admin	2	Provide, support, and/or make available ongoing training and/or professional development for AEI faculty and staff: brief explanation						
Admin	1+	Other (please explain)						
PROJECT WORK								
Project	NA	**Successful completion of 2-5 stated outcomes (list outcomes)**						
Project	NA	**Effectively communicates and collaborates with others (email, online docs and F2F/Skype meetings)**						
Project	NA	**Contributes ideas, resources and materials creation**						
Project	NA	**Feedback from direct supervisor that "meets" expectations (required)**						
Project	NA	**Formative development activity (please complete and attach form)**						
Project	1	Engages in research to ensure best practices						
Project	1	Project that enhances AEI student and/or faculty experience						

Possible Category	Pts	Activity Description	T	A D	PRJ	SVC	PD	Evidence/comments
Project	1	Goal-setting and 3 formative activities (please complete and attach the form)						
Project	2	Successful completion of 6+ stated outcomes (list outcomes)						
Project	2	Produces high-quality work that demonstrates creativity and innovation						
Project	2	Feedback from direct supervisor that "exceeds" expectations						
Project	2	Project work significantly raises the AEI/UO profile nationally or internationally						
Project	1+	Other (please explain)						
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT								
PD	1	Attendance at professional conference in the field, not presenting						
PD	1	Submission of proposal to local, regional, national or international conference (attach evidence of proposal)						
PD	2+	One state, regional, national or international presentation, webinar or workshop (non-refereed or refereed). Includes co-presentations which were co-prepared but not presented by one or more individuals due to funding or other reasons for non-attendance.)						

Possible Category	Pts	Activity Description	T	AD	PRJ	SVC	PD	Evidence/comments
PD	3	Invited presenter at regional conference (attach invitation)						
PD	2	Teaching tip or short article in newsletter or professional publication (approx. 500-1,500 words)						
PD	2-4	Graduate level coursework that directly contributes to professional development						
PD	2-4	Teaching abroad that enhances personal teaching effectiveness or leadership and UO AEI visibility (short-term, not under AEI auspices)						
PD	2-4	Editor of newsletter, journal or ELT book						
PD	4	Invited high-profile national/international presentation/workshop (plenary or keynote speaker, etc.) (Attach official invitation)						
PD	4	Feature (full-length) article in juried journal (local/regional/national/international) or chapter in book (refereed publication)						
PD	8	Ph.D. awarded in TESOL, Linguistics, or a closely related field on a subject that enhances UO AEI teaching or research						
PD	1+	Present on-campus, in-house, local, presentation, webinar or workshop (one point per)						
PD	1+	Professional coursework (e.g. language class, education course, Linguistics, any course that directly contributes to						

Possible Category	Pts	Activity Description	T	AD	PRJ	SVC	PD	Evidence/comments
		professional growth) (non credit or audit.)						
PD	1+	Attendance at presentations/workshops (i.e. TEP, faculty professional development meetings, webinars, etc.) - 1 point per 10 attended						
PD	1+	Other (please explain)						
PD	2+	National/international consulting/teacher training - for example English Language Specialist (explain)						
SERVICE								
Service	1+	Grant writing without FTE (1 point per 10 hours served) - list hours in comments						
Service	1+	Subbing (1 point per 10 hours served) - list hours in comments						
Service	1+	AEI or UO Committee member or chair (1 point per 10 hours served) - list hours in comments						
Service	1+	Other (1 point per 10 hours served, please explain, Ex. Short term observers, long term observers, subbing less than 10 hours, interns, being the non-initiator of a formative observation etc.)						
Service	1+	Program Operations outside of FTE (e.g. portfolio reading for RWG 6, SPEAK testing, participation in organized student activities, etc.)						

Possible Category	Pts	Activity Description	T	AD	PRJ	SVC	PD	Evidence/comments
Service Mix-n-Match	1+	Smaller service activities can be combined here to equal one or more points						
FLEXIBLE (PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OR SERVICE)								
PD/Service	1	Professional volunteering (1 point per 10 hours served) - list hours in comments and explain						
PD/Service	1	Professional organization or interest section position (1 point per 10 hours served) - list hours in comments						
PD/Service	1	CEA site reviewer (1 point per 10 hours served) - list hours in comments						
PD/Service	1	Service on a local, regional, national or international board/interest section committee (1 point per 10 hours served) - list hours in comments						
PD/Service	1	Conference proposal or professional publication reader for TESOL or other conference in the field (1 point per 10 hours served) - list hours in comments						
PD/Service	1	Second reader on LTS terminal project						
PD/Service	2	LTS terminal project advisor						
PD/Service (Pro Tem and TI faculty only)	1+	Mix-n-match! (This item is where small service and PD activities can be combined, e.g. 6 hours of subbing and attendance at 4 presentations)						

Please Note:

1. The categories of teaching, admin, and project work each have baseline minimum requirements. Points are not awarded for these. They are simply the baseline required to "meet" expectations within these categories.

