

Department of Philosophy  
NTTF REVIEW AND PROMOTION POLICIES  
*Approved by vote of the faculty 11.12.2015 revised 4.14.2016*

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.

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.

Career NTTF in research appointments will be reviewed by established procedures to assess the quality of work performed and the outcomes of their contributions to the research program.

## I. CAREER NTTF REVIEWS

1. Career NTTF will be reviewed in each contract period for consideration for renewal, or once every three academic years, whichever is sooner. If a career NTTF member has multiple contracts in a year, only review per fiscal academic year is required. The review will consider the faculty member's performance since the last review.
2. Career NTTF faculty members will be evaluated only by the criteria approved and made available to the faculty member. Career NTTF will be evaluated on the quality of their teaching and on their service/professional development/scholarship in proportion to the FTE afforded to those aspects in their job description.
3. If a faculty member seeks promotion in a year when a contract renewal review is due, only a single review must be completed. However, the contract renewal decision must be made independently of the promotion decision.
4. For contract renewal reviews, the faculty member will submit a curriculum vitae and a personal statement containing information relevant to their performance of assigned duties and responsibilities.
5. The following elements will be considered in evaluating teaching:
  - a. Student evaluations for all courses with five or more students.
  - b. At least one peer evaluation of teaching for each contract period. The peer evaluation will include the observation of at least one class in conjunction with an examination of the syllabus and other relevant course materials for that particular class. The time frame for this review will be established through discussion with the NTTF member; at least one week of advance notice will be provided.
  - c. Evidence of contributions to enhanced teaching through curriculum development, innovative teaching techniques, and/or course supervision will be positively considered but are not required elements of the review.
  - d. The faculty member's personal statement of teaching philosophy and practice (see #4 above, no additional statement is required).
  - e. Student evaluations, both quantitative and qualitative, will be interpreted in the light shed by the most recent high-quality meta-analysis of the reliability,

validity, and potential biases of these evaluations. Attention will be paid not just to the valence of comments, but also to their content, with an eye to the presence of comments that reflect on challenge and learning, not merely enjoyment, teacher agreeableness, or other factors. Quantitative evaluations should not be relied on exclusively for assessing the faculty member's teaching. Peer evaluations will be used as a measure of the care and effort an instructor puts into teaching and course design.

6. The following elements will be considered in evaluating service only when service is listed in the duties and responsibilities for the particular faculty member/position. Only those kinds of service that are explicitly enumerated in the duties and responsibilities are a necessary part of the review. Additional service will be considered positively but is not a required part of the review.
  - a. Evidence of formal and/or informal department service.
  - b. Evidence of formal and/or informal college service.
  - c. Evidence of formal and/or informal university service.
  - d. Evidence of community or professional service.
7. If a faculty member has been assigned specific service duties in place of some teaching, their performance of those duties will also be evaluated.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. To comply with the May 1<sup>st</sup> contract renewal notification, career NTTF will be notified by the first day of the term in which their review will occur. At that point, they will be invited to submit a CV and a personal statement as in item 4 above. If the faculty member wishes to submit a CV and/or personal statement, it must be submitted by Monday of the fourth week of the term in which the review will occur.
11. Personnel Committee
  - a. The contract or promotion review will be conducted by a committee of two faculty members appointed by the Department Head, one of whom must be tenured, the other of whom must be tenure-related or a more advanced NTTF member when one is available. If no more advanced NTTF member is available within the department, the faculty member may request that a NTTF member from outside the department be appointed in addition to the two departmental members of the committee. The committee will meet and review the materials submitted by the candidate for renewal or promotion and will write a report assessing the faculty member's work. This report will be submitted for consideration to a faculty meeting in which tenured, tenure-track, and more advanced NTTF members will be present. After a discussion, separate votes will be taken on contract renewal review and promotion review. The department head will report on the votes and submit an independent evaluation along with the vote report to the Dean's office with the complete file.
12. The review should be completed by April 5. The faculty member will be given the opportunity to discuss their efforts, performance, and review with their department

head or a designee. Contract renewal RTOs are due to CAS April 15 (12 month contracts) or June 15 (9 month contracts).

## II. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

1. Criteria for promotion to Senior Instructor I and Senior Lecturer I are based on a record of sustained highly effective performance in the responsibilities of Instructor or Lecturer, as delineated in the relevant job descriptions. Excellence in the faculty member's primary area of work (most often, teaching) will receive proportionally more weight in determining the quality of the faculty member's work toward promotion.
2. Criteria for promotion to Senior Instructor II and Senior Lecturer II are based on a record of sustained highly effective performance in the responsibilities Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer, as delineated in the relevant job descriptions. Excellence in the faculty member's primary area of work (most often, teaching) will receive proportionally more weight in determining the quality of the faculty member's work toward promotion.

