

**HEDCO Institute for Evidence-Based Educational Practice
Career Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review and Promotion Policies**

Approved by the Office of the Provost February 21, 2022

1.0 Collective Bargaining Agreement processes

Review and promotion procedures for career faculty are specified in Article 19 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and in the MOU between UO and UA dated Feb. 2, 2021. This document elaborates only on those components of review and promotion that are not prescribed in the CBA. When conducting performance and promotion reviews, the HEDCO Institute for Evidence-Based Educational Practice (HIEP) will rely on Article 19 as a primary resource. These procedures also apply to all unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy.

2.0 Annual (contract) review

- 2.1 All Career Faculty members of HIEP are reviewed annually for the first three years of employment, and at least once every three years (academic years for 9-month employees and fiscal years for 12-month employees) typically in the spring. During their first year of employment, Career Faculty will also be reviewed halfway through the year (i.e., halfway through the academic year for 9-month employees and fiscal year for 12-month employees).
- 2.2 The HIEP executive director is responsible for setting timelines for performance reviews that are consistent with COE performance review timelines, and for communicating deadlines to faculty and their supervisors.
- 2.3 Supervisors perform the performance review. Generally, there is one supervisor, but if there is more than one supervisor, each will be responsible for their area of assignment.
- 2.4 The performance review 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 period under review. Reviews for postdoctoral scholars will reflect upon individual mentoring plans. Because the research faculty are funded by development funds and sponsored projects, reviews should reflect the activities that the faculty have been funded to do.
- 2.5 Each year, 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 subsequent performance reviews.
- 2.6 Review materials
 - 2.6.1 The HIEP executive director or designee is responsible for developing and maintaining evaluation forms.
 - 2.6.2 In preparation for an performance review, the faculty member will provide their supervisor with a complete updated curriculum vitae and a report on activities and accomplishments that reflect progress towards goals set since the last review.
 - 2.6.3 For each faculty member being reviewed, the supervisor will provide the executive director with: a current job description, all of the documents

provided by the faculty member, and a completed, signed evaluation, using the form provided.

2.6.4 The supervisor and the faculty member should sign the supervisor's evaluation. The faculty member's signature acknowledges receipt of the evaluation; it does not indicate agreement with the evaluation. Faculty may also provide a response or addendum to the evaluation.

2.6.5 Documents provided by the faculty member and their supervisor will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

3.0 Promotion review

3.1 Timeline

3.1.1 As required by the CBA, a faculty member must notify the executive director of their desire to seek promotion in the year prior to seeking promotion. This should be done by the last day of Spring term.

3.1.2 The executive director or designee is responsible for developing and communicating unit deadlines to promotion candidates and their supervisors well in advance of deadlines. The exact timeline may vary from year to year depending on the number of candidates being considered for promotion.

3.1.3 Complete dossiers must be submitted to the College of Education Dean's Office by March 1, unless notified by the Dean's Office of a different deadline.

3.2 Review committee

3.2.1 In years where there are Career Faculty promotion reviews in HIEP, the executive director appoints a promotion review committee and selects one member to be the chair of the committee. In the event that the executive director is up for promotion review, the College of Education Dean or designee will appoint the committee.

3.2.2 The committee will be made up of 3-6 faculty members, including a mix of both tenure track faculty (TTF) and Career Faculty members who have a rank equivalent or higher to the aspirational rank of the candidate.

3.2.3 The committee should include at least one Career Faculty member of the appropriate rank, if such a faculty member is available. Prior to appointing a funding contingent faculty Career Faculty member, the supervisor of the Career Faculty will confirm that their participation in this committee is permitted by their funding source.

3.2.4 The committee will not include the candidate's immediate supervisor or the Institute executive director.

3.2.5 In the event that there are not enough members of HIEP at the appropriate rank to make up a committee, the executive director will appoint faculty members from other units.

3.2.6 The committee is responsible for reviewing the candidate's materials, voting, and making a written recommendation, including a formal vote, to the executive director. The executive director will include a voting summary in their evaluation letter.

3.3 Review materials

3.3.1 Curriculum vitae: A comprehensive and current listing of research, scholarly and creative activities and accomplishments, publications, appointments, presentations, and similar activities and accomplishments.

3.3.2 Personal statement: A 2-6 page personal statement (with length varying by job classification and rank) that evaluates the candidate's own performance measured against applicable criteria for promotion. This statement should address teaching, scholarship, research and creative activity, and service contributions as is applicable to the rank and position responsibilities. The statement should also include discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.