2. There is no "exceeds" category. Once you meet expectations, points simply accrue indefinitely.

3. All categories require evidence and/or comments when possible.

4. Some items have points listed as a range. These are meant to be discretionary, and the faculty member would need to justify the points claimed. If a portion of a range is met in one element and a portion in another, e.g., someone has 3 hours of grant-writing and 7 hours of subbing, that person can claim 1 point for the two range portions combined, since 10 hours is required to get 1 point in either element, and can do this cross-category as well (e.g., combine range portions in service with range portions in professional development). Any faculty member can use decimals to get credit for portions of a range. In the same above-stated scenario, for example, a faculty member could claim 0.3 points in the grant-writing element, and .7 points in the subbing element.

5. Faculty with split appointments (Ex. across admin and teaching) would have the minimum point requirements pro-rated so someone with .33 in teaching and .66 in admin would need only 1/3 of the required teaching points and 2/3 of the required admin points.

6. Faculty on multi-year contracts will submit a completed metric annually for merit review purposes (e.g., for a 3-year contract: in first year of contract--first year points will stand alone and will be viewed for purposes of merit review only, in second year--points from first and second years will be averaged and will be viewed for purposes of merit review only, only in third year will points from all three years will be added up to measure whether the performance measure is to standard--though merit will continue be calculated using an average.

Point requirements for rank
Teaching/admin/projects (all ranks):
To 'meet' the standard is to successfully complete all activity in the bolded areas, those with 'NA' in the points column. Points need not be generated in the area of teaching/admin/projects to meet the standard. (Please note: Meeting the standard does not guarantee contract renewal, merit increase, or promotion.)
Professional development and service:
Pro Tem (2 points per contract period meets, total of PD and service combined. One point must be professional development. Service is optional for Pro Tempore.
Career Track on a one-year contract (total of PD and service combined must be 8, and at least two points in each area must be generated)
Career Track on a two-year contract (total of PD and service combined, over the two-year span of the contract must be 16, and at least 4 points in each area must be generated. Totals need not be split evenly across the two years)
Senior I and Senior II Faculty--three-year contract (total of PD and service combined, over the two-year span of the contract must be 30, and at least 12 points in each area must be generated. Totals need not be split evenly across the three years.)

Formative Peer Observation Form

Note: Only the initiator of the formative observation can receive credit for the formative observation (part of teaching measure). The initiator may observe a peer or ask to be observed by a peer.

Initiator: _____

Observation partner: _____

Date of Observation: _____

Course Observed: _____

Lesson Objectives: _____

*To be filled out by the **Initiator**, before the observation:*

1. **Please note any specific area of focus of the observation** *(examples: I want to see how this T is incorporating the Reading Horizons program into their curriculum; I have asked this teacher to come watch me introduce the 5 paragraph essay using an inductive method and give me feedback; I have heard this teacher is great at motivating students and wanted to see some of the ways they accomplish this; I'd like to know more about my time management, and I would like X to come watch me and give me feedback on what I am doing OR see how X accomplishes this in their class, etc.)*

To be filled out by the Initiator after the observation:

2. **Things I learned from observing/being observed** *(can be a bullet list or narrative)*

To be filled out by the Initiator after the post-observation conversation.

3a. **Please discuss in more detail how you will apply this in your teaching.**

3b. **What were some of the most useful/valuable points that came up in your post-observation conversation?**

Initiator Instructor signature: _____   Date: _____

Partner Instructor signature: _____   Date: _____

Formative Development Activity Form

Note: This document to be used only administrative and project work faculty. All administrative and project work faculty should engage in one formative activity per year per position.

Name: _____

Formative Activity (presentation/workshop/article/other): _____

Focus of activity: _____

Administrative/Project Work Position (describe): _____

1. **Please note the specific area of focus of the activity and how it relates to your position**

2. **Give a brief summary of the activity, including title, attendance date, link/author, etc.**

3. **Why did you choose this activity and how did you or will you apply it in your position?**

Instructor signature: _____   Date: _____

AEI Annual Review Goal-setting and Activity Form

This activity is optional for all faculty members for all appointments (teaching/admin/project work). In order to complete this option, you must engage in three formative activities.

(Note: All teaching faculty must initiate a formative observation as a teaching measure to meet expectations. The same formative observation can be used here if it fits the given goal.)

