

Knight Center for Accelerating Scientific Impact NTTF - Review and Promotion Policy

Updated 09/13/17

Preamble

The Knight Campus was created in October 2016 in order to house new research and educational activities geared toward increasing the university's scientific impact within the state and nation. This document was developed in the context of the development of a new academic unit whose path is still being charted and which at the point of initiation has no faculty or staff to help form or be subject to these governance policies. As such, the initial policy is intended to provide preliminary guidance to build the faculty base with the expectation that there will be review and revision in the years to come following the requirements of Article 4. *Specifically, no later than the fall of 2021 a review of this policy will be initiated by the Director (functioning as dean for purposes of Article 4) with a goal of changes to the policy taking effect September 2022.*

Due to the circumstances of building a new academic unit from scratch, for a period of time the Internal Advisory Board (IAB) will serve as the Leadership Committee described herein. The Internal Advisory Board has members from established CAS science departments and representational members including the CAS Associate Dean for Science, the Vice President for Research and Innovation, the Graduate School Dean, a College of Education representative, a Lundquist College of Business representative and a member of the Senate leadership team. The IAB will remain in effect for a period of time while the initial faculty are recruited and established at the UO. During the period that this policy is in effect, the Leadership Committee will consist of the IAB members and any new tenure related and career research professors appointed to the Knight Campus. A membership line will be available for a representative career NTTF (not career research professor series) to join the Leadership Committee beginning in fall FY18 to assure a meaningful role in governance. The IAB is charged to provide counsel to the Director and President that is broader than the Leadership Committee responsibilities outlined below.

This document provides guidance for the process for performance review and promotion related to the career NTTF appointed in the Knight Campus apart from the Graduate Internship Program (whose governance documents are at <https://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/graduate-internship-program-gip>). This document conforms to the Collective Bargaining Agreement with United Academics in existence at the time the policy was formulated and approved and university policies. To the extent there are any discrepancies or inconsistencies, university policies and, to the extent applicable, the language of CBA Article 19 applies.

1.0 Collective Bargaining Agreement Processes

Review and promotion procedures are specified in Article 19 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement or in parallel University policies for unrepresented faculty members, to the extent those policies do not conflict with the CBA. This document elaborates only on those components of review and promotion that are not prescribed in the CBA or university policy. When conducting contract and promotion reviews, the Knight Campus for Accelerated Scientific Impact (KCASI) will rely on Article 19 as a primary resource. In extraordinary circumstances, the Director may make temporary (six months or less) revisions to these procedures. Such changes will not become permanent unless the appropriate amendment process is followed.

2.0 Annual (contract) review

- 2.1 All research faculty members of KCASI are reviewed annually. During their first contract, career NTTF will also be reviewed halfway through the individual contract period. 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.
- 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. 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.
- 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 In reviewing the faculty members performance, the following materials will be developed, submitted and reviewed:
 - 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 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. The faculty member will be provided with at least 1-week advance notice before a peer review is conducted. Student evaluations and peer reviews will be added to the promotion dossier by the relevant departmental administrator or head.
- 2.6.4 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.
- 2.6.5 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.
- 2.6.6 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 Eligibility standards are outline in Article 19, Sec. 5

- 3.1.1 Note the slight differences in the process for career NTTF in research assistant and research associate categories. (Compare Secs. 11-18 with Secs. 19-26)

3.2 Timeline

- 3.2.1 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.
- 3.2.2 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.
- 3.2.3 Like all research appointments, 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.

3.3 Review committee

- 3.3.1 In years where there are research NTTF promotion reviews, the Director appoints a promotion review committee as well as a review committee chair.
- 3.3.2 The committee will be made up of 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. The NTTF member may be from outside the Knight Campus but must be in a relevant unit. Prior to appointing a funding contingent research NTTF, the Director will confirm that their funding permits participation in this committee.

- 3.3.3 The review committee will not include the candidate's immediate supervisor, close collaborator, or the Director.
- 3.3.4 In the event that there are not enough members of Knight Campus at the appropriate rank to make up a committee, the Director should appoint faculty members from other, relevant, scientific units.
- 3.3.5 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.

3.4 Review materials

- 3.4.1 Curriculum vitae: comprehensive and current research, scholarly and creative activities and accomplishments, publications, appointments, presentations, and similar activities and accomplishments.
- 3.4.2 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.
- 3.4.3 Research and innovation portfolio: comprehensive portfolio of research and creative activity, including appropriate evidence of national or international recognition or impact.
- 3.4.4 Service portfolio (if applicable): summary of service contributions to the Knight Campus, the university, or the community.
- 3.4.5 Teaching and training 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. The portfolio will also include teaching evaluations (see 2.6.3 above). External reviewers (if applicable): member provides list of potential qualified outside reviewers.

3.5 External and internal reviews

- 3.5.1 Review for promotion to senior research assistant I and senior research assistant II and reviews for the promotion of career instructors or lecturers will generally include only internal reviews, unless the candidate has job duties that are to create an external impact.