3.3.3 Research portfolio: A comprehensive portfolio of research and outreach activity, including appropriate evidence of national or international recognition or impact (as relevant to the job classification and rank) or other translational research products (e.g., practitioner guides, infographics).

3.3.4 Service portfolio (if applicable): A portfolio describing service contributions to HIEP, the university, or the community.

3.3.5 Teaching portfolio (if applicable): A portfolio providing 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.

3.3.6 External reviewers (if applicable, based on Section 3.4 below): A member provides a list of six potential qualified outside reviewers.

3.4 External and internal reviews

3.4.1 Review for promotion to senior research assistant I and senior research assistant II will generally include only internal reviews. For candidates who have job duties that create an external impact, external reviews may be solicited if they are requested either by the candidate or the promotion review committee.

3.4.2 Candidates for promotion to research associate I and research associate II will include an evaluation from the candidate's supervisor.

3.4.3 Promotions to research associate professor and research full professor are required to have external reviews and may also include internal reviews.

3.4.4 The executive director is responsible for selecting suitable reviewers and soliciting external reviews. The executive director may seek advice from the candidate, the candidate's immediate supervisor, the promotion review committee, and the College of Education Dean's Office about suitable external reviewers. The external reviews will be provided to the promotion review committee by the executive director.

3.4.5 The review committee chair manages the process of obtaining supervisor's evaluation and internal reviews.

3.5 Criteria for promotion

- 3.5.1 HIEP relies on the following primary indicators to evaluate faculty performance: (a) quality of work; (b) effectiveness or impact of effort; and (c) contribution to the research and outreach program of the Institute.
- 3.5.2 Promotion is not an automatic process that is awarded to a faculty member for time-in-service; rather, promotion is based on a comprehensive review of a faculty member's body of contributions to their institution, their discipline, and their field.
- 3.5.3 Promotion criteria may be customized for particular positions. Position specific criteria will be based on the most important core professional responsibilities as described in a faculty member's position description and accommodate a wide range of research and evaluation methods, scholarly approaches, and technical contributions to diverse disciplinary outlets. Because research faculty are funded by donor funds and sponsored projects, these evaluations will also reflect the activities and goals that they have been funded to accomplish.
- 3.5.4 All faculty are expected to contribute to the university's goals regarding equity and inclusion. These contributions may be in the areas of research, teaching, and service activities, as appropriate given the candidate's job duties.
- 3.5.5 Criteria for promotion to Senior Research Assistant and Senior Research Assistant II
 - 3.5.5.1 Evidence of significant impact on the research activities for which the candidate is responsible.
 - 3.5.5.2 Complete execution of goals and assignments in recent years.
- 3.5.6 Criteria for promotion to Senior Research Associate and Senior Research Associate II
 - 3.5.6.1 Evidence of significant impact on the research activities for which the candidate is responsible.
 - 3.5.6.2 Evidence of recognition outside UO for contributions to research efforts.
 - 3.5.6.3 Strong record of impact in the research community derived from conference and workshop presentations and publications.
- 3.5.7 Criteria for promotion to Research Associate Professor and Research Professor
 - 3.5.7.1 Generally, the criteria for promotion in this classification are comparable to criteria for TTF, including national and international impact of their scholarship.
 - 3.5.7.2 Research - A successful and productive program of scholarly research is an absolute requirement for promotion. This is evaluated based on a number of indicators of excellence. 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 is crucial. External evidence of international impact as documented through citation ratings, outside letters of evaluation from distinguished referees, participation in conferences and workshops,

participation in translational research, evidence of impact on policy and/or practice, and invited talks are among the factors considered.

- 3.5.7.3 Service - Faculty members in HIEP are expected to contribute to sustaining and enhancing the community through service activities, in so far as their funding permits them to do so. Faculty members generally are expected to participate in HIEP governance and share in organizational work. The assessment of service contributions plays a minor role in evaluation of the faculty member for promotion to research associate professor, but the evaluation for promotion to research full 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 Institute.
- 3.5.7.4 Teaching - Excellence in teaching, as minimally defined by the University Senate and the MOU with UA, either in the classroom or as mentor within the research environment, is expected. An important aspect of the teaching mission of HIEP is the training and mentoring of students. For research professors (assistant, associate, or full) supervision and mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students working on HIEP projects is the most common way this is done.