Name:

For which appointment did you set a goal? Circle one:
Please complete one form for each appointment held during the calendar year.

Teaching   Administration   Project Work

What was your goal for improving your performance this year and how does it relate to your position?

Goal (state in 50 words or less):

How it relates to your position (state in 100 words or less):

How did you work to achieve this goal? (Three activities are required – activities can be repeated (e.g. two articles and one workshop, etc.)

_____ Formative observation (for teaching only – attach observation form[s])

_____ Read an article or book chapter (attach a summary with title, author, link, etc.)

_____ Attended a workshop/presentation/webinar (attach a summary with presenter, location, dates, etc.)

_____ Other – explain (attach a summary)

Provide a self-reflection on why you set this goal, what you learned and how this led to improvement in your work performance and/or skills relate to the specified goal. (200-300 words)

Summative Observation Standards (17 total standards in 4 categories)

Instructions: For each of the 17 standards, the observer should make a determination by checking an appropriate blank. The observer should also provide an overall determination in each standard category along with a brief rationale.

1. Preparation and organization (3 standards)

1A Lesson preparedness: Clear and observable evidence exists to show that the teacher prepared the lesson ahead of time and came to the classroom ready to deliver a well-organized lesson.

Does not meet _____   Partially meets _____   Meets _____   Exceeds _____

1B Lesson organization: The organization of the lesson is clear from the lesson plan provided, and the observed instruction is appropriately consistent with the lesson plan.

Does not meet _____   Partially meets _____   Meets _____   Exceeds _____

1C Knowledge of material: Lesson delivery demonstrates clearly that the instructor has relevant and necessary knowledge of the content to teach the course effectively.

Does not meet _____   Partially meets _____   Meets _____   Exceeds _____

Preparation of organization overall rating:

Does not meet _____   Partially meets _____   Meets _____   Exceeds ___

Rationale:

2. Classroom Procedures (6 standards)

2A. Class time and pacing: Class time is utilized effectively and class begins and ends on time. The timing and pace of the class are appropriate to student needs and facilitate the achievement of the learning objectives for the lesson.

Does not meet _____   Partially meets _____   Meets _____   Exceeds _____

2B: Instructions and explanations: The teacher provides clear and sufficient explanations for all in-class tasks and activities. It is clear that students understand and can follow these explanations.

Does not meet _____   Partially meets _____   Meets _____   Exceeds _____

2C: Feedback to students: The teacher gives task-specific feedback that supports students' efforts to complete activities and helps them meet learning objectives for the class.

Does not meet _____   Partially meets _____   Meets _____   Exceeds _____

2D: Variation of materials, tasks and instruction: Course materials, in-class activities and/or instructional techniques are sufficiently varied to meet the diverse needs of the students in the classroom.

Does not meet _____   Partially meets _____   Meets _____   Exceeds _____ NA _____

2E: Tools and materials: Classroom tools and materials (whiteboard, document camera, computer, handouts, etc.) are effectively managed and integrated throughout the lesson.

Does not meet _____ Partially meets _____ Meets _____ Exceeds _____

2F: Student involvement and voice: Students are presented with sufficient opportunity to make meaningful decisions related to classroom activities and procedures.

Does not meet _____ Partially meets _____ Meets _____ Exceeds _____ NA _____

Classroom procedures overall rating:

Does not meet _____ Partially meets _____ Meets _____ Exceeds ___

Rationale:

3. Interaction and Social Climate (3 standards)

3A Interaction between instructor and students: There is a balance of teacher-talk time and student-talk time that is appropriate for the lesson. Teacher uses a variety of questioning strategies, not just call and response/general elicitation.

Does not meet _____ Partially meets _____ Meets _____ Exceeds _____

3B Interaction among students: Teacher enables and facilitates interaction such that students interact with each other as expected (on-task, use of L2 as appropriate to the learning context). This includes actively and effectively monitoring student interactions to keep students on track without excessive intervention that keeps students from completing tasks.

Does not meet _____ Partially meets _____ Meets _____ Exceeds _____

3C Individual student needs: Teacher is able to address individual questions and needs while making sure all students stay on-task and complete tasks in a timely way. Class time is not lost due to needs of a few students.

Does not meet _____ Partially meets _____ Meets _____ Exceeds _____

Interaction and social climate overall rating:

Does not meet _____ Partially meets _____ Meets _____ Exceeds ___

Rationale:

4. Teaching Qualities (5 standards)

4A Patience and supportiveness: Teacher remains patient and supportive throughout the lesson. If needed, teacher redirects student frustration or negative situations.

