

DEPARTMENT OF ART NTTF REVIEW AND PROMOTION POLICY

PURPOSE

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

This policy outlines the Department of Art'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. For those NTTF appointments that include some explicit service responsibilities such as advising or management, the proportion would follow the job description. 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

Career NTTF who are eligible for inclusion in a review and promotion process will be given full consideration and opportunity to demonstrate individual merit. The majority of NTTF in the Art Department currently have teaching-only appointments. The assessment rubric reflects this emphasis on teaching. Evaluation will include activities that contribute to teaching preparation and staying current in the field, as well as classroom effectiveness. The Department Head and the elected Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) will constitute the 'review and promotion committee', which will conduct the assessment scoring for review. The Head will then be responsible for translating those assessment metrics.

2.1. Criteria for Review – Assessment will be based on the materials submitted by each NTTF member in relation to the Art Merit Policy criteria, with the caveat that weighting of the review criteria will reflect a realistic balance of duties. Evaluations will be based upon the quality of teaching and other professional responsibilities in proportion to the FTE in an individual's job description as well as other available information such as student course evaluations for each course taught and at least one peer review of teaching per contract period..

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

2.2.1. Review Period – 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. The review will consider the Career NTTF bargaining unit faculty member’s performance since the last review. For promotion, the candidate will establish the period of review towards eligibility.

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.

2.2.3. Standards of Performance for Promotion
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.

3. Review - 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.

3.1. 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, that merit assessment will serve as the review for all NTTF. If a merit assessment is not required, 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 be based on 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. At least 1-week notice will be given to Career NTTF 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. Notice of a peer review will be given at least 1-week before a peer review is conducted.

4. Promotion

The Department of Art 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 – Career NTTF will be eligible for promotion after accumulating six years of service at or above 0.3 FTE annualized per year, 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

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

4.3. 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 affected bargaining unit faculty member.

4.4. Credit for Prior Service – When credit for prior service is agreed upon, the terms of hire will state the number of years of credit granted and the earliest date for promotion eligibility. Teaching, scholarship, research, and creative activity completed by the bargaining unit faculty member during the period of prior service will receive full consideration during the promotion process if the bargaining unit member elects the earliest date for promotion review. Should a bargaining unit member who received credit for prior service at the time of hire choose to delay the review until completing the required six years at the University of Oregon, teaching, scholarship, research, and creative activity completed prior to arrival at the university will be of secondary consideration during the promotion process. Should the bargaining unit faculty member choose to use some, but not all of the credit for prior service, the focus of the review of teaching, scholarship, research, and creative activity will adjust appropriately so that, for example, four years at the University of Oregon would mean that at most two years of prior service will receive full consideration.

4.5. Multiple or Joint Appointments – For NTTF holding multiple or joint appointments, a memorandum will be completed at the time of 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.

4.6. 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. Candidates will provide the following according to the department’s timeline:

4.6.1. Curriculum Vitae – A comprehensive and current academic curriculum vitae including courses that the candidate has taught at the University of Oregon, departmental, university and external service, current research, scholarly and creative activities and accomplishments, including publications, appointments, presentations, and similar activities and accomplishments.

4.6.2. Personal Statement – A 2-6 page personal statement developed by the bargaining unit faculty member evaluating their performance measured against the applicable criteria for

promotion. The personal statement should expressly address the subjects of teaching; scholarship, research and creative activity; and service contributions to the academic department, center or institute, school or college, university, profession, and the community, as it pertains to individual job descriptions. The statement should also include discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.

4.6.3. Supervisors' Letters of Evaluation- An assessment of the bargaining member's teaching contribution by a faculty supervisor, generally the curricular head. If the instructor teaches in several areas within the department, there should be a detailed assessment from each supervisor.

The following documents only to the extent applicable

4.6.4. Teaching Portfolio – Representative examples of course syllabi (with course content, instructional expectations, lesson plans and calendar), 20 examples of student work, and other similar materials the candidate would like considered.

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

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

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

4.6.8. External Reviews - 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.

4.7. 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.

4.8. 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. 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. Scholarship portfolio (as applicable)

4.9.10. Service portfolio (as applicable)

4.9.11. Department Head and/or unit committee recommendations

4.9.12. Dean's recommendation

4.9.13. 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 and the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) will prepare a report on the merits of the promotion case. The report will include the FPC 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. 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 promotion by providing a written request to the Provost and Dean at any time before the Provost's decision.