## III. ELIGIBILITY

1. Career NTTF will be eligible for promotion after accumulating six years of service in rank at an average of 0.3 FTE or greater, accrued at no greater than three terms per academic year for faculty on nine month contracts and at four terms per year for faculty on 12 month contracts. The review will consider the faculty member's performance since hiring, or since the previous promotion.
2. Career NTTF who will have completed five years of employment as a faculty member at or above 0.3 annualized FTE per year may initiate the promotion process in the Spring term of the fifth year if they have an expected appointment of 0.3 annualized FTE or greater for the sixth year.
3. For all career NTTF, promotion is elective and does not involve an "up or out" decision. Career NTTF may be reappointed at their current rank if they are not promoted or not considered for promotion.
4. An accelerated promotion review may occur in particularly meritorious cases as determined by the Provost or designee in consultation with the dean, department head and faculty member. When credit for prior service is agreed upon at the time of hire, it states the earliest date of promotion. Work done by the faculty member during the period of prior service will receive full consideration during the promotion process if the faculty member elects the earliest date for promotion review. Should the faculty member choose to use some, but not all of the credit for prior service, the focus of the review will adjust appropriately.
5. MATERIAL REQUIRED FOR A PROMOTION REVIEW. Candidates wishing to be considered for promotion should notify the appropriate department head in the Spring term of the year prior to the year when promotion is sought, and must provide by February 1<sup>st</sup> in the year promotion is sought:
  - a. A comprehensive and current signed and dated **curriculum vitae** that includes the faculty member's current instructional work and other activities that relate to job performance.

- b. A 2-6-page signed and dated **personal statement** developed by the faculty member evaluating their performance measured against the applicable criteria for promotion. The personal statement should expressly address the teaching, other instruction-related activities, professional development, and service contributions to the academic department, college, university, profession and community. The statement should also include discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.
  - c. **A signed and dated waiver form.** A faculty member may choose, but is not required, to waive in advance in writing their access to any or all of the evaluative materials. Such waivers shall not preclude the use of redacted versions of these documents in a denial review process. The redacted versions are intended to protect the identity of the reviewer. If redactions are insufficient to do so, the university may prepare a suitable summary.
  - d. **Teaching portfolio:** This may include a list of courses taught, descriptions of selected courses highlighting unique features of these courses, representative course syllabi, examples of exams, handouts, assignments, and of student work, and, if applicable, thesis advising.
  - e. **Service portfolio:** In cases where service is explicitly enumerated on the list of duties and responsibilities or where the faculty member has taken on service work voluntarily: An account of the faculty member's service contributions to their academic department, college, university, profession and community. This may contain samples and/or narrative describing the service. It may be subsumed into the curriculum vitae.
6. The following materials will then be added to the file as the review proceeds:
- a. **Student evaluations** for all courses with five or more students.
  - b. **Promotion Review Committee's Report**
  - c. 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 using standard University guidelines and recommendations and consistent with the general expectations enumerated in Article 20, Section 14 of the CBA.
  - d. **Department Head's Letter of Evaluation and Report on Faculty Vote:** The department or unit head will prepare an independent report on the merits of the promotion case, with their own recommendation.
7. The file, including the committee report, the department or unit's voting summary, and the head's independent report and recommendation will then be sent to the appropriate associate dean in the College of Arts and Sciences by March 1. The review should be completed by February 18 to provide the faculty member with the opportunity to discuss their efforts, performance, and review with their supervisor prior to the submission of the report to the College.
8. **Reapplication for Promotion.** Unsuccessful candidates for promotion may continue at current rank as long as eligible under the Collective Bargaining Agreement and university policy. They may reapply for promotion after employment by the university for an additional 3 years at an average of 0.3 FTE or greater, accrued at no greater than 3 terms per academic year.

9. Appeal of Promotion Denial. Unsuccessful candidates may appeal as provided by Article 21 (Tenure and Promotion Denial Appeal) of the UA Collective Bargaining Agreement or other university appeals processes which apply to faculty not covered by the CBA.
10. Withdrawal of Application. A candidate can withdraw their application for promotion in writing to the Provost and the dean at any time before the Provost's decision.

#### IV. ADJUNCT NTTF REVIEWS

1. The instructional contributions of adjunct NTTF will be reviewed in each contract period.
2. The following will be considered in evaluating teaching:
  - a. **Student evaluations** for all courses with five or more students.
  - b. **At least one peer evaluation of teaching** for each contract period. The peer evaluation should include an examination of the faculty member's syllabus and other materials for the course being evaluated and the observation of at least one class. The time frame for this review will be established through discussion with the NTTF member; at least one week of advance notice will be provided.
  - c. **Teaching portfolio:** This may include representative course syllabi, examples of exams, handouts, assignments, and of student work.
3. Student evaluations, both quantitative and qualitative, will be interpreted in the light shed by the most recent high-quality meta-analysis of the reliability, validity, and potential biases of these evaluations. Attention will be paid not just to the valence of comments, but also to their content, with an eye to the presence of comments that reflect on challenge and learning, not merely enjoyment, teacher agreeableness, or other factors. Quantitative evaluations should not be relied on exclusively for assessing the faculty member's teaching. Peer evaluations will be used as a measure of the care and effort an instructor puts into teaching and course design.