Does not meet _____ Partially meets _____ Meets _____ Exceeds _____

4B Confidence and Rapport: Teacher demonstrates confidence in the classroom and shows that a positive rapport has been established through student willingness to participate, an understanding of expectations and a mutually positive and helpful atmosphere.

Does not meet _____ Partially meets _____ Meets _____ Exceeds _____

4C Voice (volume, clarity, speed) and use of language: Teacher speaks in a way that is appropriate for and comprehensible to the level of the students while at the same time modeling natural syntax, pronunciation and speaking speed.

Does not meet _____ Partially meets _____ Meets _____ Exceeds _____

4D Physical presence, movement and body language: Teacher's gestures and movement through the classroom contribute to a positive classroom atmosphere and learning environment rather than distracting from the lesson or indicating lack of involvement in the lesson (such as only sitting behind the desk during group work).

Does not meet _____ Partially meets _____ Meets _____ Exceeds _____

4E Classroom space: Teacher shows evidence of making the best use of available classroom space.

Does not meet _____ Partially meets _____ Meets _____ Exceeds _____

Teaching qualities overall rating:

Does not meet _____ Partially meets _____ Meets _____ Exceeds ___

Rationale:

Scoring: Does not meet=0; Partially meets=1; Meets=2; Exceeds=3

Suggested range: Exceeds = 44-51; Meets = 34-43; Partially meets = 17-33; Does not meet = 16 or less

Promotion to Senior Instructor I

Description of senior faculty:
Senior instructors are expected to provide the consistent versatility, creativity, innovation, collaboration and leadership required for effective operation of a language program in the areas of mentoring, administration, university academic activities, and other services to the AEI in addition to teaching and/or project work. They are expected to pursue professional development activities that enhance operational efficiency, instructional quality, and, for Field-Intensive faculty, the national and international reputation of the program, or for Teaching-Intensive faculty, the focus is on student experience and program operation and development.

Considerations for promotion:
Promotion Review to Senior I rank entails a holistic measure with the candidate's goal and responsibility being to show oneself to be performing at the level described in this document. All of these qualities should be exemplified in the ways set forth below.

Promotion to Senior Instructor II

Description of senior faculty:
Senior instructors are expected to provide the consistent versatility, creativity, innovation, collaboration and leadership required for effective operation of a language program in the areas of mentoring, administration, university academic activities, and other services to the AEI in addition to teaching and/or project work. They are expected to pursue professional development activities that enhance operational efficiency, instructional quality, and, for Field-Intensive faculty, the national and international reputation of the program, or for Teaching-Intensive faculty, the focus is on student experience and program operation and development.

Considerations for promotion:
Promotion Review to Senior II rank entails a holistic measure with the candidate's goal and responsibility being to show oneself to be performing at a sustained level of excellence described in this document under Senior I rank. These qualities should include evidence of sustained excellence in teaching, supervisory, and service responsibilities, and a demonstrated commitment to employing and enhancing leadership skills in areas such as pedagogical, curricular, and organizational innovations and improvements, as well as participation in, and contributions to, professional development opportunities.

Promotion Guidelines and Criteria

Split appointments:
It is understood that faculty who have split appointments between teaching/admin/project work may not necessarily fulfill all the criteria for all three categories. It is incumbent on the candidate to explain any gaps due to split appointments.

For preparing your promotion file:
Note that the narrative statement and CV are the primary guiding documents for the promotion committee. These documents should include clear evidence of versatility, creativity, innovation, collaboration and leadership as well as overall excellence (as defined in the following criteria) in job performance. The portfolio provides supporting documentation and evidence of these qualities and achievements.

1. Include standardized CV according to the provided template.
2. In your personal statement (2-6 pages), include (in prose)
   a. your teaching/administrative/project work philosophy and how it connects to your career at the AEI (during the official period of review).
   b. a description of your niche or specialty area within the AEI (how are you a go-to person?)
   c. a focus on your key accomplishments in teaching, project work and/or administration, professional development and service.
   d. A brief statement about your contributions to UO's mission on equity and inclusion (e.g. tailoring classroom materials and practices for diverse learners; provide tools for students to engage with people from other cultures, encourage students to engage in the community outside of class; teacher training for teachers from around the world; work with people from low-resource areas of the world; work with international GTFs to improve their abilities to communicate etc.)
   e. a brief summary of future goals

3. Teaching/Admin/Project Portfolio - the focus should be on quality over quantity and clearly connected to your teaching/administrative philosophy. Ideally, materials should demonstrate development of a specialty area. Materials should be original, created by you. Include a brief statement to contextualize each example (a few sentences). Maximum 25 pages.

