

NTTF Review and Promotion Policy (Institute of Theoretical Science)

1.0 Collective Bargaining Agreement Processes

Review and promotion procedures are specified in Article 19 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. This document elaborates only on those components of review and promotion that are not prescribed in the CBA. When conducting contract and promotion reviews, the Institute of Theoretical Science (ITS) 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 research faculty members of the ITS are reviewed annually, typically in the spring. During their first contract, career NTTF will be also be reviewed halfway through the contract period.
- 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. Where there is more than one supervisor, each will be responsible for their area of assignment.
- 2.4 The annual evaluation will is based upon the professional responsibilities as described in a faculty member's position description along with annual goals and major assignments during the year under review. Because the research faculty are funded by sponsored projects, evaluations should reflect the kind of activities that the faculty have been funded to do.
- 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 Review materials
 - 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 reflects progress towards goals set a year prior.
 - 2.6.3 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.
 - 2.6.4 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 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.
 - 3.1.2 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.
 - 3.1.3 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.
- 3.2 Review committee
- 3.2.1 In years where there are research NTTF promotion reviews in the ITS, the director appoints a promotion review committee as well as a review committee chair.
 - 3.2.2 The committee will consist of at least three faculty who hold a rank equivalent to or higher than 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. Prior to appointing a NTTF whose contract is contingent on external funding, the director will confirm that the terms of the funding permit participation in this committee.
 - 3.2.3 The review committee will not include the candidate's immediate supervisor or the director.
 - 3.2.4 In the event that there are not enough members of the ITS at the appropriate rank to make up a committee, the director should appoint faculty members from other units.
 - 3.2.5 The committee is responsible for reviewing the candidate's materials and making a written recommendation, including a formal vote, to the director. The director will include a voting summary in their evaluation letter.
- 3.3 Review materials
- 3.3.1 The candidate will provide the director with a current CV and a personal statement as specified in Article 19, Section 11 of the CBA. If applicable, they will also provide a list of suggested 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, unless the candidate has job duties that are to create an external impact.
 - 3.4.2 Candidates for promotion to Research Associate I and Research Associate II will be determined on a case-by-case basis. Faculty job duties include expectations of having independent external impact should have external reviews. Candidates who are largely part of teams with no expectations of independent impact will likely only need internal reviews.
 - 3.4.3 Promotions to Research Associate Professor and Research Full Professor will have external reviews, but may also include internal reviews.

- 3.4.4 Prior to embarking on obtaining reviews, the committee chair will discuss with the OVPRI the candidate and their job duties, and propose a plan regarding the time and quantity of reviews, and obtain agreement from the Office about the type and quantity of reviews.
 - 3.4.5 The review committee chair manages the process of obtaining the supervisor's evaluation, and internal and external reviews.
- 3.5 Criteria for promotion
- 3.5.1 The ITS 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 individual's unit or department, the college, university, and local, state, and national community.
 - 3.5.2 Promotion is not an automatic process, awarded for having put in their time, but rather awarded for excellence.
 - 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 sponsored projects, these evaluations will also reflect the kind of activities that they have been funded to do.
 - 3.5.4 All faculty are expected to contribute to the University's goals regarding equity and inclusion. These contributions may consist of research, teaching, and service activities as appropriate, given the candidate's job duties. Candidate's statement should describe opportunities they have had to contribute to the University's goals of equity and inclusion.
 - 3.5.5 Criteria for promotion: As of November 2014, the only personnel covered by the CBA that are employed by the ITS are postdoctoral scholars that are not eligible for promotion within their classification. Detailed criteria for the promotion of faculty in other classifications (research assistant, research associate, research professor) will be developed should such faculty be hired in the future. The initiation of the development by the faculty of promotion criteria consistent with Article 15 Section 2 and Article 19 of the CBA shall be the responsibility of the director if the need arises.