- 3.5.2 Candidates for promotion to research associate I and research associate II will be determined on a case by case basis regarding the need for external reviews.
 - 3.5.3 Promotions to research associate professor and research full professor must have external reviews but may also include internal reviews.
 - 3.5.4 Prior to embarking on obtaining reviews, the committee chair may discuss with the OVPRI the candidate and their job duties, and propose a plan regarding the time and quantity of reviews, and can seek advice from the OVPRI about the type and quantity of reviews.
 - 3.5.5 The review committee chair manages the process of obtaining supervisor's evaluation, and internal and external reviews.
- 3.6 Criteria for promotion
- 3.6.1 The Knight Campus relies on the following primary indicators to evaluate faculty performance: (a) quality of work, including quality of interactions in the workplace; (b) effectiveness or impact of effort; and (c) contribution to a research program and/or innovation efforts.
 - 3.6.2 Promotion is not an automatic process (as in awarded for having put in their time) but rather awarded for excellence.
 - 3.6.3 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 typically funded by sponsored projects, these evaluations will also reflect the activities that they have been funded to do. Furthermore, where innovation and/or entrepreneurship are important elements to the position, evidence of impact and success in these areas will be included in the evaluation.
 - 3.6.4 All faculty are expected to contribute to the university's goals regarding equity and inclusion. These contributions may be in the areas of research and innovation, teaching and training, and service activities, as appropriate given the candidate's job duties.
 - 3.6.5 Criteria for promotion to senior research assistant I and senior research assistant II.
 - 3.6.5.1 Evidence of significant impact on the research activities for which the candidate is responsible.
 - 3.6.5.2 Highly regarded and complete execution of goals and assignments in recent years.
 - 3.6.6 Criteria for promotion to senior research associate I and senior research associate II.
 - 3.6.6.1 Evidence of significant impact on the research activities for which the candidate is responsible; evidence of activity in the innovation arena is encouraged.

- 3.6.6.2 Evidence of internal and/or external recognition for contributions to research efforts.
- 3.6.6.3 Strong record of impact in the research community derived from conference and workshop presentations and publications.
- 3.6.7 Criteria for promotion to Senior Instructor I and Senior Lecturer I are based on a sustained record of excellent performance in the responsibilities of Instructor or Lecturer, as delineated in the relevant job descriptions. Excellence in the following areas is expected:
 - 3.6.7.1 Quality and versatility of teaching: Instructors and Lecturers must possess the ability to teach effectively at multiple levels in the undergraduate and/or graduate programs, or to teach effectively at a level for which the department has particular needs.
 - 3.6.7.2 Service: Instructors and Lecturers should participate in the business of the department and the university (e.g., advising, GTF training, and committee work) unless their teaching load precludes these responsibilities.
 - 3.6.7.3 Commitment to the profession: Instructors and Lecturers should demonstrate evidence of professional activities that help them stay current in both course content and instructional methodology. Other activities that promote professional growth are also relevant (e.g., conference and workshop attendance, scholarly activities such as materials development, development of assessment tools, etc.).
- 3.6.8 Criteria for promotion to Senior Instructor II and Senior Lecturer II are based on at least six years of a sustained record of excellent performance in the responsibilities of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer, as delineated in the relevant job descriptions. Excellence in the following areas is expected:
 - 3.6.8.1 Quality and versatility of teaching: Instructors and Lecturers must exhibit sustained excellence in teaching at multiple levels in the undergraduate and/or graduate programs, or at a level for which the department has particular needs. There should be a demonstrated commitment to employing and enhancing leadership skills in areas such as pedagogical, curricular, and organizational innovations and improvements.
 - 3.6.8.2 Service: Instructors and Lecturers should exhibit sustained excellence in service responsibilities through participation in the business of the department and the university (e.g., advising, GTF training, and committee work) unless their teaching load precludes these responsibilities.
 - 3.6.8.3 Commitment to the profession: Instructors and Lecturers should demonstrate evidence of professional activities that help them stay current in both course content and instructional methodology. Other activities that promote professional growth

are also relevant (e.g., conference and workshop attendance, scholarly activities such as materials development, development of assessment tools, etc.).

3.6.9 Criteria for promotion to associate research professor and research professor.

3.6.9.1 Generally, the criteria for promotion in this classification are comparable to criteria for tenure-track faculty, including national and international impact of their scholarship.

3.6.9.2 Research and innovation - 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 in the particular area of focus 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.

3.6.9.3 Service - Faculty members in the Knight Campus 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 in the research professor rank generally are expected to participate in Knight Campus governance, share in organizational work and contribute to a positive work atmosphere. The assessment of service contributions plays a minor role in evaluation of the faculty member for promotion to associate research professor, but the evaluation for promotion to research 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 Knight Campus.

3.6.9.4 Teaching and Training - Excellence in teaching, either in the classroom or as mentor within the research environment, is encouraged. An important aspect of the teaching mission of the Knight Campus 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.

3.6.10 Criteria for promotion of assistant clinical professor to associate clinical professor and clinical professor.

3.6.10.1 Evidence of high quality clinical supervision/teaching as related to the position.

3.6.10.2 Evidence of significant impact on external audiences in clinical education and/or standardized interventions or treatments.

3.6.10.3 Evidence of significant scholarly contributions to the field with an emphasis on clinical education and training.

3.6.10.4 Evidence of positive contributions to the workplace.

3.7 Promotion reapplication, appeals, and withdrawal

3.7.1 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.

3.7.2 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.

PRO TEM NTTF REVIEWS

There are no promotion opportunities for those appointed as pro tem NTTF. Pro Tem NTTF will be reviewed on an annual basis by their supervisor during the duration of their employment. They will be assessed on their ability to meet expectations, accomplish tasks and reach goals set at the onset of employment. Written assessments will be provided to the employee and a copy for the personnel file. As per university practice, employees may submit a written response to supervisor assessments and included in the personnel file.