Criteria for Teaching A successful candidate will include all of the following. Quality of work in these areas will be considered.	**Notes on quality of evidence submitted** (to be completed by the Promotion Committee)
1. Evidence of frequent and consistent leadership (lead T, point person or other)	
2. Evidence that faculty/admin look to this person as having expertise in a given area (niche) (evidence could include letters of support from supervisors and/or mentors, being asked to lead a course, leading a project, presenting to the faculty or LTS students, requests from faculty mentors to allow formative observations by other faculty, requests from faculty mentors to observe other instructors as a "master" teacher, etc.)	

	Notes on quality of evidence submitted (to be completed by the Promotion Committee)
3. Evidence of frequent and consistent materials development and sharing of excellent materials	
4. Consistent evidence that excellent materials are used by others	
5. Consistent evidence that excellent materials adhere to and enhance curriculum and lead to stated student learning outcomes	
6. Evidence of ability to collaborate and work effectively with others	
7. Evidence of a clear teaching philosophy that is borne out in materials development and practices (as evidenced in narrative and portfolio)	
8. Evidence of innovation and creativity in course, curriculum and materials design	
9. Evidence of excellence in teaching (evidence could include student evaluations, summative observations and annual reviews, examples of student achievement)	
10. Evidence of continual expansion of teaching skills/knowledge (how is professional development applied to classroom teaching?)	

Criteria for Administration A successful candidate will include all of the following. Quality of work in these areas will be considered.	Notes on quality of evidence submitted (to be completed by the Promotion Committee)
1. Evidence of frequent and consistent leadership in admin role	
2. Evidence that faculty look to this person as having expertise in something (niche) such as: (letters of support from supervisors, serving as an expert/consultant for other units on campus or in the field, feedback from faculty or administrators, lead on a project, presentations to staff, faculty or other units, cross-program collaborations, etc.)	
3. Evidence of ability to collaborate and work effectively with others	
4. Evidence of a clear philosophy that is borne out in program development and practices	
5. Evidence of innovation and creativity in program development and practices	
6. Evidence of adherence to the AEI mission and internal and external policies and standards	

	submitted (to be completed by the Promotion Committee)
7. Evidence of excellence in administration (letters from supervisors, feedback from administration and faculty, etc.)	
8. Evidence of continual expansion of skills/knowledge (how is professional development applied to the administrative position)	

Criteria for Project Work A successful candidate will include all of the following. Quality of work in these areas will be considered.	submitted (to be completed by the Promotion Committee)
1. Evidence of engagement in research to ensure best practices.	
2. Evidence of consistent meeting of stated project outcomes	
3. Evidence of contribution of ideas, resources and materials creation	
4. Evidence of ability to collaborate and work effectively with others	
5. Evidence of production of high-quality work that demonstrates creativity and innovation	
6. Evidence of project work that significantly raises the AEI/UO profile nationally or internationally	
7. Evidence of continual expansion of skills/knowledge	

4. Professional Development Portfolio - the focus should be on quality over quantity and clearly connected to your teaching/administrative philosophy. Ideally, materials should demonstrate development of a specialty area. Materials should be original, created by you. Include a brief statement to contextualize each example (a few sentences). Maximum 25 pages. (PowerPoint/Prezi slides should be 4-6 per page.)

Criteria for Professional Development A successful candidate will include evidence that all of the following were sustained over time. Quality of work in these areas will be considered.	Notes on quality of evidence submitted (to be completed by the Promotion Committee)
1. Evidence of frequent and consistent attendance at Friday PD sessions, Critical Friends meetings, UO-offered workshops and/or local and regional conferences and webinars. (Attendance at national &/or international conferences encouraged but not required.)	
2. Evidence of regular in-house & local/ regional presentations or publications. National/international presentations & publications are encouraged but not required.	

3. Evidence of regular a) national &/or international presentations, webinars and workshops b) or peer-reviewed or major commercial publications	
4. Evidence of continued education through coursework and/or independent study in the field through application and sharing.	

5. Service - In addition to the list of your service activities, other helpful evidence of service is letters from committee chairs, lead teachers or others in supervisory roles related to service and mentees, etc. Include a brief statement to contextualize each example (a few sentences). Maximum 15 pages.

Criteria for Service A successful candidate will include evidence that all of the following were sustained over time. Quality of work in these areas will be considered.	Notes on quality of evidence submitted (to be completed by the Promotion Committee)
1. Evidence of active and productive participation in high-demand committees on an annual basis and/or multiple low-to-moderate demand committees. (A candidate for senior instructor is expected to support the AEI through regular committee work.) Service to the UO and/or field is also valued.	